

Heidi Leatherwood

From: Troy Bliss
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 3:30 PM
To: Heidi Leatherwood
Subject: FW: Important--please respond.

From: Chrisdonawhite [mailto:chrisdonawhite@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 1:08 PM
To: Troy Bliss
Subject: Re: Important--please respond.

Thank you Troy. Chris

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 17, 2014, at 1:02 PM, Troy Bliss <Troy.Bliss@cityofloveland.org> wrote:

Chris,

Thank you for your email. Here is a link to our website where you can download all of the information associated to the appeal hearing tomorrow night:

<http://www.cityofloveland.org/index.aspx?recordid=58770&page=1169>

The first sheet (or coversheet) to Agenda Item #9 lists these options. Essentially they are to either uphold the Planning Commission decision, remand to Planning Commission relative to a new plan proposal, reverse the Planning Commission decision with conditions, reverse the Planning Commission decision without conditions, or continue the item to a future City Council meeting.

You will also notice in the coversheet, that if a new plan is being proposed, our recommendation (rather than uphold the Planning Commission decision) is to remand to Planning Commission for consideration. It is our understanding that the plan shared with members of the HOA's is the plan that the applicant wishes to move forward with. The City has not had the opportunity to review this plan in detail nor has the Planning Commission seen it. Therefore, we believe that in moving forward with a new plan, it should be sent back to the Planning Commission for review as opposed to being determined at an appeal hearing with City Council. City Council however has the authority to do whatever they choose.

The meeting actually begins at 6:30 p.m., so if the paper mentioned 6:00 p.m., that would have been a misprint. Thank you.

Troy Bliss
Senior Planner
Current Planning
Development Services
City of Loveland
(970) 962-2579

Troy.Bliss@cityofloveland.org

From: ChrisDona White [<mailto:chrisdonawhite@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 9:44 AM

To: Troy Bliss; Robert Paulsen; Susan

Subject: Important--please respond.

Troy,

The article in this morning's paper mentioned that the city staff listed five options for the City Council to consider and that the Planning Commission had recommended conditions for approval should the City Council vote to approve.

What are the options?

What are the conditions?

Knowing that we are a well-organized opposition representing a significant number of voting citizens, why were they not informed?

Also, the article mentions that the meeting begins at 6 p.m. Is this correct and is this a change?

Chris White

Chris and Dona White
chrisdonawhite@gmail.com

Heidi Leatherwood

From: Troy Bliss
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 3:29 PM
To: Heidi Leatherwood
Subject: FW: Tonight's meeting

From: ChrisDona White [mailto:chrisdonawhite@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 7:37 AM
To: Troy Bliss; Robert Paulsen
Cc: sarff33@msn.com; Susan; billreinert@gmail.com; Pat McFall; pat kelly; cglassmire@aol.com; Greg Howell; kaiser@digis.net; Sue; Chris Rogowski
Subject: Tonight's meeting

Troy,

The committee of six speakers presenting tonight has rehearsed their presentation multiple times. In the last two run-throughs the total duration was less than 35 minutes. Again, it is our aim to express the views of the community in an organized, succinct, and respectful manner, and hopefully avoid the pejorative, random, and repetitive comments that occurred at the very first public meeting.

At the outset, we will ask,

Supporters in the audience, at various times in the presentation we will ask you to demonstrate your support of the point being made—in the interest of time and respect, if you are in the City Council Room, please stand; if you are in the hallways, please applaud briefly so that the City Council may know of your support. Also, we ask respectfully that—if you feel that our presentation sufficiently covered the reasons for your opposition, that you let the presentation and visual demonstrations of support suffice and not repeat for emphasis points that have already been made. Of course you will have an opportunity to raise new concerns or voice your support for the proposal.

We will have a Powerpoint presentation to accompany the presentation; I will bring a flash drive with the Powerpoint to load on the computer.

Would it be possible to reserve six seats at the front for the speakers?

Please let me know if any of these arrangements are not satisfactory.

Chris and Dona White
chrisdonawhite@gmail.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 2:33 PM
To: <dsinnar@earthlink.net>
Cc: Temp CCMAIL
Subject: Re: Appropriate Development of OutlotA at Kendell Brook

Don,

Thank you for your email. Your concerns will be given weight this evening.

Troy

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 18, 2014, at 11:10 AM, "Donald Sinnar" <dsinnar@earthlink.net> wrote:

Gentlemen,

Thank you for your service to our community and to Loveland. We recognize how difficult and busy it is for city council members, with all the council has to consider. The subject of this email is no less important to Loveland.

We moved to this community for the ambiance we recognized in Kendell Brook and continue to enjoy our residence here. We are alarmed that any consideration at all would be given to the multi-unit development proposed currently by Journey Homes. We attended a professionally held meeting of the Loveland City Planning Commission wherein the proposed development was soundly rejected. We saw hundreds of our neighbors attending in opposition to this development and can expect hundreds at tonight's meeting also in united opposition to a incompatible development.

We encourage you to ratify the Planning Commission's ruling and end this incompatible endeavor.

Thank you,

Donald W. Sinnar and Diane N. Sinnar
4770 Georgetown Drive
Loveland, CO. 80538

Don Sinnar
Loveland, Colorado
970-619-8855
<image001.jpg>

Jeannie Weaver

From: dsinnar@earthlink.net
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 2:33 PM
To: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Subject: Re: Re: Appropriate Development of OutlotA at Kendell Brook

I apologize for this automatic reply to your email.

To control spam, I now allow incoming messages only from senders I have approved beforehand.

If you would like to be added to my list of approved senders, please fill out the short request form (see link below). Once I approve you, I will receive your original message in my inbox. You do not need to resend your message. I apologize for this one-time inconvenience.

Click the link below to fill out the request:

<https://webmail.pas.earthlink.net/wam/addme?a=dsinnar@earthlink.net&id=11e4-6f6a-782e4be4-872a-002128146556>

Jeannie Weaver

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 2:30 PM
To: Jeff Fisher
Cc: Temp CCMail
Subject: Re: Journey Homes Apartment Proposal

Thank you for your email. I am very aware of this situation and will weigh your concerns tonight at the hearing.

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

> On Nov 18, 2014, at 1:47 PM, "Jeff Fisher" <jtmsfish4@gmail.com> wrote:
>
> Mr. Krenning and Mr. Taylor,
>
> Since we are unable to make the planning commission meeting tonight, we wanted to send you an email with our concerns. We attended the last meeting over the summer, but our kiddo has a basketball game tonight.
>
> As property owners of a Journey Home, we are concerned about the integrity of the Journey Representative that spoke at the last meeting. We are one of the buyers that are to have our driveway replaced. We were notified of this in September of 2013, and the letter from Journey stated that they would be in touch with us in the springtime. I contacted them in June, since we had not heard from them, and they had no reason why, but that we were on the list and they would get back to us in the fall.
>
> Today, we contacted Journey Homes and were told that we were still on the list, but that there is a shortage of concrete subcontractors and it has been pushed back to an unknown date.
>
> We live in Taft Farms and moved to this neighborhood because we had lived near condos in our last neighborhood which developed a somewhat transient population in them. Parking congestion on the street accompanied this population. Now we are facing the same issue in Taft Farms. We have concerns about the parking overflow in our neighborhood, which is inevitable, as they can't park on 50th.
>
> When homeowners in Emerald Glen had concerns about the condos going up at 43rd and Glen Isle, parking was a concern. If you drive down Glen Isle after 6 pm, there is a stream of cars, whom owners live in the condo's, exactly what the residents were concerned about.
>
> The Rock Crest apartment complex at 43rd and Lucerne has increased the calls for service to this part of the town and it is unnecessary for another apartment complex so close to the Rock Crest.
>
> This proposed space is not suited for an apartment complex, with the parking issues opponents have inquired about.
>
> Thank you,
>
> Jeff and Tammy Fisher
>
>

Jeannie Weaver

From: Jeff Fisher <jtmsfish4@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 1:48 PM
To: Ward I - Troy Krenning; Ward I - Chauncey Taylor
Subject: Journey Homes Apartment Proposal

Mr. Krenning and Mr. Taylor,

Since we are unable to make the planning commission meeting tonight, we wanted to send you an email with our concerns. We attended the last meeting over the summer, but our kiddo has a basketball game tonight.

As property owners of a Journey Home, we are concerned about the integrity of the Journey Representative that spoke at the last meeting. We are one of the buyers that are to have our driveway replaced. We were notified of this in September of 2013, and the letter from Journey stated that they would be in touch with us in the springtime. I contacted them in June, since we had not heard from them, and they had no reason why, but that we were on the list and they would get back to us in the fall.

Today, we contacted Journey Homes and were told that we were still on the list, but that there is a shortage of concrete subcontractors and it has been pushed back to an unknown date.

We live in Taft Farms and moved to this neighborhood because we had lived near condos in our last neighborhood which developed a somewhat transient population in them. Parking congestion on the street accompanied this population. Now we are facing the same issue in Taft Farms. We have concerns about the parking overflow in our neighborhood, which is inevitable, as they can't park on 50th.

When homeowners in Emerald Glen had concerns about the condos going up at 43rd and Glen Isle, parking was a concern. If you drive down Glen Isle after 6 pm, there is a stream of cars, whom owners live in the condo's, exactly what the residents were concerned about.

The Rock Crest apartment complex at 43rd and Lucerne has increased the calls for service to this part of the town and it is unnecessary for another apartment complex so close to the Rock Crest.

This proposed space is not suited for an apartment complex, with the parking issues opponents have inquired about.

Thank you,

Jeff and Tammy Fisher

Jeannie Weaver

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 9:47 PM
To: fred
Cc: Temp CCMAIL
Subject: Re: Kendall Brook Outlot A Appeal

Irene, Fred

Thank you for your email. I will keep your thoughts and concerns in mind as the appeal hearing is conducted.

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 17, 2014, at 9:32 PM, "fred" <yemenfred@hotmail.com> wrote:

Dear members of Loveland City Council:

We are opposed to the plan for an apartment development along 50th Street in the Kendall Brook subdivision Outlot A. This appears to be virtually the same proposal that the Loveland Planning Commission rejected last summer, but is now reoffered with lipstick on the pig. The 12-year-old zoning for high density rental housing on this 7 acre parcel is incompatible and inconsistent with the owner-occupied single family unit neighborhoods that have evolved in the neighboring Harvest Gold, Kendall Brook, and Taft Farms subdivisions.

At the City Planning Commission meeting the developer revealed that the plan includes fewer than 2 on-site parking spaces per rental unit. Since the site is not near public transit or shopping, it is likely that most family units will be multi-vehicle owners. Parking demand for residents could easily exceed the available spaces, and not considering parking for visitors or service vehicles. There currently is no parking lane along West 50th Street, and there appears to be no room to create a parking lane on that street. We are concerned that if these units were built it is likely that parking will spill into the adjacent neighborhoods,

particularly Taft Farms, and make a serious negative impact on the established character.

We are also concerned for the impact this proposed development will have on traffic flow on 50th street. Outlot A has only two entrances, both from 50th Street, which must accommodate all the traffic from the 120 units. The eastern entrance is approximately 350 feet west of the intersection of 50th Street and Georgetown Drive. At this time most of the 350 feet is dedicated to a protected left turn from eastbound 50th Street into Taft Farms. We are concerned that traffic westbound on 50th Street attempting a left turn into the proposed development will back up and block the Georgetown Drive intersection. Although a recent City assessment of the 50th Street traffic concluded the street is adequate to handle the load, the reality we see now at certain times of the day is that traffic cuts through Taft Farms to avoid the left-turn backup at the traffic light at Taft Avenue.

The proposed development will create hard surface on at least half of the 7 acre parcel. Surface runoff from the development can only be directed toward the natural drainage/wetland along the west side of the property. During heavy runoff last year that drainage experienced significant flooding along its course across Kendall Brook. If the proposed development had then been in place it is likely the flooding in Kendall Brook would have been more extensive. Apparently some surface water calculations have been made on behalf of the developer that suggest runoff from Outlot A would not negatively impact flooding in the drainage. How about the calculations that told Richard Bronson that the Virgin Galactic spacecraft was safe?

Finally, as escapees from the East Coast, we are wondering why, with the vast undeveloped areas available along the Front Range, a developer would squeeze 120 apartment units into a 7 ½ acre parcel that is far from any public services or retail facilities! We think this parcel could be a

prime Loveland city park/natural area situated as it is beside the wetlands-like natural drainage.

Thank you for reading our concerns,

Respectfully,

Irene and Fred Moose
1534 Homeland Street
Taft Farms Subdivision

Jeannie Weaver

From: fred <yemenfred@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 9:33 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Kendall Brook Outlot A Appeal

Dear members of Loveland City Council:

We are opposed to the plan for an apartment development along 50th Street in the Kendall Brook subdivision Outlot A. This appears to be virtually the same proposal that the Loveland Planning Commission rejected last summer, but is now reoffered with lipstick on the pig. The 12-year-old zoning for high density rental housing on this 7 acre parcel is incompatible and inconsistent with the owner-occupied single family unit neighborhoods that have evolved in the neighboring Harvest Gold, Kendall Brook, and Taft Farms subdivisions.

