



WESTMINSTER

COLORADO

CITY COUNCIL MEETING

MAY 12, 2025 at 7:00 PM

A. Public Comment for May 12, 2025



Agenda Memorandum

5.A.

Agenda Item –

City Council Meeting
May 12, 2025

Subject: Public Comment for May 12, 2025

Prepared By: Abby Fitch, City Clerk

Attachments:

Ochoa Public Comment
Bowman Public Comment
Messick Public Comment

[EXTERNAL] Valley View Estates

From Katherine J Ochoa <ckmjoch@comcast.net>

Date Tue 5/6/2025 9:38 PM

To Public Comment <PublicComment@westminsterco.gov>

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Hello:

My name is Kathy Ochoa and I reside at 2792 West 105th Drive, Westminster, CO 80234. I have lived here since August 1992, almost 33 years.

I have been at many meetings with the City of Westminster and councils thereof about our area behind my home for many years. Time and time again, we come to the meetings with honesty and concern as we are attending meetings as we are voicing our unsettled thoughts. This time, I am writing and would like to share the concerns I have for the property behind my home to the west on the land to be developed.

Thank you for listening to what I have to say in writing. When attending the last meeting at the City, I felt as though we were acknowledged, but not actually heard. I question if those who are making these decisions about the development of the property have actually looked at the property to understand our voice of concern as a community living within the Meadowlark neighborhood. I think it is very important to look at the area to truly understand our position in requesting denial of the development. You see, these duplex homes I understand are to be 3 stories high or approximately 37 feet high which in my opinion will look strange in the area as many of the existing homes are lower in elevation. Therefore these units would be towering over the existing properties of our community that would back to this new development. I do not believe it is aesthetically smooth visually and would look odd or displaced. Why would the City of Westminster want this? I do not understand. If my home were yours, I believe you would agree with me that it would look too large for the land both elevation wise on the main level and as you look upward of the home to be built. Who wants to be living in a home that you have lived in for many years, and then find out that you don't have a choice about anything as to the building on the vacant land behind your home. I am saddened that if this property continues to go through the approval at the City level, I will no longer have privacy in my yard and home as the 3-4 units behind me will see everything we are doing on my property and in my home. How fair is that? I also believe this will reduce the price of my home. It will look ridiculous and not a place that anyone would want to reside in because of no privacy.

I heard at the last meeting and have read in documents that the setback is being accepted as an exception to what code actually is. I am very concerned about this. Reducing/shortening the setbacks quite a bit in front of the units and in back of the units in my opinion leads me to believe that these exceptions need to be made in order to build these duplexes on the property. **Why?** Is the City in such a state that they need to build on every piece of property and make exceptions to code to do so? I question if making these exceptions to the setbacks, will also be a concern to the drainage of the property as well as mine. I have worked in construction for over 20+ years and know that errors can occur in the elevation, swale and drainage route of water. I have done a lot of work in my backyard to make it beautiful. I have this awful feeling that water drainage will not be completed correctly and cause damage to my property which has a retaining wall from one end of the property to the other, not to mention the landscaping that has been placed. If flooding were to occur, because of the drainage and setbacks thereof, then my property could be damaged with too much water escaping to my property and possible destruction of both the retaining wall and the landscape of flowers, bushes, etc. This is a costly concern on my part in addition to landscaping to be done on the development of the property as tree roots could also push out my retaining wall. I don't have the money to take this on...if flooding exists after development of the property, who pays for that? My insurance will not as I am not in a flood zone!

Safety is also a major concern. Day after day, I see vehicles going over the speed limit from Bruchez to Decatur up to Eliot as well as coming down Eliot past Valley View park. You don't need to watch it, you can hear the vehicles going fast! In addition, in front of my home, cars go through quickly on 105th Drive as well, and don't stop at the stop sign in front of the park many times throughout the day. I am concerned that if there are young families in these duplexes bringing more visual of humans, and children are not watched, there will be an accident, especially if the children go to the park on their own. This just brings more traffic to the park by humans in and out of vehicles and on Eliot and Decatur streets. Eliot is already a concern of vehicles not breaking on the sharp turn at the bottom of the street going through barricades on Auto Nation property. I would hate to see that somebody get hit which will bring more safety issues.

