

Jennifer Luther

From: Noah Beals
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 12:13 PM
To: Jennifer Luther
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Appeal: ZBA210017

From: GARRY FRITZE <fritzga@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 12:06 PM
To: Noah Beals <nbeals@fcgov.com>; Barbara Fritz <iossibarb@gmail.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Appeal: ZBA210017

This is a comment from owner of 310 Edwards St. My apologies if you receive multiple copies.

BarbaraFritz / owner of lossihouse LLC
310 Edwards Street
Fort Collins, Colorado 80524
(970) 221-2363
fritze.ga@gmail.com

10th May, 2021

Appeal: ZBA210017
Address: 320 Edwards St.
Owner: Ralph Kiel
Petitioner: Adona Baros
Zoning District: N-C-M
Code Section: 3.8.3(1)

Dear Ms. Reader,

This is a comment regarding the above request for a modification of the City of Fort Collins Zoning Code.

I am against rezoning this property to allow people to live in the structure behind the house next to the alley. At the very least the property needs to have a means of parking that will allow all who live there to be able to park their vehicles without impacting the traffic on the alley. This traffic includes the many cars requiring alley access to reach their garages as well the many utility vehicles that are required in the alleyway for communication, power, gas, and waste disposal.

This property has been an issue at least as far back as 1983. At that time the property owner (different from the current owner) discovered people living illegally in the structure next to the alley. The former owner made efforts to have those people removed prior to selling the property. It is not clear if the current owner has made similar efforts and vehicles parked between the structure and the alley is causing significant problems. The best use of that structure would be as a garage. If more than one family is to live in the main house then I

would hope the city would require the structure to be demolished to allow adequate parking for the separate families.

Regards,
Barbara Fritz
310 Edwards Street

Jennifer Luther

From: Noah Beals
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 4:17 PM
To: Jennifer Luther
Subject: FW: Appeal #ZBA210017/320 Edwards St

From: Welsch,Marty <Marty.Welsch@colostate.edu>
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 4:15 PM
To: Noah Beals <nbeals@fcgov.com>
Cc: Stan Welsch <swelsch@fcgov.com>; Welsch,Marty <Marty.Welsch@colostate.edu>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Appeal #ZBA210017/320 Edwards St

Hello, Noah: My husband and I received information that a hearing will be held for a modification of the City of Fort Collins Zoning Code for the above property.

We have lived at 1110 Mathews St for 17 years and will note our property sits at the alley entrance of the detached accessory structure (structure) that sits at the rear of the 320 Edwards property.

This structure has been nothing but problematic since we have moved into our Matthews St house:

- There have been high levels of traffic going in and out multiple times per day at high rates of speed.
- There routinely has been large piles of household trash accumulated in front of the structure at times blocking passage through the alley.
- There have been multiple instances of raised voices, loud music, and concerning behavior over the years coming from the various short term residents of the structure.
- Parking has been random and haphazard in the alley resulting in blocking passage through the alley.
- Most concerning is the police standoff last summer in which a notorious fugitive was apparently housed in the structure. Fortunately, the police avoided escalation and the fugitive ultimately surrendered after several hours. However, it became clear that many unrelated adults lived or had unrestricted access to that structure. Needless to say this event was very disturbing to our neighborhood and, in particular, to the neighbors on Edwards St.

Of course, my husband and I would like to see significant improvement to the above situation and believe that responsible home ownership will alleviate our concerns. If the new owner can ensure and enforce organized and structured parking for the Home Occupation, safe traffic flow at low rates of speed in the alley, consistent property maintenance to the structure, and overall responsible ownership we would gladly welcome the new owner and her family to our neighborhood and not oppose the request for a modification of the City of Fort Collins Zoning Code.

In the interest of neighborhood relationships, we respectfully request that our concerns be kept confidential and not open to the public. Please let us know if this is not possible.