At the City Planning Commission meeting the developer revealed that the plan includes fewer than 2 on-site parking spaces per rental unit. Since the site is not near public transit or shopping, it is likely that most family units will be multi-vehicle owners. Parking demand for residents could easily exceed the available spaces, and not considering parking for visitors or service vehicles. There currently is no parking lane along West 50th Street, and there appears to be no room to create a parking lane on that street. We are concerned that if these units were built it is likely that parking will spill into the adjacent neighborhoods, particularly Taft Farms, and make a serious negative impact on the established character.

We are also concerned for the impact this proposed development will have on traffic flow on 50th street. Outlot A has only two entrances, both from 50th Street, which must accommodate all the traffic from the 120 units. The eastern entrance is approximately 350 feet west of the intersection of 50th Street and Georgetown Drive. At this time most of the 350 feet is dedicated to a protected left turn from eastbound 50th Street into Taft Farms. We are concerned that traffic westbound on 50th Street attempting a left turn into the proposed development will back up and block the Georgetown Drive intersection. Although a recent City assessment of the 50th Street traffic concluded the street is adequate to handle the load, the reality we see now at certain times of the day is that traffic cuts through Taft Farms to avoid the left-turn backup at the traffic light at Taft Avenue.

The proposed development will create hard surface on at least half of the 7 acre parcel. Surface runoff from the development can only be directed toward the natural drainage/wetland along the west side of the property. During heavy runoff last year that drainage experienced significant flooding along its course across Kendall Brook. If the proposed development had then been in place it is likely the flooding in Kendall Brook would have been more extensive. Apparently some surface water calculations have been made on behalf of the developer that suggest runoff from Outlot A would not negatively impact flooding in the drainage. How about the calculations that told Richard Bronson that the Virgin Galactic spacecraft was safe?

Finally, as escapees from the East Coast, we are wondering why, with the vast undeveloped areas available along the Front Range, a developer would squeeze 120 apartment units into a 7 ½ acre parcel that is far from any public services or retail facilities! We think this parcel could be a prime Loveland city park/natural area situated as it is beside the wetlands-like natural drainage.

Thank you for reading our concerns,

Respectfully,

Irene and Fred Moose
1534 Homeland Street
Taft Farms Subdivision

Jeannie Weaver

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 7:10 PM
To: Preston
Cc: Temp CCMail
Subject: Re: Journey Homes apartment complex

Mr. Mrs. Preston,

Thank you for your sharing your concerns, as you may be aware I am very dialed into the issues raised by you and others. Although the applicant certainly has the right to appeal the decision of the planning commission, I will be certain to address your concerns at the hearing.

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

> On Nov 17, 2014, at 7:06 PM, "Preston" <preter@netzero.net> wrote:

>

> Dear Mr. Krenning,

>

> I am writing you as a resident of the Kendall Brook subdivision and a Journey Homes home owner. I wanted to share with you some of my experiences with dealing with Journey Homes. My wife and I closed on our house at the end of July 2013 and the concrete in our driveway and porch steps started to crack by the first week in September 2013 (please see the attached pictures). Journey Homes was very slow to respond to our complaints about the quality of their concrete work. At times their representatives were outright rude to us when we pressed them on when they were going to fix the problems that were caused by not pouring the concrete correctly. Journey Homes did come out to fix the cracking concrete, but I believe that the only reason they did this was because of the upcoming decision about the proposed apartment complex. The new concrete that was poured less than two months ago has already started to crack and Journey Homes has no intention of coming back to fix it correctly.

>

> My wife and I believe that you will see the same quality of work and willingness to remedy quality issues with this proposed apartment complex that we have experienced with our house. The proposed apartment complex does not fit with the design scheme that is followed by the rest of the neighborhood and will drop the surrounding property values. As registered voters in Ward I my wife and I will consider Tuesday's city council decision when voting in the next city council elections. We urge you to deny the building permit for the proposed Journey Homes apartment complex. Feel free to contact me via email if you would like to discuss this topic further.

>

> Thank you for your time,
 > Preston & Lindsay Peterson

>

>

>

>

 > Odd Trick Fights Diabetes

> "Unique" Proven Method To Control Blood Sugar In 3 Weeks. Watch Video.

>

> <<http://thirdpartyoffers.netzero.net/TGL3242/546aa9663980b296522dbst02duc>>DiabetesProtocol.com<<http://thirdpartyoffers.netzero.net/TGL3242/546aa9663980b296522dbst02duc>>

> <20140711_164818.jpg>

> <20140711_164912.jpg>

> <20140711_164943.jpg>









Jeannie Weaver

From: Preston <preter@netzero.net>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 7:05 PM
To: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Subject: Journey Homes apartment complex
Attachments: 20140711_164818.jpg; 20140711_164912.jpg; 20140711_164943.jpg; 20140711_165348.jpg

Dear Mr. Krenning,

I am writing you as a resident of the Kendall Brook subdivision and a Journey Homes home owner. I wanted to share with you some of my experiences with dealing with Journey Homes. My wife and I closed on our house at the end of July 2013 and the concrete in our driveway and porch steps started to crack by the first week in September 2013 (please see the attached pictures). Journey Homes was very slow to respond to our complaints about the quality of their concrete work. At times their representatives were outright rude to us when we pressed them on when they were going to fix the problems that were caused by not pouring the concrete correctly. Journey Homes did come out to fix the cracking concrete, but I believe that the only reason they did this was because of the upcoming decision about the proposed apartment complex. The new concrete that was poured less than two months ago has already started to crack and Journey Homes has no intention of coming back to fix it correctly.

My wife and I believe that you will see the same quality of work and willingness to remedy quality issues with this proposed apartment complex that we have experienced with our house. The proposed apartment complex does not fit with the design scheme that is followed by the rest of the neighborhood and will drop the surrounding property values. As registered voters in Ward I my wife and I will consider Tuesday's city council decision when voting in the next city council elections. We urge you to deny the building permit for the proposed Journey Homes apartment complex. Feel free to contact me via email if you would like to discuss this topic further.

Thank you for your time,
Preston & Lindsay Peterson

Odd Trick Fights Diabetes

"Unique" Proven Method To Control Blood Sugar In 3 Weeks. Watch Video.
DiabetesProtocol.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Preston <preter@netzero.net>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 7:00 PM
To: Ward I - Chauncey Taylor
Subject: Kendall Brook apartment complex
Attachments: 20140711_164818.jpg; 20140711_164912.jpg; 20140711_165017.jpg; 20140711_165348.jpg

Dear Mr. Taylor,

I am writing you as a resident of the Kendall Brook subdivision and a Journey Homes home owner. I wanted to share with you some of my experiences with dealing with Journey Homes. My wife and I closed on our house at the end of July 2013 and the concrete in our driveway and porch steps started to crack by the first week in September 2013 (please see the attached pictures). Journey Homes was very slow to respond to our complaints about the quality of their concrete work. At times their representatives were outright rude to us when we pressed them on when they were going to fix the problems that were caused by not pouring the concrete correctly. Journey Homes did come out to fix the cracking concrete, but I believe that the only reason they did this was because of the upcoming decision about the proposed apartment complex. The new concrete that was poured less than two months ago has already started to crack and Journey Homes has no intention of coming back to fix it correctly.

My wife and I believe that you will see the same quality of work and willingness to remedy quality issues with this proposed apartment complex that we have experienced with our house. The proposed apartment complex does not fit with the design scheme that is followed by the rest of the neighborhood and will drop the surrounding property values. As registered voters in Ward I my wife and I will consider Tuesday's city council decision when voting in the next city council elections. We urge you to deny the building permit for the proposed Journey Homes apartment complex. Feel free to contact me via email if you would like to discuss this topic further.

Thank you for your time,
Preston & Lindsay Peterson

Odd Trick Fights Diabetes

"Unique" Proven Method To Control Blood Sugar In 3 Weeks. Watch Video.
DiabetesProtocol.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 6:48 PM
To: Allison Hoover
Cc: Temp CCMail
Subject: Re: 50th and Georgetown Complex Proposal

Ms. Hoover,

Thank you for your email and sharing your concerns. I will carefully weigh your comments and concerns with the information presented tomorrow night.

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 17, 2014, at 6:14 PM, "Allison Hoover" <ajh8373@yahoo.com> wrote:

Mr. Krenning and Mr. Taylor,

My name is Allison Hoover, and I live in the Taft Farms subdivision (1529 Wetland Drive). We moved into this neighborhood more than 2 years ago. Previously, my family and I lived in the Greenbriar subdivision, just a mile away, for almost 10 years. Needless to say, we are very familiar with this area of town.

I am writing this email because, unfortunately, my husband and I are unable to attend the council meeting tomorrow in regards to the appeal to review the apartment complex at 50th and Georgetown. I am reaching out to you as the representatives of our ward. I cannot express strongly enough that we disagree with this project.

An apartment complex is not consistent with the current neighborhood demographics; therefore, the concern of property values and safety are of enormous concern to us.

The City Council listened to the surrounding neighborhoods weeks ago and agreed that the proposed location is not ideal for this project. I implore you to stand with your original decision and not allow this project to move forward.

Allison Hoover
1529 Wetland Street
Loveland, CO 80538
(970) 593-8130

Jeannie Weaver

From: Allison Hoover <ajh8373@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 6:15 PM
To: Ward I - Troy Krenning; Ward I - Chauncey Taylor
Subject: 50th and Georgetown Complex Proposal

Mr. Krenning and Mr. Taylor,

My name is Allison Hoover, and I live in the Taft Farms subdivision (1529 Wetland Drive). We moved into this neighborhood more than 2 years ago. Previously, my family and I lived in the Greenbriar subdivision, just a mile away, for almost 10 years. Needless to say, we are very familiar with this area of town.

I am writing this email because, unfortunately, my husband and I are unable to attend the council meeting tomorrow in regards to the appeal to review the apartment complex at 50th and Georgetown. I am reaching out to you as the representatives of our ward. I cannot express strongly enough that we disagree with this project.

An apartment complex is not consistent with the current neighborhood demographics; therefore, the concern of property values and safety are of enormous concern to us.

The City Council listened to the surrounding neighborhoods weeks ago and agreed that the proposed location is not ideal for this project. I implore you to stand with your original decision and not allow this project to move forward.

Allison Hoover
1529 Wetland Street
Loveland, CO 80538
(970) 593-8130

Jeannie Weaver

From: Allison Hoover <ajh8373@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 6:18 PM
To: Mayor - Cecil Gutierrez
Subject: Apartment Complex at 50th and Georgetown

Mayor Gutierrez,

My name is Allison Hoover, and I live in the Taft Farms subdivision (1529 Wetland Drive). We moved into this neighborhood more than 2 years ago. Previously, my family and I lived in the Greenbriar subdivision, just a mile away, for almost 10 years. Needless to say, we are very familiar with this area of town.

I am writing this email because, unfortunately, my husband and I are unable to attend the council meeting tomorrow in regards to the appeal to review the apartment complex at 50th and Georgetown. I am reaching out to you as the mayor of Loveland. I cannot express strongly enough that we disagree with this project.

An apartment complex is not consistent with the current neighborhood demographics; therefore, the concern of property values and safety are of enormous concern to us.

The City Council listened to the surrounding neighborhoods weeks ago and agreed that the proposed location is not ideal for this project. I implore you to stand with your original decision and not allow this project to move forward.

Allison Hoover
1529 Wetland Street
Loveland, CO 80538
(970) 593-8130

Jeannie Weaver

From: Allison Hoover <ajh8373@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 6:23 PM
To: Ward II - Joan Shaffer; Ward II - Phil Farley; Ward III - Hugh McKean; Ward III - John Fogle;
Ward IV - Ralph Trenary; Ward IV - Dave Clark
Subject: Apartment Complex at 50th and Georgetown

My name is Allison Hoover, and I live in the Taft Farms subdivision (1529 Wetland Drive). We moved into this neighborhood more than 2 years ago. Previously, my family and I lived in the Greenbriar subdivision, just a mile away, for almost 10 years. Needless to say, we are very familiar with this area of town.

I am writing this email because, unfortunately, my husband and I are unable to attend the council meeting tomorrow in regards to the appeal to review the apartment complex at 50th and Georgetown. I am reaching out to you, the representatives of the citizens of Loveland. I cannot express strongly enough that we disagree with this project.

An apartment complex is not consistent with the current neighborhood demographics; therefore, the concern of property values and safety are of enormous concern to us.

The City Council listened to the surrounding neighborhoods weeks ago and agreed that the proposed location is not ideal for this project. I implore you to stand with your original decision and not allow this project to move forward.

Allison Hoover
1529 Wetland Street
Loveland, CO 80538
(970) 593-8130

Jeannie Weaver

From: clark lowry <thelowrys1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 11:05 AM
To: Ward IV - Ralph Trenary
Subject: Please Uphold the Planning Commission's Recommendation

Dear Mr. Trenary,

We are contacting you concerning the proposal for multifamily homes in the Kendall Brook neighborhood.

When our family chose to move to Loveland 13 years ago, we chose a new house in a new development because of the park, walking trails, and wetlands area that it provided. We were aware that at some point Outlot A would be developed. However, it was always represented to us, that it would be built for individual owners. We believe in and support businesses and the development to Outlot A as we have always known it would be developed. With this said, there needs to be a social responsibility taken into consideration along with the overall blending of the neighborhood as a whole.

