

Appendix A: Public Survey Results

The CCE Development Committee and Board discussed the overlays at almost every meeting through 2020 - 2022. A CCE community meeting was held February 16, 2021 to present the overlays and solicit feedback. Attendees were recruited via CCEA membership mailing, social media postings, CCE business mailing lists, and other lists. Outreach was also conducted with area developers and property owners throughout 2021. A CCE survey regarding the overlays was posted through July 15th, 2021 so that the CCEA Board could include the perceptions of its constituents in its recommendation to City Council. There were 169 responses from CCEA members (70%), CCEA non-members (30%), and property developers. 75% favored the overlay. Survey details are provided below.

About the Survey

How was the CCEA overlay survey promoted?

- Emails to 200+ local residents, commercial property owners, businesses and developers.
 - Emails were sent to CCEA members, non-members for whom we have email addresses, members of the CCE Social group and community safety group.
- Multiple postings to the CCE Facebook page [464 members] and Chris Hinds FB page.
- Multiple postings on Nextdoor CCE page [1,658 members]
- Hand delivered flyers within CCE [100+ flyers]
- Recipients were encouraged to share the survey link and several did.

How many persons responded?

- 169 persons responded. The total included residential and commercial property owners, renters, developers and their representatives.

Who took the survey? Not surprisingly, those most engaged in and invested in CCE and local affairs responded.

- The majority [70%] were CCEA members. This group tends to be most engaged in CCE community issues.
 - The 30% who are not CCEA members shows that the survey reached and includes the broader community.
- The majority [89%] own residential property in CCE. The majority [89%] live east of Madison St.
- Four persons who are currently developing commercial property in CCE responded. There are three concurrent commercial developments underway.
- Two persons who are currently developing residential property in CCE responded.

Who contributed to the survey development?

- About 20 members of the CCEA Development Committee and Board
- Commercial property owners and developers
- City Planning
- Other CCE residents
- The complete survey and background are attached. The reader is encouraged to scan these attachments.

When was the survey was conducted?

- June 28th through July 15th, 2021, allowing both those who work during the week and those who do not plenty of time to respond.

Commercial, Mixed Use Overlay Survey Results

When asked: *“Based on what you have read here about the commercial, mixed use overlay and your review of the attached details, should the Cherry Creek East Association Board support or not support, this commercial, mixed use overlay?”*

- The great majority (75%, three quarters) said yes
- A minority (17%, less than 1 in 5) said no
- A small minority (8%, less than 1 in 10) were not sure

When asked: *“Why do you say that about the CCEA Board supporting or not supporting the commercial, mixed use zoning overlay?”*

- The great majority who said “yes” agreed with the overlay objectives, the process for developing it and the proposed approach to meeting those objectives. Sample comments are below. A complete list of comments is attached in the complete final report downloaded directly from SurveyMonkey.
 - *“Completely agree with objectives of overlay.”*
 - *“Sounds like a reasonable compromise for development in our neighborhood”*
 - *“The overlay strikes the right balance between asking too much and too little. It will allow for new development but ensure that the new development meets neighborhood and City goals for mobility [walking/ bikes], open space and safety.”*
 - *“The CCEA Board should support this overlay precisely because of the points discussed in the proposal.”*
 - *“The overlay will make sure future developments meet the stated goals of the overlay, which generally will maintain the quality of life in the neighborhood while allowing developers reasonable ways to develop property.”*
 - *“I have been following the development of the overlays by attending Development Committee meetings and approve of the process and results.”*
 - *“I think the overlay is preferable to the effort and unpredictable nature of negotiating each development.”*
 - *“It creates the balance between neighborhood and city.”*
 - *“Retains the residential aspect of our neighborhood in terms of density, walkability, avoids concrete canyons, and respects the scale and of the bulk of existing structures.”*
- The minority who said “no” or “not sure” were divided between those who feel that the commercial overlay as stated should have been more restrictive vs. those who feel it is too restrictive.
 - Proposal should be **more** restrictive ... sample comments
 - *“No interest in crowding the CCE. This is great for developers but not the residents. Bad idea.”*
 - *“I’m not sure the 5 foot setbacks are big enough”*
 - *“Based on what I’m reading this would allow large buildings which I’m not in favor of.”*

