



Denise Ciernia <dciernia@littletongov.org>

comments for today

Loretta Lohman <lorettalohman@gmail.com>

Mon, Nov 12, 2018 at 2:32 PM

To: Mark Rudnicki <pcmr@littletongov.org>, Sherri Almond <pcsa@littletongov.org>, Robin Swartzbacker <pcrs@littletongov.org>, Jason Reynolds <pcjr@littletongov.org>, Dan Miller <pcdm@littletongov.org>, John Bridenbaugh <pcjb@littletongov.org>, David Bolt <pcdb@littletongov.org>, Bruce Stahlman <pcbs@littletongov.org>, Mark Relph <mrelph@littletongov.org>

Cc: Denise Ciernia <cddjc@littletongov.org>, Jocelyn Mills <jmills@littletongov.org>

RE: The city is seeking feedback on the pr <<https://littletonplans.org/sites/littletonplans.org/files/media/Subdivision%20Code%20-%20proposed%20amendments%20to%20PC%2011-12-18.pdf>> oposed subdivision code amendments <<https://littletonplans.org/sites/littletonplans.org/files/media/Subdivision%20Code%20-%20proposed%20amendments%20to%20PC%2011-12-18.pdf>> that were presented to City Council on August 14, 2018 and to Planning Commission on August 27, 2018. Planning commission will hear testimony and staff recommendations at their regular meeting on November 12 at 6:30 p.m. in council chambers. *Written comments must be submitted by September 12 at 5:00 p.m.* to have your comments presented to Planning Commission at their meeting.

Once again the Planning Commission seems to be operating under cover of darkness and a fair amount of secrecy. I ONLY heard about today's meeting because a kind person forwarded me the information. People I know to try very hard to keep up with PC were also caught unaware. Clearly this is not any type of democratic process as it is operating in darkness.

Once again the very short notice makes it impossible to respond, especially if one is ill and has house-guests. For now I will simple reiterate that this matter is being pushed with great rapidity, little input, in possible contravention of what the developing Little ton Plan may incorporate [assuming said plan has any public input], and seems freighted toward one point of view. Just today saw the release of a major academic study that found a great deal of today's political polarization is rooted in planning decisions made some years ago. I see those things beginning to happen in Littleton.

Please postpone this consideration until full public notice and input and be achieved to better know what may be useful for the actual, real citizens of Littleton.

--

Loretta Lohman, PhD
303-549-3063



Denise Ciernia <dciernia@littletongov.org>

No on Admin approval: Condo and Subdivision Code Public Hearing, Monday 11/12

Pam Chadbourne <ChadboLittCO@ecentral.com>

Mon, Nov 12, 2018 at 3:59 PM

To: Mark Rudnicki <pcmr@littletongov.org>, Bruce Stahlman <pcbs@littletongov.org>, David Bolt <pcdb@littletongov.org>, John Bridenbaugh <pcjb@littletongov.org>, Dan Miller <pcdm@littletongov.org>, Jason Reynolds <pcjr@littletongov.org>, Robin Swartzbacker <pcrs@littletongov.org>, Craig Coronato <pccc@littletongov.org>, Sherri Almond <pcsa@littletongov.org>

Cc: Denise Ciernia <cddjc@littletongov.org>, ChadboLittCO@ecentral.com

To: Littleton Planning Commissioners

Regarding: November 12 Public Hearing;

Agenda item 6a. PC Resolution 27-2018

Resolution to Amend Title 11, Regarding Minor Subdivisions and Administrative Plats and Replats, and to create a new chapter, Chapter 10 for Condominium Subdivisions

I urge you to disapprove this Resolution to recommend this Code Change for approval by City Council.

Or, Postpone to a Date Certain, so that Staff can:

1. **separate the several mixed items** included in this proposal, so that the document-improvement items are not included with, and do not confuse or obscure, substantive changes to process and outcomes.
2. **hold a Study session** to illustrate the proposed changes to Process and to Outcomes, showing "Now" and "Proposed" conditions applied hypothetically to several actual Project sites on the Development Activity List. We all need to **understand possible impacts** of this proposal, before we can decide on it.