The proposed building specifications from Journey Homes are not harmonious with our established neighborhood. As a friendly, supportive, cohesive neighborhood, the proposal that Journey Homes has presented, is incongruent with what our neighborhood has become and matured into. We are genuinely concerned about the inadequate room that Larry Buckendorf is proposing to stuff everyone into and the proximity of the tenet's playground for children next to Loudon Ditch. It makes little sense to build apartment buildings in that location, as the tenets would be far away from public transportation, work, shopping etc. Their buildings would completely change our neighborhood and it would put their tenets in an uncomfortable situation as they are forced to park in the streets and cul-de-sacs of other parts of the neighborhood. They too will have to deal with the congestion of traffic that the surrounding streets are not adequately designed to accommodate and have little to no outdoor living space. Their prospective tenets deserve better. We are also very concerned about Journey Homes accumulating 70 votes as part of our HOA. This is disturbing as Mr. Buckendorf has been condescending, manipulative, and hostile towards our neighborhood and we find it difficult to believe he will want to work with the neighborhood in the future. Again, the future tenants and the neighborhood deserve better and we do not believe Journey Homes or Mr. Bukendorf will be able provide what is needed based on our past history with them.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's recommendation for denial of this project.

Clark and Jill Lowry
4530 Walden Ct
Loveland, CO 80538

Jeannie Weaver

From: clark lowry <thelowrys1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 11:03 AM
To: Ward III - Hugh McKean
Subject: Please Uphold the Planning Commission's Recommendation

Dear Mr. McKean,

We are contacting you concerning the proposal for multifamily homes in the Kendall Brook neighborhood.

When our family chose to move to Loveland 13 years ago, we chose a new house in a new development because of the park, walking trails, and wetlands area that it provided. We were aware that at some point Outlot A would be developed. However, it was always represented to us, that it would be built for individual owners. We believe in and support businesses and the development to Outlot A as we have always known it would be developed. With this said, there needs to be a social responsibility taken into consideration along with the overall blending of the neighborhood as a whole.

The proposed building specifications from Journey Homes are not harmonious with our established neighborhood. As a friendly, supportive, cohesive neighborhood, the proposal that Journey Homes has presented, is incongruent with what our neighborhood has become and matured into. We are genuinely concerned about the inadequate room that Larry Buckendorf is proposing to stuff everyone into and the proximity of the tenet's playground for children next to Loudon Ditch. It makes little sense to build apartment buildings in that location, as the tenets would be far away from public transportation, work, shopping etc. Their buildings would completely change our neighborhood and it would put their tenets in an uncomfortable situation as they are forced to park in the streets and cul-de-sacs of other parts of the neighborhood. They too will have to deal with the congestion of traffic that the surrounding streets are not adequately designed to accommodate and have little to no outdoor living space. Their prospective tenets deserve better. We are also very concerned about Journey Homes accumulating 70 votes as part of our HOA. This is disturbing as Mr. Buckendorf has been condescending, manipulative, and hostile towards our neighborhood and we find it difficult to believe he will want to work with the neighborhood in the future. Again, the future tenants and the neighborhood deserve better and we do not believe Journey Homes or Mr. Bukendorf will be able provide what is needed based on our past history with them.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's recommendation for denial of this project.

Clark and Jill Lowry
4530 Walden Ct
Loveland, CO 80538

Jeannie Weaver

From: clark lowry <thelowrys1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 11:01 AM
To: Ward II - Joan Shaffer
Subject: Please Uphold the Planning Commission's Recommendation

Dear Ms. Shaffer

We are contacting you concerning the proposal for multifamily homes in the Kendall Brook neighborhood.

When our family chose to move to Loveland 13 years ago, we chose a new house in a new development because of the park, walking trails, and wetlands area that it provided. We were aware that at some point Outlot A would be developed. However, it was always represented to us, that it would be built for individual owners. We believe in and support businesses and the development to Outlot A as we have always known it would be developed. With this said, there needs to be a social responsibility taken into consideration along with the overall blending of the neighborhood as a whole.

The proposed building specifications from Journey Homes are not harmonious with our established neighborhood. As a friendly, supportive, cohesive neighborhood, the proposal that Journey Homes has presented, is incongruent with what our neighborhood has become and matured into. We are genuinely concerned about the inadequate room that Larry Buckendorf is proposing to stuff everyone into and the proximity of the tenet's playground for children next to Loudon Ditch. It makes little sense to build apartment buildings in that location, as the tenets would be far away from public transportation, work, shopping etc. Their buildings would completely change our neighborhood and it would put their tenets in an uncomfortable situation as they are forced to park in the streets and cul-de-sacs of other parts of the neighborhood. They too will have to deal with the congestion of traffic that the surrounding streets are not adequately designed to accommodate and have little to no outdoor living space. Their prospective tenets deserve better. We are also very concerned about Journey Homes accumulating 70 votes as part of our HOA. This is disturbing as Mr. Buckendorf has been condescending, manipulative, and hostile towards our neighborhood and we find it difficult to believe he will want to work with the neighborhood in the future. Again, the future tenants and the neighborhood deserve better and we do not believe Journey Homes or Mr. Bukendorf will be able provide what is needed based on our past history with them.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's recommendation for denial of this project.

Clark and Jill Lowry
4530 Walden Ct
Loveland, CO 80538

Jeannie Weaver

From: clark lowry <thelowrys1@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 10:56 AM
To: Ward I - Chauncey Taylor
Subject: Please Uphold the Planning Commission's Recommendation

Dear Mr. Taylor

We are contacting you concerning the proposal for multifamily homes in the Kendall Brook neighborhood.

When our family chose to move to Loveland 13 years ago, we chose a new house in a new development because of the park, walking trails, and wetlands area that it provided. We were aware that at some point Outlot A would be developed. However, it was always represented to us, that it would be built for individual owners. We believe in and support businesses and the development to Outlot A as we have always known it would be developed. With this said, there needs to be a social responsibility taken into consideration along with the overall blending of the neighborhood as a whole.

The proposed building specifications from Journey Homes are not harmonious with our established neighborhood. As a friendly, supportive, cohesive neighborhood, the proposal that Journey Homes has presented, is incongruent with what our neighborhood has become and matured into. We are genuinely concerned about the inadequate room that Larry Buckendorf is proposing to stuff everyone into and the proximity of the tenet's playground for children next to Loudon Ditch. It makes little sense to build apartment buildings in that location, as the tenets would be far away from public transportation, work, shopping etc. Their buildings would completely change our neighborhood and it would put their tenets in an uncomfortable situation as they are forced to park in the streets and cul-de-sacs of other parts of the neighborhood. They too will have to deal with the congestion of traffic that the surrounding streets are not adequately designed to accommodate and have little to no outdoor living space. Their prospective tenets deserve better. We are also very concerned about Journey Homes accumulating 70 votes as part of our HOA. This is disturbing as Mr. Buckendorf has been condescending, manipulative, and hostile towards our neighborhood and we find it difficult to believe he will want to work with the neighborhood in the future. Again, the future tenants and the neighborhood deserve better and we do not believe Journey Homes or Mr. Bukendorf will be able provide what is needed based on our past history with them.

Please uphold the Planning Commission's recommendation for denial of this project.

Clark and Jill Lowry
4530 Walden Ct
Loveland, CO 80538

Jeannie Weaver

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 9:27 AM
To: Mary Janet Bergstrand
Cc: Temp CCMail
Subject: Re: Kendall Brook Subdivision

Thank you for sharing your concerns. I am dialed into this issue and will weigh your concerns and comments tomorrow evening during the hearing.

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 17, 2014, at 9:24 AM, "Mary Janet Bergstrand" <westierrorist@yahoo.com> wrote:

Dear Mr. Krenning,

This is a letter to express my personal feelings re: the Journey Homes/Crow Creek request to build over 100 units of rental property on 50th St.

I was present at the planning commission meeting, but due to family issues, we will be out of town tomorrow evening. I am concerned re: this developer's plans. While there has been some improvements made, the overall changes are not sufficient to warrant the city council's approval. As you will likely hear from those residents who are speaking tomorrow, the density is quite high. Several of the buildings were altered to include balconies, patios and some more varied elevations. (Interesting, since the spokesperson for the developer said that it was impossible to get insurance to add balconies.) However, there are still buildings with the "barrack" look that the planning commission stated did not work with the surrounding community. The sheer number of units will place a huge number of people in a very small area (high density). There is little plan for lifestyle needs, but rather only a place to sleep. It is easy to see that these will be occupied by students, young adults etc...each with their own car. Parking issues have not been well addressed. Oversight of the property to assure that upkeep, observance of HOA restrictions etc. has not been clarified in writing by this developer. I would welcome multi-family units built by a builder with a solid reputation that are in keeping with the existing neighborhood. There are townhomes and attached housing along Glen Isle, and across 43rd St. that are excellent examples. Even the housing up on 50th and Wilson has more to offer and this is subsidized housing.

Please do not allow this developer and builder to lower our property values by placing unattractive, unsupervised high density rental property with inadequate space for storage, parking, and outdoor living. Above this, we do not see this arrangement as "fitting-in" with what is currently existing in the surrounding neighborhoods.

I would gladly speak to you in person, should you want to meet. I trust that you will be representing this neighborhood of Kendall Brooks well on Tuesday evening.

Sincerely, Mary Janet Bergstrand

1620 Dumont Place

292-8804

MJ Bergstrand

westierrorist@yahoo.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Mary Janet Bergstrand <westieterrorist@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 9:24 AM
To: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Subject: Kendall Brook Subdivision

Dear Mr. Krenning,

This is a letter to express my personal feelings re: the Journey Homes/Crow Creek request to build over 100 units of rental property on 50th St.

I was present at the planning commission meeting, but due to family issues, we will be out of town tomorrow evening. I am concerned re: this developer's plans. While there has been some improvements made, the overall changes are not sufficient to warrant the city council's approval. As you will likely hear from those residents who are speaking tomorrow, the density is quite high. Several of the buildings were altered to include balconies, patios and some more varied elevations.

(Interesting, since the spokesperson for the developer said that it was impossible to get insurance to add balconies.) However, there are still buildings with the "barrack" look that the planning commission stated did not work with the surrounding community. The sheer number of units will place a huge number of people in a very small area (high density). There is little plan for lifestyle needs, but rather only a place to sleep. It is easy to see that these will be occupied by students, young adults etc...each with their own car. Parking issues have not been well addressed. Oversight of the property to assure that upkeep, observance of HOA restrictions etc. has not been clarified in writing by this developer.

I would welcome multi-family units built by a builder with a solid reputation that are in keeping with the existing neighborhood. There are townhomes and attached housing along Glen Isle, and across 43rd St. that are excellent examples. Even the housing up on 50th and Wilson has more to offer and this is subsidized housing.

Please do not allow this developer and builder to lower our property values by placing unattractive, unsupervised high density rental property with inadequate space for storage, parking, and outdoor living. Above this, we do not see this arrangement as "fitting-in" with what is currently existing in the surrounding neighborhoods.

I would gladly speak to you in person, should you want to meet. I trust that you will be representing this neighborhood of Kendall Brooks well on Tuesday evening.

Sincerely, Mary Janet Bergstrand
1620 Dumont Place
292-8804

MJ Bergstrand
westieterrorist@yahoo.com

"God who began the good work within you will keep right on helping you grow in his grace until his task with you is finally finished." Philippians 1:6

Jeannie Weaver

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 6:18 AM
To: Franci Wunderlich
Cc: Temp CCMAIL
Subject: Re: Kendall Brook Journey Homes Apartment Proposal

Ms. Wunderlich,

Thank you for your email. I am aware of this issue and will weigh your concerns as this issue is presented tomorrow night.

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 17, 2014, at 12:42 AM, "Franci Wunderlich" <Franci@YourHouseInColorado.Com> wrote:

Troy Krenning
Loveland City Council

Dear Councilor Krenning,

I am a homeowner in the Kendall Brook Subdivision and also own a property in Taft Farms north of 50th Street. I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to the plan and revision that has been put forth by Journey Homes at the corner of 50th and Georgetown in Kendall Brook subdivision. It is extremely important that the City hear the voice of the neighborhood and I believe it was clear and truly evident in the meetings held so far that the neighborhood does not want to see this particular project go forward in any way, shape or form. The idea of putting over 100 rental units in two story buildings on that land is extremely incompatible with the neighborhood and that kind of density is inconsistent and also not compatible or wise for the neighborhood.

The site in question is already elevated from the surrounding neighborhood and it is surrounded mostly by single story \$350,000 to \$400,000+ homes. To put any kind of two story building on top of land that is already elevated would stick out like a sore thumb and severely negatively impact the value of the properties around it. The amount of traffic generated by 100 plus units would be overwhelming and the overflow parking would go into the neighborhood. Even lighting that is designed to cast downward would be an eyesore since the land is already elevated. This project would have a severely detrimental impact upon the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods.

I would encourage the City Council to not approve this proposed plan, and for alternative uses for this land to be explored including zoning changes that would encourage more compatible development such as patio homes, senior living duplexes or one story townhomes. There is a great need for this kind of property to be available in Loveland at this time and it would be much more compatible. If you and the other Councilors have not gone physically to the property, I would encourage you to do so. The elevated area is not obvious when looking at the maps and plans that have been submitted. I realize the City cannot direct what developer may purchase the site and what the future purchaser's plans would be, but hopefully the Council can take into account the best use of the land when reviewing development proposals. I would encourage the City to only approve buildings with one story above grade due to the lay of the land on that parcel.

