

Section Comments

ID	Section	Staff Response
#3342	Section 10-3-2.2 CMU Lot and Building Standards	
Date:10/26/2024	How many proposed mixed-use developments has the city received since the ULUC was adopted (other than from SMHO)? Do you think these restrictive, unrealistic, counterproductive building heights have anything to do with it? Unless, of course, the goal is not to actually allow such a building type in downtown.	This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.
#3341	Section 10-2-3.2.M Townhouse Building Type	
Date:10/26/2024	Allow a minimum 80% building coverage max! Allow much smaller Build-to-zones! Allow much smaller rear setbacks! Allow much smaller Public Amenity/OPen Space and Tree Canopy Coverage %s! STOP PROHIBITING FLAT ROOFS!! THESE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS, AS WRITTEN, MAKE IT NEARLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR NEW, MISSING MIDDLE HOMES, TO BE BUILT DOWNTOWN. If the city council wants to enable the missing middle then these standards must be written to enable them - not prevent them, which is what they currently do.	Staff will bring this up during the Planning Commission public hearing for discussion.
#3340	Section 10-2-3.2.L Multiplex Building Type	
Date:10/26/2024	If the city council is committed to encouraging more housing in the city, then these currently-suburban development standards must be revised. In a downtown area the setbacks should be much smaller, the amount of open space per lot should be much less and the heights should be much greater. This and all the other building-type- standards tables have earned the ULUC the "Bait and Switch Code" nickname. These standards are a thinly veiled, very effective attempt at stopping new neighbors from moving into the downtown area. How many applications for new homes in the downtown area has the city received since the ULUC was adopted???? I'd guess that many fewer were received compared to prior to the ULUC's adoption.	Staff will bring this up during the Planning Commission public hearing for discussion.
#3339	Section 10-1-1.7 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	
Date:10/26/2024	Thank you for removing the obvious barriers to ADU construction (all the roof slope/privacy/deck nonsense).	Thank you for your feedback.

ID	Section	Staff Response
#3338	Section 10-1-1.7 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	
Date:10/26/2024	B.3.c. should be revised so that "manufactured homes" is NOT included in the list of "temporary structures." The world of homebuilding is working to move to manufactured product as it is more resource, energy, and time efficient than stick-built construction.	"Manufactured home" has a specific definition that aligns it to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development's definition of manufactured home. Staff believes the commenter is referring to "modular home," which is different.
#3337	Section 10-1-1.3 Land Use Matrix	
Date:10/26/2024	Table Note #3. I've edited it for you. "Townhomes in MLR and SLR are only permitted to contain 3 or 4 primary dwelling units. Townhomes in ACR and LLR may have an unlimited number of dwelling units."	Staff will bring this up during the Planning Commission public hearing for discussion.
#3336	Section 10-1-1.3 Land Use Matrix	
Date:10/26/2024	Please please do the brave, right thing for Littleton and this region. Please do meaningful zoning reform and allow the missing middle in greater abundance throughout the city. What's proposed is inadequate and won't result in lots of new homes being built. These proposed changes are stingy and cowardly.	Thank you for your feedback.
#3335	Section 10-1-1.1 Base Districts	
Date:10/26/2024	The MLR district must allow townhomes and not just duplexes! Only allowing duplexes will not result in the substantial amount of housing that Littleton needs to get built. Allowing only duplexes is ineffective - unless, of course, that's the city's goal...to continue to protect the "status-quo" at the cost of all other things, people, and common goods.	3- or 4-unit townhomes are being proposed as permitted in MLR.
#3334	Section 10-1-1.1 Base Districts	
Date:10/26/2024	The ACR and LLR districts are the ones with the largest lots and can most easily accommodate more housing types. Tri, four-, five-, and six-plexes should be allowed. Please allow the missing middle, once and for all!!! Please allow the city to be economically integrated, once and for all.	Multiplexes, which contain 3 or 4 units, are now being proposed as permitted in ACR and LLR as well.
#3333	Height	

ID	Section	Staff Response
Date:10/24/2024	What if the grade is modified during construction? Shouldn't it be the original grade? In other cities I have seen builders take advantage of this kind of language to build out very tall basements and get an overall much taller structure.	For consistency across codes, the proposed definition copies of the definition of "height" found in the International Building Code and International Residential Code.
#3332	Subsec. 10-1-3.7.A Parking and Loading	
Date:10/24/2024	Why is parking not required for an ADU???? Does anyone (other than those pushing for this) actually believe that these people don't own, and use, a vehicle? Considering how bad public transportation is in the metro, personal transportation is required and since the city does not seem to be concerned about attracting business (other than minimum wage retail jobs), most working residents must commute to their work. Again, this is despite the proponents of this plan erroneously arguing that "everyone works from home" and "people can just take public transportation or ride a bike". Also, even if some individuals do take public transport or alternative transportation, I would venture a guess that the majority do own a vehicle and use it at some point, such as to go to the mountains to go ski, or camp, or hike, or take their bike to a trail, etc.	This is a requirement of the state ADU legislation.
#3331	Subsec. 10-1-3.7.A Parking and Loading	
Date:10/24/2024	I know the footnote #2 is language from HB24-1152 but really, why are we even bothering to come up with this exception? How many circumstances could this even apply to? I'd recommend removing it and simplifying the code. You don't HAVE to include it just because the bill said that was a possible exception.	This is a requirement of the state ADU legislation that we must include.
#3330	Subsec. 10-1-3.7.A Parking and Loading	
Date:10/24/2024	I know this isn't the point of these changes but our parking requirements are obscenely high. Parking requirements contribute to high housing costs, increased greenhouse gas emissions, and incentivize more vehicle miles traveled. We need to remove them from our code if we are serious about improving the housing crisis, and to support strong businesses in Littleton.	This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.
#3329	Section 10-1-1.7 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	
Date:10/24/2024	In 5(b) you should remove the "to the extent practicable" language as the privacy mitigation should be required. To allow otherwise is to completely ignore the neighbor's	Per the state ADU legislation, we cannot require standards that are more restrictive than a