- *“It seems like we are surrendering to the lesser-evil. I thought we voted for a board that would fight overdevelopment of this area and keep the buildings to three stories – keep the residential feel, pace, and openness. Yes, the setbacks on street level and higher floors are preferable, but I don’t want that to be a “loophole” used for taller buildings that will dwarf and smother this area”.*
 - *“Lack of requirement for larger sidewalk to improve walkability (walkability is one of your goals). Disagree with an alternative to 5 ft setback. Setback should be always required and more than 5 feet.”*
- Proposal should be **less** restrictive ... sample comments
 - *“The goals of the commercial overlay are great. The overlay as drafted is much too restrictive on building types, and does not allow enough design flexibility.”*
 - *“The overlay prohibits the development of smaller properties by taking away too much land. CCE will not ever create a warm environment with the plan”*
 - *“Let zoning take care of this”*

Residential Overlay Survey Results

When asked: *“Based on what you have just read here about the residential overlay and your review of the attached details, should the Cherry Creek East Association Board support or not support, this residential use overlay?”*

- The great majority (79%, 8 of 10 respondents) said “yes”
- A minority (13%, about 1 in 8) said “no”
- A small minority (8%, about 1 in 12) said “not sure”

When asked: *“Why do you say that about the CCEA Board supporting or not supporting the residential zoning overlay?”*

- Consistent with the commercial mixed-use response, the great majority [79%] who said “yes” to the residential overlay agreed with key goals, process and proposed approach of the proposed residential overlay. Sample comments:
 - *“The CCEA Board should support this overlay precisely because of the points discussed in the proposal.”*
 - *“Thoughtful recommendations. The front porch is particularly important”*
 - *“Promotes safety, walkability, attractiveness and neighborhood interactions”*
 - *“Improve the safety, friendliness and communication between residents and appearance of our neighborhood and provide shade for our sidewalks.”*
 - *“Again, we need to keep the residential feel of the neighborhood. Porches/patios and trees will encourage people to be outside and walking in the neighborhood”*
 - *“The front porch and lighting enhance a neighborhood and encourages neighbors to get to know each other”*
 - *“The CCEA Board is exercising the will of the majority of CCE owners.”*
- The minority [21%] who said “no” or “not sure” to the residential overlay gave a wide variety of reasons. There is no single, persistent theme within the minority responses. Some would like more restrictions, some fewer. Sample comments:

- *“I agree with all 3 of these stipulations, absolutely. They should be bare minimum. Still not sure about overall plan here. Are they going to agree to these niceties and then, once their development approved, do whatever the hell they want and just ignore our complaints? Odds are good.”*
- *“Certainly nothing wrong with guidelines but do not address other key elements (e.g., no curb cuts, detached sidewalk requirements, landscaping requirements) encompassed in the Cherry Creek East Design Guidelines in effect until 2012”*
- *“This overlay needs additional work to incorporate more of the original “Cherry Creek East Design Guidelines” requirements. i.e., required entries on side streets (Avenues) at corner lots. Minimum caliper size trees in tree lawns and maximum spacing per City Forester requirements. Also, minimum landscaped area requirements, etc.”*
- *“I cannot stand the front porches. I’d rather have more area in the back for entertaining. This is not the south where we have huge homes and beautiful wrap around porches. I find the townhome front porches strange.”*
- *“Totally disagree with lighting!!!!!!”*
- *“Not needed”*

At the end of the survey, respondents were asked: *“Finally, if you have any questions or comments about the survey or development in CCE please let us know below.”*

- Many responses were complimentary e.g., *“Excellent work on the survey and process,”* some discussed unrelated perceived problems in CCE e.g., street maintenance, unkempt properties, traffic, etc. The rest were mostly one-off comments. One noted: *“We trust the City Council will see the wisdom of endorsing the commercial and residential overlays discussed in this survey.”*