Kendall Brook has become a more diverse community in the last few years, but as one drives and walks through the subdivision the demographics seem to lean toward an older more mature population, especially in the areas surrounding this parcel. The demographics of those attending the meeting also seem to support that. For this reason, among many others, a single story, less dense construction plan would be more compatible and, in the long run, preserve the look and the feel of the subdivision and the community there.

Thank you for hearing my voice, our (homeowners') voice and our heart at the meeting and in past meetings on this project.

Frances Wunderlich, Homeowner

Frances Wunderlich

970-667-1828

Franci@YourHouseInColorado.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Franci Wunderlich <Franci@YourHouseInColorado.Com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 12:55 AM
To: Mayor - Cecil Gutierrez
Subject: Kendall Brook Journey Homes Apartment Proposal

Mayor Cecil Gutierrez
Loveland City Council

Dear Mayor Gutierrez,

I am a homeowner in the Kendall Brook Subdivision and also own a property in Taft Farms north of 50th Street. I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to the plan and revision that has been put forth by Journey Homes at the corner of 50th and Georgetown in Kendall Brook subdivision. It is extremely important that the City hear the voice of the neighborhood and I believe it was clear and truly evident in the meetings held so far that the neighborhood does not want to see this particular project go forward in any way, shape or form. The idea of putting over 100 rental units in two story buildings on that land is extremely incompatible with the neighborhood and that kind of density is inconsistent and also not compatible or wise for the neighborhood.

The site in question is already elevated from the surrounding neighborhood and it is surrounded mostly by single story \$350,000 to \$400,000+ homes. To put any kind of two story building on top of land that is already elevated would stick out like a sore thumb and severely negatively impact the value of the properties around it. The amount of traffic generated by 100 plus units would be overwhelming and the overflow parking would go into the neighborhood. Even lighting that is designed to cast downward would be an eyesore since the land is already elevated. This project would have a severely detrimental impact upon the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods.

I would encourage the City Council to not approve this proposed plan, and for alternative uses for this land to be explored including zoning changes that would encourage more compatible development such as patio homes, senior living duplexes or one story townhomes. There is a great need for this kind of property to be available in Loveland at this time and it would be much more compatible. If you and the Councilors have not gone physically to the property, I would encourage you to do so. The elevated area is not obvious when looking at the maps and plans that have been submitted. I realize the City cannot direct what developer may purchase the site and what the future purchaser's plans would be, but hopefully the Council can take into account the best use of the land when reviewing development proposals. I would encourage the City to only approve buildings with one story above grade due to the lay of the land on that parcel.

Kendall Brook has become a more diverse community in the last few years, but as one drives and walks through the subdivision the demographics seem to lean toward an older more mature population, especially in the areas surrounding this parcel. The demographics of those attending the meeting also seem to support that. For this reason, among many others, a single story, less dense construction plan would be more compatible and, in the long run, preserve the look and the feel of the subdivision and the community there.

Thank you for hearing my voice, our (homeowners') voice and our heart at the meeting and in past meetings on this project.

Frances Wunderlich, Homeowner

Frances Wunderlich

970-667-1828

Franci@YourHouseInColorado.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Franci Wunderlich <Franci@YourHouseInColorado.Com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 12:45 AM
To: Ward I - Chauncey Taylor
Subject: Kendall Brook Journey Homes Apartment Proposal

Chauncey Taylor
Loveland City Council

Dear Councilor Taylor,

I am a homeowner in the Kendall Brook Subdivision and also own a property in Taft Farms north of 50th Street. I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to the plan and revision that has been put forth by Journey Homes at the corner of 50th and Georgetown in Kendall Brook subdivision. It is extremely important that the City hear the voice of the neighborhood and I believe it was clear and truly evident in the meetings held so far that the neighborhood does not want to see this particular project go forward in any way, shape or form. The idea of putting over 100 rental units in two story buildings on that land is extremely incompatible with the neighborhood and that kind of density is inconsistent and also not compatible or wise for the neighborhood.

The site in question is already elevated from the surrounding neighborhood and it is surrounded mostly by single story \$350,000 to \$400,000+ homes. To put any kind of two story building on top of land that is already elevated would stick out like a sore thumb and severely negatively impact the value of the properties around it. The amount of traffic generated by 100 plus units would be overwhelming and the overflow parking would go into the neighborhood. Even lighting that is designed to cast downward would be an eyesore since the land is already elevated. This project would have a severely detrimental impact upon the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods.

I would encourage the City Council to not approve this proposed plan, and for alternative uses for this land to be explored including zoning changes that would encourage more compatible development such as patio homes, senior living duplexes or one story townhomes. There is a great need for this kind of property to be available in Loveland at this time and it would be much more compatible. If you and the other Councilors have not gone physically to the property, I would encourage you to do so. The elevated area is not obvious when looking at the maps and plans that have been submitted. I realize the City cannot direct what developer may purchase the site and what the future purchaser's plans would be, but hopefully the Council can take into account the best use of the land when reviewing development proposals. I would encourage the City to only approve buildings with one story above grade due to the lay of the land on that parcel.

Kendall Brook has become a more diverse community in the last few years, but as one drives and walks through the subdivision the demographics seem to lean toward an older more mature population, especially in the areas surrounding this parcel. The demographics of those attending the meeting also seem to support that. For this reason, among many others, a single story, less dense construction plan would be more compatible and, in the long run, preserve the look and the feel of the subdivision and the community there.

Thank you for hearing my voice, our (homeowners') voice and our heart at the meeting and in past meetings on this project.

Frances Wunderlich, Homeowner

Frances Wunderlich

970-667-1828

Franci@YourHouseInColorado.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Franci Wunderlich <Franci@YourHouseInColorado.Com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 12:42 AM
To: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Subject: Kendall Brook Journey Homes Apartment Proposal

Troy Krenning
Loveland City Council

Dear Councilor Krenning,

I am a homeowner in the Kendall Brook Subdivision and also own a property in Taft Farms north of 50th Street. I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to the plan and revision that has been put forth by Journey Homes at the corner of 50th and Georgetown in Kendall Brook subdivision. It is extremely important that the City hear the voice of the neighborhood and I believe it was clear and truly evident in the meetings held so far that the neighborhood does not want to see this particular project go forward in any way, shape or form. The idea of putting over 100 rental units in two story buildings on that land is extremely incompatible with the neighborhood and that kind of density is inconsistent and also not compatible or wise for the neighborhood.

The site in question is already elevated from the surrounding neighborhood and it is surrounded mostly by single story \$350,000 to \$400,000+ homes. To put any kind of two story building on top of land that is already elevated would stick out like a sore thumb and severely negatively impact the value of the properties around it. The amount of traffic generated by 100 plus units would be overwhelming and the overflow parking would go into the neighborhood. Even lighting that is designed to cast downward would be an eyesore since the land is already elevated. This project would have a severely detrimental impact upon the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods.

I would encourage the City Council to not approve this proposed plan, and for alternative uses for this land to be explored including zoning changes that would encourage more compatible development such as patio homes, senior living duplexes or one story townhomes. There is a great need for this kind of property to be available in Loveland at this time and it would be much more compatible. If you and the other Councilors have not gone physically to the property, I would encourage you to do so. The elevated area is not obvious when looking at the maps and plans that have been submitted. I realize the City cannot direct what developer may purchase the site and what the future purchaser's plans would be, but hopefully the Council can take into account the best use of the land when reviewing development proposals. I would encourage the City to only approve buildings with one story above grade due to the lay of the land on that parcel.

Kendall Brook has become a more diverse community in the last few years, but as one drives and walks through the subdivision the demographics seem to lean toward an older more mature population, especially in the areas surrounding this parcel. The demographics of those attending the meeting also seem to support that. For this reason, among many others, a single story, less dense construction plan would be more compatible and, in the long run, preserve the look and the feel of the subdivision and the community there.

Thank you for hearing my voice, our (homeowners') voice and our heart at the meeting and in past meetings on this project.

Frances Wunderlich, Homeowner

Frances Wunderlich

970-667-1828

Franci@YourHouseInColorado.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Franci Wunderlich <Franci@YourHouseInColorado.Com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 12:40 AM
To: Ward II - Joan Shaffer
Subject: Kendall Brook Journey Homes Apartment Proposal

Joan Shaffer
Loveland City Council

Dear Councilor Shaffer,

I am a homeowner in the Kendall Brook Subdivision and also own a property in Taft Farms north of 50th Street. I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to the plan and revision that has been put forth by Journey Homes at the corner of 50th and Georgetown in Kendall Brook subdivision. It is extremely important that the City hear the voice of the neighborhood and I believe it was clear and truly evident in the meetings held so far that the neighborhood does not want to see this particular project go forward in any way, shape or form. The idea of putting over 100 rental units in two story buildings on that land is extremely incompatible with the neighborhood and that kind of density is inconsistent and also not compatible or wise for the neighborhood.

The site in question is already elevated from the surrounding neighborhood and it is surrounded mostly by single story \$350,000 to \$400,000+ homes. To put any kind of two story building on top of land that is already elevated would stick out like a sore thumb and severely negatively impact the value of the properties around it. The amount of traffic generated by 100 plus units would be overwhelming and the overflow parking would go into the neighborhood. Even lighting that is designed to cast downward would be an eyesore since the land is already elevated. This project would have a severely detrimental impact upon the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods.

I would encourage the City Council to not approve this proposed plan, and for alternative uses for this land to be explored including zoning changes that would encourage more compatible development such as patio homes, senior living duplexes or one story townhomes. There is a great need for this kind of property to be available in Loveland at this time and it would be much more compatible. If you and the other Councilors have not gone physically to the property, I would encourage you to do so. The elevated area is not obvious when looking at the maps and plans that have been submitted. I realize the City cannot direct what developer may purchase the site and what the future purchaser's plans would be, but hopefully the Council can take into account the best use of the land when reviewing development proposals. I would encourage the City to only approve buildings with one story above grade due to the lay of the land on that parcel.

Kendall Brook has become a more diverse community in the last few years, but as one drives and walks through the subdivision the demographics seem to lean toward an older more mature population, especially in the areas surrounding this parcel. The demographics of those attending the meeting also seem to support that. For this reason, among many others, a single story, less dense construction plan would be more compatible and, in the long run, preserve the look and the feel of the subdivision and the community there.

Thank you for hearing my voice, our (homeowners') voice and our heart at the meeting and in past meetings on this project.

Frances Wunderlich, Homeowner

Frances Wunderlich

970-667-1828

Franci@YourHouseInColorado.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Franci Wunderlich <Franci@YourHouseInColorado.Com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 12:38 AM
To: Ward II - Phil Farley
Subject: Kendall Brook Journey Homes Apartment Proposal

Phil Farley
 Loveland City Council

Dear Councilor Farley,

I am a homeowner in the Kendall Brook Subdivision and also own a property in Taft Farms north of 50th Street. I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to the plan and revision that has been put forth by Journey Homes at the corner of 50th and Georgetown in Kendall Brook subdivision. It is extremely important that the City hear the voice of the neighborhood and I believe it was clear and truly evident in the meetings held so far that the neighborhood does not want to see this particular project go forward in any way, shape or form. The idea of putting over 100 rental units in two story buildings on that land is extremely incompatible with the neighborhood and that kind of density is inconsistent and also not compatible or wise for the neighborhood.

The site in question is already elevated from the surrounding neighborhood and it is surrounded mostly by single story \$350,000 to \$400,000+ homes. To put any kind of two story building on top of land that is already elevated would stick out like a sore thumb and severely negatively impact the value of the properties around it. The amount of traffic generated by 100 plus units would be overwhelming and the overflow parking would go into the neighborhood. Even lighting that is designed to cast downward would be an eyesore since the land is already elevated. This project would have a severely detrimental impact upon the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods.

I would encourage the City Council to not approve this proposed plan, and for alternative uses for this land to be explored including zoning changes that would encourage more compatible development such as patio homes, senior living duplexes or one story townhomes. There is a great need for this kind of property to be available in Loveland at this time and it would be much more compatible. If you and the other Councilors have not gone physically to the property, I would encourage you to do so. The elevated area is not obvious when looking at the maps and plans that have been submitted. I realize the City cannot direct what developer may purchase the site and what the future purchaser's plans would be, but hopefully the Council can take into account the best use of the land when reviewing development proposals. I would encourage the City to only approve buildings with one story above grade due to the lay of the land on that parcel.

Kendall Brook has become a more diverse community in the last few years, but as one drives and walks through the subdivision the demographics seem to lean toward an older more mature population, especially in the areas surrounding this parcel. The demographics of those attending the meeting also seem to support that. For this reason, among many others, a single story, less dense construction plan would be more compatible and, in the long run, preserve the look and the feel of the subdivision and the community there.

Thank you for hearing my voice, our (homeowners') voice and our heart at the meeting and in past meetings on this project.