In closing, I have loved living in the City of Westminster. I am scared as to what is ahead for our lives, privacy and decline of property value. This development is not a good thing to do. It is too large of a project in size for the size of this land. It will not look good and as I walked the neighborhood speaking to neighbors in Meadowlark, the first thing they told me is "why"? "Why is the City making exceptions to code to build on this property as it surely seems as though the land parcel is too small. It is going to look weird for this entrance to our community".

Please look at this piece of land not on drawings but as hands on while understanding the building and what it will encompass. If you do this, I truly believe that if this was your home, you would also be concerned, scared and dissatisfied with the decision to build on this small parcel of land.

Respectfully,

Kathy Ochoa
2792 West 105th Drive
Westminster, CO 80234

[EXTERNAL] Request to Amend Municipal Code to Allow Two Miniature Goats per Household in the City of Westminster.

From Jenelle Bowman <genbowman18@gmail.com>

Date Wed 5/7/2025 9:24 PM

To Public Comment <PublicComment@westminsterco.gov>

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Westminster City Council,

We the undersigned residents of Westminster, respectfully petition the City Council to amend existing animal-keeping regulations to permit each household to keep two miniature goats, such as Nigerian Dwarf or African Pygmy breeds. This request aligns with successful urban agriculture initiatives in neighboring Colorado cities and supports sustainable living practices.

Rationale:

1. Precedent in Neighboring Cities:

Denver has allowed residents to keep up to two dwarf goats since 2011, requiring a simple permit process.

Arvada permits up to two miniature goats per household across all zoning districts, recognizing their suitability for urban settings.

Thornton implemented a pilot program allowing two miniature goats per residence, which received positive feedback and was extended.

Colorado Springs amended its pet ordinance to include miniature goats, allowing two per household.

Lafayette Allows no more than and no less than 2 miniature goats, with a license fee.

2. Benefits of Miniature Goats:

Sustainable Living: Miniature goats can provide a source of fresh milk and cheese, contributing to food security and self-sufficiency.

Educational Opportunities: Keeping goats offers hands-on learning experiences for families and children about animal care and agriculture. They are also a great animal for 4H youth projects.

Environmental Management: Goats can assist in managing vegetation and producing natural fertilizer for

gardens.

Companionship: These goats are known for their friendly nature and can serve as affectionate companions. They can be pets and are so much fun. They are small like a medium sized dog.

Entrepreneurship: Their milk can be made into many products such as Soap, Candles, lotions and salves.

Community Engagement: Goats can foster a sense of community by attracting neighbors interested in learning about sustainable living and local food systems.

3. Proposed Regulations:

To ensure responsible ownership and address potential concerns, we propose the following guidelines:

No more and no less than (2) miniature goats per household. (2) must be kept in order to humanely meet the goats companionship needs.

Only female or neutered male goats permitted

No Bucks unaltered.

Adequate shelter and secure fencing to prevent escapes and protect the animals.

Fencing should be 6 ft in height no less.

Compliance with existing noise and waste management ordinances.

Required permitting process to ensure adherence to regulations.

Conclusion:

By adopting these measures, Westminster can join other progressive Colorado cities in promoting sustainable urban agriculture while maintaining community standards. We urge the City Council to consider this amendment, reflecting the evolving needs and interests of its residents.

Thank you for your time

Sincerely,

Jenelle Bowman

720-235-2651

Resident of Westminster Colorado.

Other residents include:

Shiela and Casey Dubois

602-571-0211

Mary Vo

303-941-1604

Joyce Kruger

720-388-9848

Colleen and Dan Burdick

720-841-3309

Sara Marchiondo
303-842-8856

Hello City Council Members,

My name is Amanda Messick. My property is right in the middle of the proposed new development. My family and I will have several units directly behind our property. I have many concerns with the proposed property.