Sincerely,

Stan and Marty Welsch

Jennifer Luther

From: Noah Beals
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 4:55 PM
To: Jennifer Luther
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Appeal: ZBA210017

From: Tom Brewer <tjbrewer.dds@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 10, 2021 4:22 PM
To: Noah Beals <nbeals@fcgov.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Appeal: ZBA210017

I am writing to voice my opposition to the variance request being made at the address of 320 Edwards Street. The proposal will have a consequential and detrimental impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

Thank you,
Tom Brewer
336 Garfield St.
Fort Collins

Jennifer Luther

From: Noah Beals
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:37 AM
To: Jennifer Luther
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Zoning Appeal ZBA2100017, 320 Edwards for May 13, 2021 hearing

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

From: ellenaudley@frii.com <ellenaudley@frii.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:35 AM
To: Noah Beals <nbeals@fcgov.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Zoning Appeal ZBA2100017, 320 Edwards for May 13, 2021 hearing

Hi Neal,

I am writing to voice my opposition to the request for modification of the City of Fort Collins Zoning Code regarding 320 Edwards Street. I have been a property owner and continuous resident next door at 318 Edwards since 1984.

Part of my opposition is colored by experience. Over the years, the house and the modified garage structure on the alley property have been rentals which frequently exceeded the three unrelated rule, bringing more noise and traffic than a typical property. Trash near the alley residence and parking in the alley has been a frequent issue until recently. The SWAT team event within the last year, during which the police evacuated me for over four hours to due concern for potential gunfire, was the most extreme event.

Neither residence has been occupied since then, and the feeling of privacy in the back yard, quiet, safety and predictability has been wonderful.

The variance would create the opportunity for one hairstylist, an additional non-residential employee, and up to two other hair stylists who could live in the main house to potentially establish a customer base in the alley structure. This would bring more traffic, parking issues and noise to the alley if it is the main access point. If customers park on Edwards Street, they'll be walking between the houses within a few feet of the east side windows of my home. As customers come and go, whether from the alley or street, there will be much more traffic and noise than three unrelated people occupying either the alley structure or the main house on the property.

While an owner-occupied house could be an asset to the neighborhood, I am opposed to a home business with the potential to create the impacts of a full-time business with a multi-stylist presence while bringing related impacts and reducing residential privacy.

Respectfully,
Ellen Audley

Jennifer Luther

From: Noah Beals
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 8:38 PM
To: Jennifer Luther
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Zoning Appeal ZBA210017

From: Noah Beals
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 11:40 AM
To: John Jones <johnny.jones9899@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: [EXTERNAL] Zoning Appeal ZBA210017

Hello,

I offered a response to your questions below highlight in blue.

Regards,

Noah Beals
Senior City Planner-Zoning | City of Fort Collins
[970 416-2313](tel:9704162313)



From: John Jones <johnny.jones9899@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 10:55 AM
To: Noah Beals <nbeals@fcgov.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Zoning Appeal ZBA210017

Good morning, Mr. Beals,

I wanted to submit some questions that might be relevant for the Notice of Public Hearing meeting to be held May 13, 2021. These questions are in regards to the property at 320 Edwards Street.

1. In regards to the request to change zoning, it is stated that the Board hears cases where regulations result in difficulties and/or undue hardship on the owner. What is the owner's exceptional situation or circumstances resulting in undue hardship? What is said hardship?

There are three criteria the Zoning Board of Appeals may base an approval. In general those three criteria are 1) Hardship 2) Equal to or better than and 3) Nominal/Inconsequential. The Board does not need to find that all three are being met only one. In this case the applicant is suggesting the request is nominal/inconsequential.

2. How is the proposal in this particular situation going to better promote the general purpose of the standard?

Criteria 2) The proposal as submitted will promote the general purpose of the standard for which the variance is requested equally well or better than would a proposal which complies with the standard for which the variance is requested. Again this not the criteria the applicant is suggesting.

3. The notice claims that the proposal will not diverge from the standards of the Land Use Code except in "nominal/inconsequential ways." Please address these.

The applicant suggest running the home occupation from the existing accessory building verses the main house will have little impact and mentions there are other home businesses in the neighborhood as well.

4. The neighborhood has been negatively impacted by the mismanagement of this property for quite some time. How can the neighborhood be confident that the change in the Zoning Code being discussed for this property will result in a positive change for the neighborhood?

A home occupation is allowed at every dwelling unit. If the applicant was requesting it be operated in the main house this license would have already been issued. The variance request is to operate it from the accessory building. A home occupation does require the license holder to live in the primary house. A home occupation has other requirements that the applicant has not requested a variance such as operating hours 8am-6pm Monday-Saturday. These are only some details of the request.