Frances Wunderlich, Homeowner

Frances Wunderlich

970-667-1828

Franci@YourHouseInColorado.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Franci Wunderlich <Franci@YourHouseInColorado.Com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 12:36 AM
To: Ward III - Hugh McKean
Subject: Kendall Brook Journey Homes Apartment Proposal

Hugh McKean
Loveland City Council

Dear Councilor McKean,

I am a homeowner in the Kendall Brook Subdivision and also own a property in Taft Farms north of 50th Street. I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to the plan and revision that has been put forth by Journey Homes at the corner of 50th and Georgetown in Kendall Brook subdivision. It is extremely important that the City hear the voice of the neighborhood and I believe it was clear and truly evident in the meetings held so far that the neighborhood does not want to see this particular project go forward in any way, shape or form. The idea of putting over 100 rental units in two story buildings on that land is extremely incompatible with the neighborhood and that kind of density is inconsistent and also not compatible or wise for the neighborhood.

The site in question is already elevated from the surrounding neighborhood and it is surrounded mostly by single story \$350,000 to \$400,000+ homes. To put any kind of two story building on top of land that is already elevated would stick out like a sore thumb and severely negatively impact the value of the properties around it. The amount of traffic generated by 100 plus units would be overwhelming and the overflow parking would go into the neighborhood. Even lighting that is designed to cast downward would be an eyesore since the land is already elevated. This project would have a severely detrimental impact upon the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods.

I would encourage the City Council to not approve this proposed plan, and for alternative uses for this land to be explored including zoning changes that would encourage more compatible development such as patio homes, senior living duplexes or one story townhomes. There is a great need for this kind of property to be available in Loveland at this time and it would be much more compatible. If you and the other Councilors have not gone physically to the property, I would encourage you to do so. The elevated area is not obvious when looking at the maps and plans that have been submitted. I realize the City cannot direct what developer may purchase the site and what the future purchaser's plans would be, but hopefully the Council can take into account the best use of the land when reviewing development proposals. I would encourage the City to only approve buildings with one story above grade due to the lay of the land on that parcel.

Kendall Brook has become a more diverse community in the last few years, but as one drives and walks through the subdivision the demographics seem to lean toward an older more mature population, especially in the areas surrounding this parcel. The demographics of those attending the meeting also seem to support that. For this reason, among many others, a single story, less dense construction plan would be more compatible and, in the long run, preserve the look and the feel of the subdivision and the community there.

Thank you for hearing my voice, our (homeowners') voice and our heart at the meeting and in past meetings on this project.

Frances Wunderlich, Homeowner

Frances Wunderlich

970-667-1828

Franci@YourHouseInColorado.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Franci Wunderlich <Franci@YourHouseInColorado.Com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 12:34 AM
To: Ward III - John Fogle
Subject: Kendall Brook Journey Homes Apartment Proposal

John Fogle
 Loveland City Council

Dear Councilor Fogle,

I am a homeowner in the Kendall Brook Subdivision and also own a property in Taft Farms north of 50th Street. I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to the plan and revision that has been put forth by Journey Homes at the corner of 50th and Georgetown in Kendall Brook subdivision. It is extremely important that the City hear the voice of the neighborhood and I believe it was clear and truly evident in the meetings held so far that the neighborhood does not want to see this particular project go forward in any way, shape or form. The idea of putting over 100 rental units in two story buildings on that land is extremely incompatible with the neighborhood and that kind of density is inconsistent and also not compatible or wise for the neighborhood.

The site in question is already elevated from the surrounding neighborhood and it is surrounded mostly by single story \$350,000 to \$400,000+ homes. To put any kind of two story building on top of land that is already elevated would stick out like a sore thumb and severely negatively impact the value of the properties around it. The amount of traffic generated by 100 plus units would be overwhelming and the overflow parking would go into the neighborhood. Even lighting that is designed to cast downward would be an eyesore since the land is already elevated. This project would have a severely detrimental impact upon the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods.

I would encourage the City Council to not approve this proposed plan, and for alternative uses for this land to be explored including zoning changes that would encourage more compatible development such as patio homes, senior living duplexes or one story townhomes. There is a great need for this kind of property to be available in Loveland at this time and it would be much more compatible. If you and the other Councilors have not gone physically to the property, I would encourage you to do so. The elevated area is not obvious when looking at the maps and plans that have been submitted. I realize the City cannot direct what developer may purchase the site and what the future purchaser's plans would be, but hopefully the Council can take into account the best use of the land when reviewing development proposals. I would encourage the City to only approve buildings with one story above grade due to the lay of the land on that parcel.

Kendall Brook has become a more diverse community in the last few years, but as one drives and walks through the subdivision the demographics seem to lean toward an older more mature population, especially in the areas surrounding this parcel. The demographics of those attending the meeting also seem to support that. For this reason, among many others, a single story, less dense construction plan would be more compatible and, in the long run, preserve the look and the feel of the subdivision and the community there.

Thank you for hearing my voice, our (homeowners') voice and our heart at the meeting and in past meetings on this project.

Frances Wunderlich, Homeowner

Frances Wunderlich

970-667-1828

Franci@YourHouseInColorado.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Franci Wunderlich <Franci@YourHouseInColorado.Com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 12:31 AM
To: Ward IV - Ralph Trenary
Subject: Kendall Brook Journey Homes Apartment Proposal

Ralph Trenary
 Loveland City Council

Dear Councilor Trenary,

I am a homeowner in the Kendall Brook Subdivision and also own a property in Taft Farms north of 50th Street. I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to the plan and revision that has been put forth by Journey Homes at the corner of 50th and Georgetown in Kendall Brook subdivision. It is extremely important that the City hear the voice of the neighborhood and I believe it was clear and truly evident in the meetings held so far that the neighborhood does not want to see this particular project go forward in any way, shape or form. The idea of putting over 100 rental units in two story buildings on that land is extremely incompatible with the neighborhood and that kind of density is inconsistent and also not compatible or wise for the neighborhood.

The site in question is already elevated from the surrounding neighborhood and it is surrounded mostly by single story \$350,000 to \$400,000+ homes. To put any kind of two story building on top of land that is already elevated would stick out like a sore thumb and severely negatively impact the value of the properties around it. The amount of traffic generated by 100 plus units would be overwhelming and the overflow parking would go into the neighborhood. Even lighting that is designed to cast downward would be an eyesore since the land is already elevated. This project would have a severely detrimental impact upon the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods.

I would encourage the City Council to not approve this proposed plan, and for alternative uses for this land to be explored including zoning changes that would encourage more compatible development such as patio homes, senior living duplexes or one story townhomes. There is a great need for this kind of property to be available in Loveland at this time and it would be much more compatible. If you and the other Councilors have not gone physically to the property, I would encourage you to do so. The elevated area is not obvious when looking at the maps and plans that have been submitted. I realize the City cannot direct what developer may purchase the site and what the future purchaser's plans would be, but hopefully the Council can take into account the best use of the land when reviewing development proposals. I would encourage the City to only approve buildings with one story above grade due to the lay of the land on that parcel.

Kendall Brook has become a more diverse community in the last few years, but as one drives and walks through the subdivision the demographics seem to lean toward an older more mature population, especially in the areas surrounding this parcel. The demographics of those attending the meeting also seem to support that. For this reason, among many others, a single story, less dense construction plan would be more compatible and, in the long run, preserve the look and the feel of the subdivision and the community there.

Thank you for hearing my voice, our (homeowners') voice and our heart at the meeting and in past meetings on this project.

Frances Wunderlich, Homeowner

Frances Wunderlich

970-667-1828

Franci@YourHouseInColorado.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Franci Wunderlich <Franci@YourHouseInColorado.Com>
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 12:29 AM
To: Ward IV - Dave Clark
Subject: Kendall Brook Journey Homes Apartment Proposal

Dave Clark
Loveland City Council

Dear Councilor Clark,

I am a homeowner in the Kendall Brook Subdivision and also own a property in Taft Farms north of 50th Street. I am writing to let you know that I am opposed to the plan and revision that has been put forth by Journey Homes at the corner of 50th and Georgetown in Kendall Brook subdivision. It is extremely important that the City hear the voice of the neighborhood and I believe it was clear and truly evident in the meetings held so far that the neighborhood does not want to see this particular project go forward in any way, shape or form. The idea of putting over 100 rental units in two story buildings on that land is extremely incompatible with the neighborhood and that kind of density is inconsistent and also not compatible or wise for the neighborhood.

The site in question is already elevated from the surrounding neighborhood and it is surrounded mostly by single story \$350,000 to \$400,000+ homes. To put any kind of two story building on top of land that is already elevated would stick out like a sore thumb and severely negatively impact the value of the properties around it. The amount of traffic generated by 100 plus units would be overwhelming and the overflow parking would go into the neighborhood. Even lighting that is designed to cast downward would be an eyesore since the land is already elevated. This project would have a severely detrimental impact upon the neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods.

I would encourage the City Council to not approve this proposed plan, and for alternative uses for this land to be explored including zoning changes that would encourage more compatible development such as patio homes, senior living duplexes or one story townhomes. There is a great need for this kind of property to be available in Loveland at this time and it would be much more compatible. If you and the other Councilors have not gone physically to the property, I would encourage you to do so. The elevated area is not obvious when looking at the maps and plans that have been submitted. I realize the City cannot direct what developer may purchase the site and what the future purchaser's plans would be, but hopefully the Council can take into account the best use of the land when reviewing development proposals. I would encourage the City to only approve buildings with one story above grade due to the lay of the land on that parcel.

Kendall Brook has become a more diverse community in the last few years, but as one drives and walks through the subdivision the demographics seem to lean toward an older more mature population, especially in the areas surrounding this parcel. The demographics of those attending the meeting also seem to support that. For this reason, among many others, a single story, less dense construction plan would be more compatible and, in the long run, preserve the look and the feel of the subdivision and the community there.

Thank you for hearing my voice, our (homeowners') voice and our heart at the meeting and in past meetings on this project.

Frances Wunderlich, Homeowner

Frances Wunderlich

970-667-1828

Franci@YourHouseInColorado.com

Jeannie Weaver

From: Jeremy Jersvig <jeremy.jersvig@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2014 11:07 PM
To: Mayor - Cecil Gutierrez; Ward I - Chauncey Taylor; Ward I - Troy Krenning; Ward II - Joan Shaffer; Ward II - Phil Farley; Ward III - Hugh McKean; Ward III - John Fogle; Ward IV - Ralph Trenary; Ward IV - Dave Clark
Cc: Bill Cahill

Council Members,

I write to you as a private citizen and as a neighbor of the proposed multi-family development in the Kendall Brook subdivision. I do not live within the Kendall Brook subdivision, I live in the major block just south of it.

The proposed development by Journey Homes LLC is not one that would contribute, in a positive way, to the neighborhood as a whole. I am defining neighborhood to include the areas beyond Kendall Brook in all directions; Alford Meadows, Northlands, Green Briar, Harvest Gold, Taft Farms, Emerald Glen and others, including areas currently planned, would be affected by any major development in this parcel, or any large parcel in the area. The designs drawn up by Journey Homes are inconsistent with the surrounding homes, streets and common areas of the neighborhood. There are other multi-family developments in the neighborhood, including townhomes and apartments, which do lend to the harmonious and diverse aspects of the area. I am not against multi-family housing. The proposed design, however, is not consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and, honestly, would be an eyesore when compared to that which surrounds it.

The architecture of the buildings is akin to single officer, even enlisted, housing on a U.S. Army base. Having spent a portion of my childhood living on Army bases, as well as visiting many of them as a member of the U.S. Navy, I can see this correlation. The units have no outside enjoyment areas, balconies and the like, and the structures are almost one-dimensional with no character to lend to the interest of the neighborhood. Arranged in a rectangle surrounding a parking lot, as proposed, the plan appears even more military-like as the layout does not allow for any recreation to take place on the premises. This is where the Army barracks have a plus: Single soldier housing usually has recreation areas within the immediate vicinity of the housing units, e.g. grills, volleyball, horseshoes, picnic tables and shelters right outside the buildings. Navy barracks have the same amenities. The Journey Homes apartment proposal does not.

Such lackluster designs, combined with the myriad issues previously discussed by the Planning Commission, will result, I predict, in a project that will be wanting of renters at the rate that is proposed. With a lack of renters, the project will lose money and will undoubtedly end up in disrepair. The alternative would be the project owners applying for subsidies, which Mr. Buckendorf and his associate, Ms. Kelly Peters, personally stated would not happen when specifically questioned. The fact that the applicant expressed desire to separate each building into different parcels gives me worry. The applicant stated that he would be the owner for the "long haul" and then spoke of piece-mealing the deal into separate, individually sell-able parcels. Why, if he is in it for the long haul, does he feel the need at this point to take such action? I question the motive and I question the future plans of this project, if approved.

Councilmembers, I implore you, as a neighbor and as a citizen of Loveland, to deny the appeal of Journey Homes LLC for the proposed multi-family project in Kendall Brook. This project would not be in the best interest of the neighborhood or of the City of Loveland, as a whole.

Thank you for your time,

Jeremy Jersvig

3854 Buena Vista Dr

Loveland, CO 80538

Jeannie Weaver

From: Patrick Hepburn <scotmen1776@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2014 7:57 PM
To: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Subject: Re: Development of Apartments on 50th

Thank you,

I applaud your honesty and fairness to hear all sides before making a choice. Such integrity we seem to lack at many levels of Government.

No matter the verdict I'm pleased to have you representing our city.