The first concern I have is how many exceptions were given to this property. The 2 I have the most concern with are the front building setback and the rear building setback. It seems like these properties are going to be way too close to our properties which could lead to sewer, flood and landscaping problems such as overgrown trees.

The city code for front setbacks is 30' from the proposed right of way for a collector street per section 11(A)(3) of the single family attached design standards. The builder is asking for an exception to make this 20' this is a 10 foot difference. What concessions are the builders willing to give the existing homeowners/neighborhood to shorten this setback by 10 feet. The rear building setback code is 54'-1.5" per section 1(B) of the single family attached design standards. They are asking for the rear setback to be 34' which is a 20 foot difference. This seems like an extreme change in development code. In total they are asking for a 30 foot difference between code

and what they are trying to build. This is a huge number when you think about space on a lot and between buildings. The buildings should be required to meet the setback allotments. Allowing exceptions is a concession to the builder and a bad deal for neighbors. If exceptions are needed, the structures are too large for the lot they are proposed to be built on. Why have setbacks driven by the depth of the structure if they are to be ignored for the sake of building more units and larger units in a space where they don't fit?

I am curious about the city code that says "The plan exhibits the application of sound, creative, innovative, or efficient planning and design principles." If you have to ask for exceptions to setback rules then it seems the property is too small to be developed with this large of a development. It seems like this development lacks creative, innovative or efficient planning if they are trying to build a development that is larger than the property can allow.

Another concern I have is the exception the builder is asking for in relation to a retaining wall separation. The code states that a minimum landscape area of 7 feet in width must be provided between adjacent retaining walls per the city's retail commercial design guidelines. They are providing 4 feet. Again they are shorting the dimensions by 3 feet. We are now

up to a total of 33 feet difference between what code states should happen and what the developers are proposing for this area. The developer says this is not possible due to the small size of development. Again I will state, if the property is too small to develop what they are proposing then why should they be allowed to break city code to build it.

Another exception requested was a landscaped median/island being required at a major entrance to a project per section 8 (A) (2). They say that no median will be required because of the small size of the project and the configuration of the adjacent streets. There already is not an existing turn lane off of 104th onto Elliot street. The existing speed limit on 104th is 40 MPH right there. People can not properly slow down to make the turn from 104th to Elliot as it is. With more houses and parking along this street this will cause a traffic problem.

In the traffic justification it says it will only lead to about 113 new trips for this development. That is a huge number of trips for a small suburban community with a park next to it where many children play, dogs walk and baseball games are held. We already have structural damage to our streets with the amount of cars that use our small suburban streets and this will lead to much more traffic. Can you please explain to

me what the traffic numbers are and how you get them? It doesn't seem to make sense.

There is also a no parking zone on the east side of the street where the developments will be. Will that stay a no parking zone? If so there will be parking issues between the existing parking, commercial trucks hauling cars to the dealerships and the new development parking.

Along the lines of traffic there are safety concerns. That corner at the North side of this development is a traffic hazard in the winter. Many, many cars have gone through the dealership fence going too fast around the icy corner.

When we were at the city planning commission meeting one of the commissioners voted no on this proposed development because of the 6% grade. They commented on how steep this is for a street. This will lead to drainage issues for the homes at the bottom of that steep grade. Especially since the existing houses are below the proposed development in elevation. This is also a parking issue with the dangerous driving conditions.

One of the planning commissioners that voted no, voted this way because they wanted to know who would maintain the

drainage behind the properties and the HOA. This commissioner had concerns about the HOA being run by homeowners that had no interest in maintaining the swales put in.

Lastly, as a long time Westminster resident we loved living in Westminster because of the open space, parks, and space between houses. Now it feels as if Westminster is building more and more apartments or duplexes everywhere you look. We can't leave a single spot untouched. This tiny parcel of land is way too small for the amount of building being proposed on it. These massive dwellings will tower above our houses as a complete out of place eyesore. I urge you to reconsider the priorities of Westminster. Should we try to build new developments that are harmonious with the existing neighborhoods in size and planning or should we overdevelop properties allowing existing city codes to be broken.