Good evening, I am Erik Mathys. I live in Arvada at 15025 W 68th Place.

There are 7 listed Approval Criteria to consider for a change to the Comprehensive Plan. Other speakers will/have cover(ed) other points in the approval criteria. I wish to address **Items 6 and 7**.

**Item 6** asks the question:

If strict adherence to the existing comprehensive plan would result in a situation neither intended nor in keeping with other key elements and policies of the plan?

The developer’s response is that strict adherence to the current Comprehensive Plan would render the land unusable. As the site was used as a landfill formerly, the land is not environmentally safe for residential land uses.

The developer knew this when he purchased this legacy landfill in 2012 for $85K for back taxes. The developer fails to mention that with proper remediation, the site can be made safe for residential developments.

It is recognized that to make the site safe for residential uses, a significant portion of the landfill materials need to be removed, however, the same applies for most industrial uses and construction.

The geotechnical reports for the site clearly state that higher cost remediation is the recommended option for all types of development. However, they also state that lower cost alternatives can be considered, if the owner is willing to accept the higher risk of failures and high level of continuing maintenance which would create a whole new set of potential exposure and environmental problems.

The primary reason for saying the site is unfit for residential use is that the regulatory exposure limits for hazardous items of concern are somewhat more stringent for residential than for industrial applications which means a somewhat lower level of remediation not to the point that industrial applications are significantly less costly.

**Item 7** of the approval criteria asks the question:

Will the proposal plan amendment promote the public welfare and will it be consistent with the goals and policies of the comprehensive plan and the elements there of?

The applicant responds to this by stating

The proposed Plan amendment will promote the public welfare and will be consistent with the goals and policies by providing public improvements and enhancements to a blighted site.

It is hard to see what public improvements will be provided by the proposed plan amendment. The bulk of the site improvements occur on privately held property. There does not appear to be any upgrade of the area transportation system, or to water, sewer, or electrical services.

It is further stated that enhancements will be made to the blighted site. This probably refers to the regulatory landscaping and lighting requirements for the proposed project. It should be noted that the site is presently covered by a grassy surface with scattered shrubs and supports a range of wildlife on the site and in the adjacent Ralston creek drainage. This developer does not have the best interests of the surrounding established neighborhoods in it’s plans. It could be argued that a 355 space gravel covered parking lot is still a blighted site from visual perspectives, with potential dust emission concerns, and unaddressed environmental concerns.

If this landowner is not willing to invest in this property to ensure that any development will be safe for surrounding residents, then the City should not approve of the Comprehensive Plan Amendment or allow the developer to move forward with this proposal.