Pat Hepburn

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning <Troy.Krenning@cityofloveland.org>
To: Patrick Hepburn <scotmen1776@yahoo.com>
Cc: Ward I - Chauncey Taylor <Chauncey.Taylor@cityofloveland.org>; Temp CCMAIL <TEMPCC@cityofloveland.org>
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2014 7:47 PM
Subject: Re: Development of Apartments on 50th

The City Council must hear all appeals from either side after a planning commission determination, it is not a choice. If the planning commission had ruled in favor of the developer and you or other neighbors had appealed, your appeal would have been heard by the Council as well. Please don't mistake the Council's duty to hear the appeal as anything other than our duty to hear the appeal. This issue has nothing to do with taxes.

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 16, 2014, at 7:40 PM, "Patrick Hepburn"
 <scotmen1776@yahoo.com<<mailto:scotmen1776@yahoo.com>>> wrote:

16 Nov 2014

Dear planning Commission,

My wife (Sheryl) and I (Patrick) cannot understand why the City Council would even consider this building proposal. how it ever even got zoned makes no sense. The Planning Commission had no problem understanding the reasons to deny such a plan as this. Now we wonder the same over why a City Council would even consider such a plan. 106 units built in the middle of single family homes. With only a single lane road to exit on and enter upon. Doing the simple math of cars alone going to work and back is 424 cars added daily to a single lane (50th) road.

Traffic congestion in the middle of a residential area ? The real threat to children playing and biking on 50th. The Loveland Recreation path runs along this property. If anything the property should be maintained by the city and turned into a park for all to enjoy as they travel along the Recreation path. An asset to the community and the people of Loveland. Where an apartment complex is totally incompatible with the area and inconsistent with the established neighborhoods. Those using the trail have to cross 50th creating a safety issue to pedestrians and bike riders.

The builder stated in the last meeting that complaints on prior constructions over a year old is not a problem and is reasonable !
Seeing this builder lack quality in his construction and lacks responsibility to built is a company Loveland should not desire in the community.

Would any Commission member want an apartment complex in their back yard ? Would you want the increase in traffic ? This is wrong in every way. Would you allow your neighborhood to suffer changes that do not reflect the quality of your established neighborhood ? Would you allow something totally inconsistent to your area to be injected into it ?
I pray the Commission shall not be thinking of the taxes Loveland shall receive BUT instead think as you should of the People who live in Loveland and most importantly what Loveland represents.

Thank you,
Patrick & Sheryl Hepburn

Jeannie Weaver

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2014 7:48 PM
To: Patrick Hepburn
Cc: Ward I - Chauncey Taylor; Temp CCMAIL
Subject: Re: Development of Apartments on 50th

The City Council must hear all appeals from either side after a planning commission determination, it is not a choice. If the planning commission had ruled in favor of the developer and you or other neighbors had appealed, your appeal would have been heard by the Council as well. Please don't mistake the Council's duty to hear the appeal as anything other than our duty to hear the appeal. This issue has nothing to do with taxes.

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 16, 2014, at 7:40 PM, "Patrick Hepburn" <scotmen1776@yahoo.com> wrote:

16 Nov. 2014

Dear planning Commission,

My wife (Sheryl) and I (Patrick) cannot understand why the City Council would even consider this building proposal. how it ever even got zoned makes no sense. The Planning Commission had no problem understanding the reasons to deny such a plan as this. Now we wonder the same over why a City Council would even consider such a plan. 106 units built in the middle of single family homes. With only a single lane road to exit on and enter upon. Doing the simple math of cars alone going to work and back is 424 cars added daily to a single lane (50th) road. Traffic congestion in the middle of a residential area ? The real threat to children playing and biking on 50th. The Loveland Recreation path runs along this property. If anything the property should be maintained by the city and turned into a park for all to enjoy as they travel along the Recreation path. An asset to the community and the people of Loveland. Where an apartment complex is totally incompatible with the area and inconsistent with the established neighborhoods. Those using the trail have to cross 50th creating a safety issue to pedestrians and bike riders.

The builder stated in the last meeting that complaints on prior constructions over a year old is not a problem and is reasonable !^{P.46}
Seeing this builder lack quality in his construction and lacks responsibility to built is a company Loveland should not desire in the community.

Would any Commission member want an apartment complex in their back yard ? Would you want the increase in traffic ? This is wrong in every way. Would you allow your neighborhood to suffer changes that do not reflect the quality of your established neighborhood ? Would you allow something totally inconsistent to your area to be injected into it ?

I pray the Commission shall not be thinking of the taxes Loveland shall receive BUT instead think as you should of the People who live in Loveland and most importantly what Loveland represents.

Thank you,
Patrick & Sheryl Hepburn

Jeannie Weaver

From: Patrick Hepburn <scotmen1776@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2014 7:46 PM
To: Ward IV - Ralph Trenary; Ward IV - Dave Clark
Subject: Development of Apartments on 50th

16 Nov 2014

Dear planning Commission,

My wife (Sheryl) and I (Patrick) cannot understand why the City Council would even consider this building proposal. how it ever even got zoned makes no sense. The Planning Commission had no problem understanding the reasons to deny such a plan as this. Now we wonder the same over why a City Council would even consider such a plan. 106 units built in the middle of single family homes. With only a single lane road to exit on and enter upon.

Doing the simple math of cars alone going to work and back is 424 cars added daily to a single lane (50th) road.

Traffic congestion in the middle of a residential area ? The real threat to children playing and biking on 50th. The Loveland Recreation path runs along this property. If anything the property should be maintained by the city and turned into a park for all to enjoy as they travel along the Recreation path. An asset to the community and the people of Loveland. Where an apartment complex is totally incompatible with the area and inconsistent with the established neighborhoods. Those using the trail have to cross 50th creating a safety issue to pedestrians and bike riders.

The builder stated in the last meeting that complaints on prior constructions over a year old is not a problem and is reasonable !

Seeing this builder lack quality in his construction and lacks responsibility to built is a company Loveland should not desire in the community.

Would any Commission member want an apartment complex in their back yard ? Would you want the increase in traffic ? This is wrong in every way. Would you allow your neighborhood to suffer changes that do not reflect the quality of your established neighborhood ? Would you allow something totally inconsistent to your area to be injected into it ?

I pray the Commission shall not be thinking of the taxes Loveland shall receive BUT instead think as you should of the People who live in Loveland and most importantly what Loveland represents.

Thank you,
Patrick & Sheryl Hepburn

Jeannie Weaver

From: Patrick Hepburn <scotmen1776@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2014 7:44 PM
To: Ward III - Hugh McKean; Ward III - John Fogle
Subject: Development of Apartments on 50th

16 Nov 2014

Dear planning Commission,

My wife (Sheryl) and I (Patrick) cannot understand why the City Council would even consider this building proposal. how it ever even got zoned makes no sense. The Planning Commission had no problem understanding the reasons to deny such a plan as this. Now we wonder the same over why a City Council would even consider such a plan. 106 units built in the middle of single family homes. With only a single lane road to exit on and enter upon. Doing the simple math of cars alone going to work and back is 424 cars added daily to a single lane (50th) road.

Traffic congestion in the middle of a residential area ? The real threat to children playing and biking on 50th. The Loveland Recreation path runs along this property. If anything the property should be maintained by the city and turned into a park for all to enjoy as they travel along the Recreation path. An asset to the community and the people of Loveland. Where an apartment complex is totally incompatible with the area and inconsistent with the established neighborhoods. Those using the trail have to cross 50th creating a safety issue to pedestrians and bike riders.

The builder stated in the last meeting that complaints on prior constructions over a year old is not a problem and is reasonable !

Seeing this builder lack quality in his construction and lacks responsibility to built is a company Loveland should not desire in the community.

Would any Commission member want an apartment complex in their back yard ? Would you want the increase in traffic ? This is wrong in every way. Would you allow your neighborhood to suffer changes that do not reflect the quality of your established neighborhood ? Would you allow something totally inconsistent to your area to be injected into it ?

I pray the Commission shall not be thinking of the taxes Loveland shall receive BUT instead think as you should of the People who live in Loveland and most importantly what Loveland represents.

Thank you,
Patrick & Sheryl Hepburn

Jeannie Weaver

From: Patrick Hepburn <scotmen1776@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2014 7:42 PM
To: Ward II - Joan Shaffer; Ward II - Phil Farley
Subject: Development of Apartments on 50th

16 Nov 2014

Dear planning Commission,

My wife (Sheryl) and I (Patrick) cannot understand why the City Council would even consider this building proposal. how it ever even got zoned makes no sense. The Planning Commission had no problem understanding the reasons to deny such a plan as this. Now we wonder the same over why a City Council would even consider such a plan. 106 units built in the middle of single family homes. With only a single lane road to exit on and enter upon. Doing the simple math of cars alone going to work and back is 424 cars added daily to a single lane (50th) road.

Traffic congestion in the middle of a residential area ? The real threat to children playing and biking on 50th. The Loveland Recreation path runs along this property. If anything the property should be maintained by the city and turned into a park for all to enjoy as they travel along the Recreation path. An asset to the community and the people of Loveland. Where an apartment complex is totally incompatible with the area and inconsistent with the established neighborhoods. Those using the trail have to cross 50th creating a safety issue to pedestrians and bike riders.

The builder stated in the last meeting that complaints on prior constructions over a year old is not a problem and is reasonable !

Seeing this builder lack quality in his construction and lacks responsibility to built is a company Loveland should not desire in the community.

Would any Commission member want an apartment complex in their back yard ? Would you want the increase in traffic ? This is wrong in every way. Would you allow your neighborhood to suffer changes that do not reflect the quality of your established neighborhood ? Would you allow something totally inconsistent to your area to be injected into it ?

I pray the Commission shall not be thinking of the taxes Loveland shall receive BUT instead think as you should of the People who live in Loveland and most importantly what Loveland represents.

Thank you,
Patrick & Sheryl Hepburn

Jeannie Weaver

From: Patrick Hepburn <scotmen1776@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2014 7:40 PM
To: Ward I - Chauncey Taylor; Ward I - Troy Krenning
Subject: Development of Apartments on 50th

16 Nov 2014

Dear planning Commission,

My wife (Sheryl) and I (Patrick) cannot understand why the City Council would even consider this building proposal. how it ever even got zoned makes no sense. The Planning Commission had no problem understanding the reasons to deny such a plan as this. Now we wonder the same over why a City Council would even consider such a plan. 106 units built in the middle of single family homes. With only a single lane road to exit on and enter upon. Doing the simple math of cars alone going to work and back is 424 cars added daily to a single lane (50th) road.

Traffic congestion in the middle of a residential area ? The real threat to children playing and biking on 50th. The Loveland Recreation path runs along this property. If anything the property should be maintained by the city and turned into a park for all to enjoy as they travel along the Recreation path. An asset to the community and the people of Loveland. Where an apartment complex is totally incompatible with the area and inconsistent with the established neighborhoods. Those using the trail have to cross 50th creating a safety issue to pedestrians and bike riders.

The builder stated in the last meeting that complaints on prior constructions over a year old is not a problem and is reasonable !

Seeing this builder lack quality in his construction and lacks responsibility to built is a company Loveland should not desire in the community.

Would any Commission member want an apartment complex in their back yard ? Would you want the increase in traffic ? This is wrong in every way. Would you allow your neighborhood to suffer changes that do not reflect the quality of your established neighborhood ? Would you allow something totally inconsistent to your area to be injected into it ?

I pray the Commission shall not be thinking of the taxes Loveland shall receive BUT instead think as you should of the People who live in Loveland and most importantly what Loveland represents.

Thank you,
Patrick & Sheryl Hepburn

Jeannie Weaver

From: Patrick Hepburn <scotmen1776@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2014 7:37 PM
To: City Council
Subject: Development of Apartments on 50th

16 Nov 2014

Dear planning Commission,

My wife (Sheryl) and I (Patrick) cannot understand why the City Council would even consider this building proposal. how it ever even got zoned makes no sense. The Planning Commission had no problem understanding the reasons to deny such a plan as this. Now we wonder the same over why a City Council would even consider such a plan. 106 units built in the middle of single family homes. With only a single lane road to exit on and enter upon. Doing the simple math of cars alone going to work and back is 424 cars added daily to a single lane (50th) road.

Traffic congestion in the middle of a residential area ? The real threat to children playing and biking on 50th. The Loveland Recreation path runs along this property. If anything the property should be maintained by the city and turned into a park for all to enjoy as they travel along the Recreation path. An asset to the community and the people of Loveland. Where an apartment complex is totally incompatible with the area and inconsistent with the established neighborhoods. Those using the trail have to cross 50th creating a safety issue to pedestrians and bike riders.

The builder stated in the last meeting that complaints on prior constructions over a year old is not a problem and is reasonable !

Seeing this builder lack quality in his construction and lacks responsibility to built is a company Loveland should not desire in the community.

Would any Commission member want an apartment complex in their back yard ? Would you want the increase in traffic ? This is wrong in every way. Would you allow your neighborhood to suffer changes that do not reflect the quality of your established neighborhood ? Would you allow something totally inconsistent to your area to be injected into it ?

I pray the Commission shall not be thinking of the taxes Loveland shall receive BUT instead think as you should of the People who live in Loveland and most importantly what Loveland represents.