5. If the Zoning Code is changed for this property to allow a business to be run out of one of the buildings on this property, which building will house the business?
 1. The building on the alley is "out of sight" from the public, has limited parking, limited space for deliveries, etc.

The request is for the business to run from the accessory building which is accessed from the alley.

6. How will hours of the business be monitored?

A license is required for a home occupation. The applicant self certifies they are meeting the standards of the license. The City responds to any complaints it may receive that would be a violation.

7. Where will employees and customers park?

All may park were it is legal to park.

8. How will trash regulations be monitored and enforced?

There are not additional trash regulations associated with a home occupation.

9. How will noise, dust, other neighborhood impacts be monitored?

The City responds to any complaints it may receive that would be a violation.

10. If Home Occupation codes are violated, what occurs?

The typical follow up for compliance issues include notice of violation and request for compliance, if needed suspension and/or revocations of license, last action would be a summons to court.

Kind regards

Jennifer Luther

From: Noah Beals
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 5:31 PM
To: Jennifer Luther
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] 228 Wood St Variance Input

From: BONNIE BRUMMER <bbrn@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2021 8:02 AM
To: Noah Beals <nbeals@fcgov.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 228 Wood St Variance Input

Good Morning Noah & Zoning Board,

I was planning on attending the meeting but got called into the hospital so I wanted to pass along our sentiments for the request, we are an adjacent owner and will be closing on 232 Wood St this week and be the next door neighbor to the north. This is probably the most impacted property from the request & my husband and I are in full support of the curb cut, it doesn't impact the traffic flow and is in line with a number of other homes on the block that have front curbs/driveways and will likely alleviate parking pressure that has increased on the block over the years.

It will also allow them to keep the charming barn-like garage in the backyard in tact which is not currently suitable for parking and preserve an important part of the esthetics of the neighborhood in my opinion.

I hope these help in making your decision and wish our neighbors the best of luck today!

Best regards,

Bonnie Brummer

Jennifer Luther

From: Noah Beals
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:35 AM
To: Jennifer Luther
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] 346 N. Loomis request for modification - Appeal ZBA210018

From: Joshua Beck <joshuacurtisbeck@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:28 AM
To: Noah Beals <nbeals@fcgov.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] 346 N. Loomis request for modification - Appeal ZBA210018

Hi Noah,

I am unable to attend the meeting for the request for permission to exceed the fence height at 346 N. loomis but I do have input regarding the request. The excessively tall fence was installed at the time of the current owner moving in. Since the owner is now asking for a variance, I presume either neighborhood complaints or Code Compliance forced him to ask for the variance. It looks like a walled compound, not unlike what you expect to see in a gated community, certainly not in-line with the historic look of Old Town. The towering fence was put up without permission and given what the (architecturally inappropriate for historic Old Town standards) house sold for, I believe the owner will not suffer exceptional undue hardship removing the excessively tall compound fence. Having the fence brought down to regulation height would make that home less of an eyesore in our already rapidly gentrifying Martinez neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration, good luck.

Due to the closeness of our homes and the fact that the owner has posted numerous signs (on his towering fences) indicating his willingness to shoot people, I'd prefer to remain anonymous.

Thanks,
Josh Beck
610 Cherry

Jennifer Luther

From: Noah Beals
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 9:19 AM
To: Jennifer Luther
Subject: FW: [EXTERNAL] Appeal ZBA210018

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

From: Hobbes Cat <kristinkjer75@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2021 5:44 PM
To: Noah Beals <nbeals@fcgov.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Appeal ZBA210018

Hi Noah,

Just wanted to put my two cents in regarding the request for the 346 N Loomis property to exceed the maximum fence height of 6ft by an additional 2ft. As an adjacent property owner, I do not see how this property has an exceptional circumstance nor do I believe it affects the neighborhood in a nominal, inconsequential way—it is definitely an eyesore. I am assuming the proposal is a response to the current code violation due to the fact that the fence is already ridiculously high and gives the appearance of an off putting fortress. I do not believe that just because the owner is obviously well off that he should be able to do whatever he wants. I would like to see the fence come down to regulation height.

Because we are close neighbors, I'd prefer to remain anonymous.

Thanks,

Kristin Kjer
610 Cherry St

Sent from my iPhone