Planning Commissioners, I'm concerned that this proposal would reduce public oversight, and could enable/promote more projects with denser redevelopment on small neighborhood lots. But I don't really know; this is a change only a lawyer or their redeveloper client could love, and the impact has been poorly described for us, and in a very short time.

It sure seems to me like something is going on behind the scenes. This Change did not come from us, the citizens and current property owners!

This seems to be presented as a group of small innocuous changes to 'modernize' Code, which in itself is not adequate rationale for a Code change.

The text claims citizens will **understand this Code better**, but I for one **don't find that to be true**. And I'm not a casual observer, either. Maybe parts of it are great - but I think there're some parts that aren't.

It sounds to me like one part of it would change some review and approvals of smaller redevelopments (but could it be up to **10 units**(?) infill, which isn't small if it's next door or down the street!), **from** the quasi-judicial **Public process**, to **"Administrative" approval by Staff**. That means no public process, no oversight review, just staff approval. I want Planning Commission to say No to that!

This is also said to be one of several changes, **more to come**. What is this setting us up for? What is the big picture? Code should not be changed piecemeal. We all should understand the intention and scope of all the promised/threatened proposed Code changes. The City Attorney should not be the only one who is aware of the scope and intention of this so-far hidden Code-revision project.

Another rationale is that this would be **easier for staff** (called "more efficient"). Yes, not preparing Public review of final plats for us and for the Planning Commission, probably would be easier for staff. **I'm not supportive in this case**; we the public, as well as Planning Commission and Council, **need and deserve to know** about these re-plats and more dense

housing that are being built in our older, more interesting neighborhoods. And Planning Commission needs more information, to act in the best interests of the entire City.

Staff is currently budgeted to conduct the public process; developers and owners are aware of the current Code. There is **no harm, and no urgency**, to not approving the process and outcome portions of this change at this time.

It sounds to me as if this would make it legal for staff to more easily, more quickly, approve more density, more units, on smaller lots, in regular neighborhoods. This is exactly where increased density on neighboring lots would **cause the most stress**. Maybe because some developers want to build condos, with our reduced Construction Defect protections? A change that would do this, **needs more justification** to be able to claim that it is in the General Welfare - I'm pretty sure most of us citizens would not agree that's in the best interests of the majority of us property owners.

Also, please consider that the Envision Littleton process is in progress, to update the Comprehensive Plan. Until that Plan is updated, **the last thing the City should do, is remove public process** on subdivision or replating for condos or any more dense infill redevelopment, and replace it with a unchecked, unbalance internal staff approval.

Would more locations become more attractive for more dense infill, if this Code change is approved? Would more infills be approved by staff? We need to know, before this is approved.

I am asking that Planning Commission postpone for a Study Session. At that Study session, I would like all of us to benefit from **typical professional Change Management process**, standard-of-practice when changes like this are proposed in enterprises like our City. I'd like to see:

- examples of the "Now" case, and the "Proposed" case,
- for several existing proposed project sites in Littleton, with hypothetical redevelopment scenarios:
- on some downtown Littleton redevelopment sites, and also along Prince Street and along Belleview.
- Hypothetical cases that would illustrate for all of us, how both the process and resulting projects could be different under this change.
- What are the limiting or boundary cases? What are the "worst" cases?

Maybe I'm wrong in my concerns about the consequences of this change. But more illustrations of the impact of the proposed change would help all of us understand, and perhaps agree. And I think separating the text document changes, from operational process and outcome changes, would be beneficial.

So I ask that Planning Commission vote to Postpone this change to a later Date Certain, with that date based on

- Staff splitting the proposal to separate document changes from substantive operational changes;
- and Staff preparing a Study session presentation that clearly illustrates the "Now" process and projects, compared to the "Proposed" process and projects, using hypothetical scenarios on some specific Littleton sites already up on the Development Activity List, so that we all better understand what this proposal could do.

Thanks for your service to our City, and thank you for your consideration of this request.

Pam Chadbourne
downtown Littleton resident and homeowner

--