Thank you,
Patrick & Sheryl Hepburn

Jeannie Weaver

From: Patrick Hepburn <scotmen1776@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2014 7:35 PM
To: Mayor - Cecil Gutierrez
Subject: Apartments on 50th proposal

16 Nov 2014

Dear Loveland Mayor and planning Commission,

My wife (Sheryl) and I (Patrick) cannot understand why the City Council would even consider this building proposal. how it ever even got zoned makes no sense. The Planning Commission had no problem understanding the reasons to deny such a plan as this. Now we wonder the same over why a City Council would even consider such a plan. 106 units built in the middle of single family homes. With only a single lane road to exit on and enter upon. Doing the simple math of cars alone going to work and back is 424 cars added daily to a single lane (50th) road.

Traffic congestion in the middle of a residential area ? The real threat to children playing and biking on 50th. The Loveland Recreation path runs along this property. If anything the property should be maintained by the city and turned into a park for all to enjoy as they travel along the Recreation path. An asset to the community and the people of Loveland. Where an apartment complex is totally incompatible with the area and inconsistent with the established neighborhoods. Those using the trail have to cross 50th creating a safety issue to pedestrians and bike riders.

The builder stated in the last meeting that complaints on prior constructions over a year old is not a problem and is reasonable !

Seeing this builder lack quality in his construction and lacks responsibility to built is a company Loveland should not desire in the community.

Would any Commission member want an apartment complex in their back yard ? Would you want the increase in traffic ? This is wrong in every way. Would you allow your neighborhood to suffer changes that do not reflect the quality of your established neighborhood ? Would you allow something totally inconsistent to your area to be injected into it ?

I pray the Commission shall not be thinking of the taxes Loveland shall receive BUT instead think as you should of the People who live in Loveland and most importantly what Loveland represents.

Thank you,
Patrick & Sheryl Hepburn

Jeannie Weaver

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2014 7:49 PM
To: CGlassmire@aol.com
Cc: Temp CCMail
Subject: Re: Kendall Brook Appeal of Planning Commission

Thank you for your email. I am aware of the issues regarding this proposal.

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 16, 2014, at 12:42 PM, "CGlassmire@aol.com" <CGlassmire@aol.com> wrote:

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

My name is Chuck Glassmire and I reside at 4950 Georgetown Dr. in Loveland.

On Tuesday November 18, 2014 you will be voting on the proposed apartment complex in the Kendall Brook subdivision. For many reasons I am opposed to this project and would like each of you to vote against this proposal as the Planning Commission has already done.

At the meeting I am sure you will hear many reasons why this apartment complex should not be built. To save a little time at the meeting, I have attached a small file that I hope you will download and read...shouldn't take more than three or four minutes to read. In a nutshell, it says don't buy a house next to an apartment building...thus, don't build an apartment building next to homes.

Now, I am not suggesting that the zoning of this land be changed...although that would be great. I am saying that if an apartment complex is built on this land, it should be well designed and well built so as not to diminish the value or attractiveness of the surrounding neighborhoods. The current proposal does neither of these.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,
Chuck Glassmire

<Proximity to Multifamily Building1.docx>

Jeannie Weaver

From: CGlassmire@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2014 12:42 PM
To: Mayor - Cecil Gutierrez; Ward I - Chauncey Taylor; Ward I - Troy Krenning; Ward II - Joan Shaffer; Ward II - Phil Farley; Ward III - Hugh McKean; Ward III - John Fogle; Ward IV - Ralph Trenary; Ward IV - Dave Clark
Subject: Kendall Brook Appeal of Planning Commission
Attachments: Proximity to Multifamily Building1.docx

Dear Mayor and Council Members,

My name is Chuck Glassmire and I reside at 4950 Georgetown Dr. in Loveland.

On Tuesday November 18, 2014 you will be voting on the proposed apartment complex in the Kendall Brook subdivision. For many reasons I am opposed to this project and would like each of you to vote against this proposal as the Planning Commission has already done.

At the meeting I am sure you will hear many reasons why this apartment complex should not be built. To save a little time at the meeting, I have attached a small file that I hope you will download and read...shouldn't take more than three or four minutes to read. In a nutshell, it says don't buy a house next to an apartment building...thus, don't build an apartment building next to homes.

Now, I am not suggesting that the zoning of this land be changed...although that would be great. I am saying that if an apartment complex is built on this land, it should be well designed and well built so as not to diminish the value or attractiveness of the surrounding neighborhoods. The current proposal does neither of these.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,
Chuck Glassmire

Jeannie Weaver

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2014 2:03 PM
To: Paul Kaiser
Cc: Temp CCMAIL
Subject: Re: Letter in opposition to Journey Homes Appeal

Paul,

Thank you for this. Of course I'm paying very close attention to this issue.

Troy

Sent from my iPhone

> On Nov 13, 2014, at 11:33 AM, "Paul Kaiser" <kaiser@digis.net> wrote:

>

> I have attached a letter outlying some of the points against Journey Homes development of Outlot A in Kendall Brook Subdivision. This is a development that the community as a whole is against.

> <Ltr to City Council Troy Krenning.docx>

Jeannie Weaver

From: Paul Kaiser <kaiser@digis.net>
Sent: Saturday, November 15, 2014 3:14 PM
To: Ward II - Joan Shaffer; Ward II - Phil Farley; Ward III - Hugh McKean; Ward III - John Fogle;
Ward III - Hugh McKean; Ward IV - Ralph Trenary; Ward IV - Dave Clark
Subject: Letter Against Journey Homes Appeal of Resolution 14-03

Dear City Council Members;

I am writing this letter to share my concerns with the appeal filed by Journey Homes over the Planning Commission's decision 14-03 which will be heard before you on November 18 in the Loveland Council chambers.

The high density development is neither in conformity nor compatible with the low density of the existing subdivision. The design as presented tries to stuff the maximum number of structures onto the parcel. This is a forced fit! The apartments do not provide any immediate outdoor space for the residents that they can call their own. Journey Homes calling the front entrance pad a porch is a joke.

The traffic study as presented by Journey Homes is way off base. To say that only 60 residents will be leaving the complex during the morning high peak hours is erroneous. If there are 106 apartment units, are they trying to say that a little over half of the residents will work or need to take kids to school or leave for any other reason.

Journey states that they will hire a company to remove snow, well where will the company pile snow prior to removing it without having to impact parking areas for temporary snow storage. Journey Homes just says trust us, yea right.

It is well known in the community about the quality of the work Journey Homes does. In Kendall Brook alone they built 87 homes and by their account, 39 have concrete issues which equates to 45% having issues, what does that say about the quality of their work.

You will probably be appalled when you see the pictures of the driveway/walkway replacement Journey Homes have done which I will show during the Council meeting. The new work is even of less quality than the original work which is saying something. This lack of quality only validates one of our concerns.

There are a number of other reasons why the appeal should be denied which I am sure will be shared before you on November 18. I ask that you listen carefully to the input of our residents during the meeting and uphold the Planning Commission denial.

Sincerely

Paul Kaiser

Jeannie Weaver

From: JOAN HUEBL <hueblje@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, November 14, 2014 8:59 AM
To: Ward I - Chauncey Taylor; Ward I - Troy Krenning
Subject: November 18th Council Meeting to address Kendall Brook proposal

Dear Mr. Taylor and Mr. Krenning:

Unfortunately my work schedule does not allow me to be present at the November 18th City Council meeting. I strongly oppose the proposed apartment complex in the Kendall Brook subdivision. I own a home in Kendall Brook.

My opposition stems from the following:

1. Even give the alterations from the original plan which changed the number of units from 120 to 106, this project would put too many people on very limited land. This population density does not reflect the actual character of the existing Kendall Brook subdivision even if the original PUD (completed over a decade ago) does condone this arrangement.
2. Parking for both tenants and visitors is inadequate. There is no parking allowed on either 50th Street or Georgetown (the two main streets adjoining the north and east sides of this proposal). The overflow parking will probably spill over into other, adjacent residential streets. The HOA has been disapproving of both on street and driveway parking by Kendall Brook residents. Additional police monitoring will be needed to enforce these parking bans.
3. The Loudon Canal runs adjacent to this proposed development and there is no plan for adequate protection for children to keep them from harming themselves in the ditch. There is now a small play area proposed and this is adjacent to the Loudon Canal.
4. The addition of 200 or more cars, plus visitors, would put significant stress on traffic in the area. As discussed in the Planning Commission meeting, there is already significant traffic delays in this area during busy hours of the day. Some intervention in terms of traffic control and traffic flow will be required.
5. The project could significantly affect the wetlands directly to the west and south of the property. Where there is now open space to absorb rain and snow, this development will "flood" both the wetlands and the Canal. Again, as demonstrated during the Planning Commission meeting, the surrounding homes on the south side of this proposed development and the Loudon Canal are at risk for flooding.
6. Even with the proposed changes to the exteriors of these buildings, they are not compatible with the Kendall Brook community.
7. Having done business with this developer and watched their presentation at the Planning Commission meeting as well as their interactions with residents of Kendall Brook, they do not appear to be the "community partners" we need. This developer will have about 60 votes in the HOA and will have a significant "bloc" impact on our community. Their history in dealing with homeowners concerns is one of delay and appealing to the "letter of the law" without regard for the residents and/or the spirit of this community. I can only imagine what the response to "renters" will be. As one of the Planning Commission members stated,

"Just because you can do something, it doesn't mean you should." This seems like good advice in regard to this proposal.

Please follow the Planning Commission's lead and reject this appeal!

Respectfully,

Joan E. Huebl
4675 Laporte Avenue
Loveland, CO 80538

Jeannie Weaver

From: JOAN HUEBL <hueblje@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, November 14, 2014 9:01 AM
To: Ward II - Joan Shaffer; Ward II - Phil Farley
Subject: November 18th Council Meeting to address Kendall Brook Proposal

Dear Ms. Shaffer and Mr. Farley:

Dear Mr. Taylor and Mr. Krenning:

Unfortunately my work schedule does not allow me to be present at the November 18th City Council meeting. I strongly oppose the proposed apartment complex in the Kendall Brook subdivision. I own a home in Kendall Brook.

My opposition stems from the following:

1. Even give the alterations from the original plan which changed the number of units from 120 to 106, this project would put too many people on very limited land. This population density does not reflect the actual character of the existing Kendall Brook subdivision even if the original PUD (completed over a decade ago) does condone this arrangement.
2. Parking for both tenants and visitors is inadequate. There is no parking allowed on either 50th Street or Georgetown (the two main streets adjoining the north and east sides of this proposal). The overflow parking will probably spill over into other, adjacent residential streets. The HOA has been disapproving of both on street and driveway parking by Kendall Brook residents. Additional police monitoring will be needed to enforce these parking bans.
3. The Loudon Canal runs adjacent to this proposed development and there is no plan for adequate protection for children to keep them from harming themselves in the ditch. There is now a small play area proposed and this is adjacent to the Loudon Canal.
4. The addition of 200 or more cars, plus visitors, would put significant stress on traffic in the area. As discussed in the Planning Commission meeting, there is already significant traffic delays in this area during busy hours of the day. Some intervention in terms of traffic control and traffic flow will be required.
5. The project could significantly affect the wetlands directly to the west and south of the property. Where there is now open space to absorb rain and snow, this development will "flood" both the wetlands and the Canal. Again, as demonstrated during the Planning Commission meeting, the surrounding homes on the south side of this proposed development and the Loudon Canal are at risk for flooding.
6. Even with the proposed changes to the exteriors of these buildings, they are not compatible with the Kendall Brook community.
7. Having done business with this developer and watched their presentation at the Planning Commission meeting as well as their interactions with residents of Kendall Brook, they do not appear to be the "community partners" we need. This developer will have about 60 votes in the HOA and will have a significant "bloc" impact on our community. Their history in dealing with homeowners concerns is one of delay and

appealing to the "letter of the law" without regard for the residents and/or the spirit of this community. I can only imagine what the response to "renters" will be. As one of the Planning Commission members stated, "Just because you can do something, it doesn't mean you should." This seems like good advice in regard to this proposal.

Please follow the Planning Commission's lead and reject this appeal!

Respectfully,

Joan E. Huebl
4675 Laporte Avenue
Loveland, CO 80538

Jeannie Weaver

From: JOAN HUEBL <hueblje@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, November 14, 2014 9:02 AM
To: Mayor - Cecil Gutierrez
Subject: November 18th Council Meeting concerning Kendall Brook Proposal

Dear Mayor Gutierrez:

Dear Mr. Taylor and Mr. Krenning:

Unfortunately my work schedule does not allow me to be present at the November 18th City Council meeting. I strongly oppose the proposed apartment complex in the Kendall Brook subdivision. I own a home in Kendall Brook.

My opposition stems from the following:

1. Even give the alterations from the original plan which changed the number of units from 120 to 106, this project would put too many people on very limited land. This population density does not reflect the actual character of the existing Kendall Brook subdivision even if the original PUD (completed over a decade ago) does condone this arrangement.
2. Parking for both tenants and visitors is inadequate. There is no parking allowed on either 50th Street or Georgetown (the two main streets adjoining the north and east sides of this proposal). The overflow parking will probably spill over into other, adjacent residential streets. The HOA has been disapproving of both on street and driveway parking by Kendall Brook residents. Additional police monitoring will be needed to enforce these parking bans.
3. The Loudon Canal runs adjacent to this proposed development and there is no plan for adequate protection for children to keep them from harming themselves in the ditch. There is now a small play area proposed and this is adjacent to the Loudon Canal.
4. The addition of 200 or more cars, plus visitors, would put significant stress on traffic in the area. As discussed in the Planning Commission meeting, there is already significant traffic delays in this area during busy hours of the day. Some intervention in terms of traffic control and traffic flow will be required.
5. The project could significantly affect the wetlands directly to the west and south of the property. Where there is now open space to absorb rain and snow, this development will "flood" both the wetlands and the Canal. Again, as demonstrated during the Planning Commission meeting, the surrounding homes on the south side of this proposed development and the Loudon Canal are at risk for flooding.
6. Even with the proposed changes to the exteriors of these buildings, they are not compatible with the Kendall Brook community.
7. Having done business with this developer and watched their presentation at the Planning Commission meeting as well as their interactions with residents of Kendall Brook, they do not appear to be the "community partners" we need. This developer will have about 60 votes in the HOA and will have a significant

"bloc" impact on our community. Their history in dealing with homeowners concerns is one of delay and appealing to the "letter of the law" without regard for the residents and/or the spirit of this community. I can only imagine what the response to "renters" will be. As one of the Planning Commission members stated, "Just because you can do something, it doesn't mean you should." This seems like good advice in regard to this proposal.

Please follow the Planning Commission's lead and reject this appeal!

Respectfully,

Joan E. Huebl
4675 Laporte Avenue
Loveland, CO 80538

Jeannie Weaver

From: JOAN HUEBL <hueblje@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, November 14, 2014 9:04 AM
To: Ward III - Hugh McKean; Ward III - John Fogle
Subject: November 18th Council Meeting concerning Kendall Brook proposal

Dear Mr. McKean and Mr. Fogle:

Dear Mr. Taylor and Mr. Krenning:

Unfortunately my work schedule does not allow me to be present at the November 18th City Council meeting. I strongly oppose the proposed apartment complex in the Kendall Brook subdivision. I own a home in Kendall Brook.

My opposition stems from the following:

1. Even give the alterations from the original plan which changed the number of units from 120 to 106, this project would put too many people on very limited land. This population density does not reflect the actual character of the existing Kendall Brook subdivision even if the original PUD (completed over a decade ago) does condone this arrangement.
2. Parking for both tenants and visitors is inadequate. There is no parking allowed on either 50th Street or Georgetown (the two main streets adjoining the north and east sides of this proposal). The overflow parking will probably spill over into other, adjacent residential streets. The HOA has been disapproving of both on street and driveway parking by Kendall Brook residents. Additional police monitoring will be needed to enforce these parking bans.
3. The Loudon Canal runs adjacent to this proposed development and there is no plan for adequate protection for children to keep them from harming themselves in the ditch. There is now a small play area proposed and this is adjacent to the Loudon Canal.
4. The addition of 200 or more cars, plus visitors, would put significant stress on traffic in the area. As discussed in the Planning Commission meeting, there is already significant traffic delays in this area during busy hours of the day. Some intervention in terms of traffic control and traffic flow will be required.
5. The project could significantly affect the wetlands directly to the west and south of the property. Where there is now open space to absorb rain and snow, this development will "flood" both the wetlands and the Canal. Again, as demonstrated during the Planning Commission meeting, the surrounding homes on the south side of this proposed development and the Loudon Canal are at risk for flooding.
6. Even with the proposed changes to the exteriors of these buildings, they are not compatible with the Kendall Brook community.
7. Having done business with this developer and watched their presentation at the Planning Commission meeting as well as their interactions with residents of Kendall Brook, they do not appear to be the "community partners" we need. This developer will have about 60 votes in the HOA and will have a significant

"bloc" impact on our community. Their history in dealing with homeowners concerns is one of delay and appealing to the "letter of the law" without regard for the residents and/or the spirit of this community. I can only imagine what the response to "renters" will be. As one of the Planning Commission members stated, "Just because you can do something, it doesn't mean you should." This seems like good advice in regard to this proposal.

Please follow the Planning Commission's lead and reject this appeal!

Respectfully,

Joan E. Huebl
4675 Laporte Avenue
Loveland, CO 80538

Jeannie Weaver

From: JOAN HUEBL <hueblje@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, November 14, 2014 9:06 AM
To: Ward IV - Ralph Trenary; Ward IV - Dave Clark
Subject: November 18th Council Meeting concerning Kendall Brook Proposal

Dear Mr. Trenary and Mr. Clark:

Unfortunately my work schedule does not allow me to be present at the November 18th City Council meeting. I strongly oppose the proposed apartment complex in the Kendall Brook subdivision. I own a home in Kendall Brook.

My opposition stems from the following:

1. Even give the alterations from the original plan which changed the number of units from 120 to 106, this project would put too many people on very limited land. This population density does not reflect the actual character of the existing Kendall Brook subdivision even if the original PUD (completed over a decade ago) does condone this arrangement.
2. Parking for both tenants and visitors is inadequate. There is no parking allowed on either 50th Street or Georgetown (the two main streets adjoining the north and east sides of this proposal). The overflow parking will probably spill over into other, adjacent residential streets. The HOA has been disapproving of both on street and driveway parking by Kendall Brook residents. Additional police monitoring will be needed to enforce these parking bans.
3. The Loudon Canal runs adjacent to this proposed development and there is no plan for adequate protection for children to keep them from harming themselves in the ditch. There is now a small play area proposed and this is adjacent to the Loudon Canal.
4. The addition of 200 or more cars, plus visitors, would put significant stress on traffic in the area. As discussed in the Planning Commission meeting, there is already significant traffic delays in this area during busy hours of the day. Some intervention in terms of traffic control and traffic flow will be required.
5. The project could significantly affect the wetlands directly to the west and south of the property. Where there is now open space to absorb rain and snow, this development will "flood" both the wetlands and the Canal. Again, as demonstrated during the Planning Commission meeting, the surrounding homes on the south side of this proposed development and the Loudon Canal are at risk for flooding.
6. Even with the proposed changes to the exteriors of these buildings, they are not compatible with the Kendall Brook community.
7. Having done business with this developer and watched their presentation at the Planning Commission meeting as well as their interactions with residents of Kendall Brook, they do not appear to be the "community partners" we need. This developer will have about 60 votes in the HOA and will have a significant "bloc" impact on our community. Their history in dealing with homeowners concerns is one of delay and appealing to the "letter of the law" without regard for the residents and/or the spirit of this community. I can only imagine what the response to "renters" will be. As one of the Planning Commission members stated, "Just because you can do something, it doesn't mean you should." This seems like good advice in regard to this proposal.

Please follow the Planning Commission's lead and reject this appeal!

Respectfully,

Joan E. Huebl
4675 Laporte Avenue
Loveland, CO 80538

Jeannie Weaver

From: Paul Kaiser <kaiser@digis.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2014 11:34 AM
To: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Subject: Letter in opposition to Journey Homes Appeal
Attachments: Ltr to City Council Troy Krenning.docx

I have attached a letter outlying some of the points against Journey Homes development of Outlot A in Kendall Brook Subdivision. This is a development that the community as a whole is against.

1675 Rhode Island Street
Loveland, CO 80538
November 13, 2014

Troy Krenning
2908 Bent Drive
Loveland, CO 80538

Dear Councilman Krenning:

I am writing this letter to share my concerns with the appeal filed by Journey Homes over the Planning Commission's decision 14-03 which will be heard before you on November 18 in the Loveland Council chambers.

The high density development is neither in conformity nor compatible with the low density of the existing subdivision. The design as presented tries to stuff the maximum number of structures on to the parcel. This is a forced fit! The apartments do not provide any immediate outdoor space for the residents that they can call their own. Journey Homes calling the front entrance pad a porch is a joke.

The traffic study as presented by Journey Homes is way off base. To say that only 60 residents will be leaving the complex during the morning high peak hours is erroneous. If there are 106 apartment units, are they trying to say that a little over half of the residents will work or need to take kids to school or leave for any other reason.

Journey states that they will hire a company to remove snow, well where will the company pile snow prior to removing it without having to impact parking areas for temporary snow storage. Journey Homes just says trust us, yea right.

It is well known in the community about the quality of the work Journey Homes does. In Kendall Brook alone they built 87 homes and by their account, 39 have concrete issues which equates to 45% having issues, what does that say about the quality of their work.

You should see the pictures of the driveway/walkway replacement they have done which I will show during the Council meeting. The new work is even of less quality than the original work which is saying something.

There are a number of other reasons why the appeal should be denied which I am sure will be shared before you on November 18. I ask that you listen carefully to the input of our residents during the meeting and uphold the Planning Commission denial.

Sincerely

Paul Kaiser

Jeannie Weaver

From: Paul Kaiser <kaiser@digis.net>
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2014 11:37 AM
To: Ward I - Chauncey Taylor
Subject: Letter in opposition to Journey Homes appeal
Attachments: Ltr to City Council Chauncey Taylor.docx

I have attached a letter outlying some of the points against Journey Homes development of Outlot A in Kendall Brook Subdivision. This is a development that the community as a whole is against.

Jeannie Weaver

From: Ward I - Troy Krenning
Sent: Thursday, November 13, 2014 6:41 AM
To: Ned & Sandy Puev
Cc: Temp CCMail
Subject: Re: 11/18/14, Public Hearing for Kendall Brook First Subdivisio-Outlot A

Ned and Sandy,

I have been watching this issue for some time and appreciate your email. I am aware of the issues and the concerns.

Troy Krenning

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 12, 2014, at 8:14 PM, "Ned & Sandy Puev" <nspuev@netscape.com> wrote:

Loveland City Council:
 Mayer; C. Gutierrez.
 Members; C. Taylor, T. Krenning, J. Shaffer, P. Farley, H. McKean, J. H. Fogle, R. Trenary, D. Clark.

Honorable Council Members:

My name is Ned Puev. We (my wife Alexandra and I) live on Ignacio Ave., across from the proposed construction which you will be reviewing on November 18th.

Seven years ago we build a home and moved to Kendall Brook community, to live as retirees. Prior to signing the home building contract we were told that future development and building on Outlot A, will be compatible with the rest of Kendall Brook Community. Now, seven years later we find it is not to be.

We are happy to live in Loveland, and specifically in Kendall Brook Community, where more than 400 to 500 families have invested their lifesavings (just like us) to live preferred lifestyle in a great community environment. We paid for this privilege and like to continue and enjoy it for the rest of our lives. For most of us in this Community, our investments are for Life.

We understand that people have the right to make investment for profit. That is exactly what the project presented to you, by Journey Homes, is. This project however, completely ignores the conflicts it will create. The following are four, but not all;

1. The magnitude of this project is totally incompatible with the rest of the Community.
2. Limited parking will result in vehicles being parked in the neighboring streets.
3. Increased traffic volume will result in endangerment of Children Safety.
4. Additional burden on Law Enforcement and the City Judicial System. As conflicts from parking, traffic and other issues develop, Law Enforcement and Judicial Agencies will be called to resolve such conflicts.

When there is a serious conflict between investment for Life and investment for profit, we need to find a way to balance the two conflicting motives. On November 18, you will have the opportunity to establish that balance.

We appeal to you to reject the project in the magnitude presented to you. By doing so, you will pave the way for the "Appropriate Development of Outlot A" in Kendall Brook, where future renters or owners and current residents will live in harmony. The proposal before you, in its magnitude, will result in just the opposite.

Thank you,

Jeannie Weaver

From: Ned & Sandy Puev <nspuev@netscape.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2014 8:08 PM
To: City Council
Cc: Ned & Sandy
Subject: 11/18/14, Public Hearing for Kendall Brook First Subdivisio-Outlot A

Loveland City Council:
Mayer; C. Gutierrez.
Members; C. Taylor, T. Krenning, J. Shaffer, P. Farley, H. McKean, J. H. Fogle, R. Trenary, D. Clark.

Honorable Council Members:

My name is Ned Puev. We (my wife Alexandra and I) live on Ignacio Ave., across from the proposed construction which you will be reviewing on November 18th.

Seven years ago we build a home and moved to Kendall Brook community, to live as retirees. Prior to signing the home building contract we were told that future development and building on Outlot A, will be compatible with the rest of Kendall Brook Community. Now, seven years later we find it is not to be.

We are happy to live in Loveland, and specifically in Kendall Brook Community, where more than 400 to 500 families have invested their lifesavings (just like us) to live preferred lifestyle in a great community environment. We paid for this privilege and like to continue and enjoy it for the rest of our lives. For most of us in this Community, our investments are for Life.

We understand that people have the right to make investment for profit. That is exactly what the project presented to you, by Journey Homes, is. This project however, completely ignores the conflicts it will create. The following are four, but not all;

1. The magnitude of this project is totally incompatible with the rest of the Community.
2. Limited parking will result in vehicles being parked in the neighboring streets.
3. Increased traffic volume will result in endangerment of Children Safety.
4. Additional burden on Law Enforcement and the City Judicial System. As conflicts from parking, traffic and other issues develop, Law Enforcement and Judicial Agencies will be called to resolve such conflicts.

When there is a serious conflict between investment for Life and investment for profit, we need to find a way to balance the two conflicting motives. On November 18, you will have the opportunity to establish that balance.

We appeal to you to reject the project in the magnitude presented to you. By doing so, you will pave the way for the "Appropriate Development of Outlot A" in Kendall Brook, where future renters or owners and current residents will live in harmony. The proposal before you, in its magnitude, will result in just the opposite.

Thank you,
Ned & Alexandra Puev