ID	Section	Staff Response
	expectations of the property when they purchased. While it is fine to say people can do what they want with their own property - some consideration must be given to what the neighboring properties expected when they purchased as well.	single-family home in the same district.
#3328	Section 10-1-1.7 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	
Date:10/24/2024	For the most part these are great changes to support ADUs. However, I strongly believe all architectural compatibility standards in C.5. should be removed. This is not compliant with HB24-1152 and are discretionary standards that are impossible to quantify what "complements" and what qualifies as a privacy mitigation measure? These are exactly what the state bill was trying to get away from. Strongly suggest removing!	We are including language saying "as long as privacy mitigation does not include an architectural style, building material, or landscaping that is more restrictive than a single-family home in the same district" to ensure this isn't considered a restrictive design, dimensional standard, or subjective standard and, thus, in violation of the state legislation.
#3327	Section 10-1-1.7 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	
Date:10/24/2024	ADUs should NOT be eligible for short term rentals. Residential neighborhoods should not be used for hotels.	Per our short-term rental regulations in Title 3 of the City Code, "Short term rentals are not permitted in ADUs that are detached either as the primary or non-primary unit. Only attached ADUs are allowed as applicable." This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.
#3326	Section 10-1-1.3 Land Use Matrix	
Date:10/24/2024	I am very supportive of these use matrix changes to make duplexes and other missing middle housing types allowed in more zoning districts. Just a formatting point - why are there footnotes in the table rather than just putting that information into the standards for that use? It is a bit less user friendly to divide it up that way.	The footnotes are included so that a user can see some of the limiting provisions in one place (vs. clicking through different code provisions). The footnotes are also, generally, repeated in the specific code sections as well.

ID	Section	Staff Response
#3325	Section 10-1-1.7 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	
Date:10/24/2024	In Denver ADUS have different setbacks than houses and that is how in most cases they will be able to fit on existing lots. This makes sense to add density where there is vacant land where the ADU's can fit (in the setbacks). I think Littleton should consider this if they want to encourage density. In Denver the 20' rear setback is reduced to 10' for ADU's. I would think in urban areas with small lots this would encourage development.	ADUs are permitted to be built up to 5 feet from the rear property line; this is more permissive than what is permitted for primary dwelling units.
#3324	Section 10-2-3.2.K Single-Family Attached / Duplex Dwelling Type	
Date:10/24/2024	Will the number of stories for a Duplex be adjusted from 2.5? Possibly to 3?	Staff will bring this up during the Planning Commission public hearing for discussion.
#3323	Dwelling, Single-Family Attached / Duplex	
Date:10/23/2024	First sentence - "...means a principle residential structure, including a duplex or townhome..." - delete duplex since it has a separate definition.	Deleted.
#3322	Subsec. 10-1-3.8.B Bicycle Parking	
Date:10/22/2024	Add to design standards and entry to accommodate a minimum percentage of family/cargo bicycles	This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.
#3321	Subsec. 10-1-3.8.B Bicycle Parking	
Date:10/22/2024	C.4 needs more than 1 spot per 25 units!	This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.
#3320	Subsec. 10-1-3.8.B Bicycle Parking	
Date:10/22/2024	DMS needs more than 6 bicycle parking spots per block!	This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal.

ID	Section	Staff Response
		However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.
#3319	Subsec. 10-1-3.7.B Parking and Access in the DT Districts	
Date:10/22/2024	Remove the dictated parking minimums, developers and businesses know what they need.	This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.
#3318	Subsec. 10-1-3.7.A Parking and Loading	
Date:10/22/2024	Get rid of all the parking minimums; there's no data to support these minimums and they drive up costs for every type of development.	This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.
#3317	Subsec. 10-1-1.6.A Accessory Uses	
Date:10/22/2024	Update section 14 to align with HB24-1007 for residential occupancy limits, eg. A maximum of roomers/boarders is subject to limitation based on demonstrated health and safety standards, such as international building code standards, fire code regulations, or Colorado department of public health and environment wastewater and water quality standards; or Local, state, federal, or political subdivision affordable housing program guidelines.	Updates to the ULUC to comply with HB24-1007 will occur under a separate code amendment next year.
#3316	Subsec. 10-1-1.6.A Accessory Uses	
Date:10/22/2024	Add use for market garden, to allow sale of food crop items, using the same general list as for cottage food operations with modifications (modifications to item d - within the property lines of the residence, and h, conducted from within the residence or garden space) Replace 6e with single sign not to exceed certain size; people have been shot for knocking on the wrong door and a single small sign akin to a political yard sign should not be difficult to accommodate	This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.

ID	Section	Staff Response
#3315	Section 10-1-1.3 Land Use Matrix	
Date:10/22/2024	Update Agriculture and Animal Oriented uses entry for "Community Garden" to "Community or Market Garden" Add PS for Multiplex to ACR & LLR neighborhood uses	This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.
#3314	Section 10-1-1.1 Base Districts	
Date:10/22/2024	ACR, LLR, MLR, SLR should all state "single family detached, duplex, triplex, & quadplex residential". If a lot can accommodate a duplex with each home at 3000 sq ft, then it can also accommodate a triplex at 2000sq ft each or a quad-plex at 1500 sq ft each.	This section has been now updated to reflect the permitted uses allowed in these zone districts as a result of the Oct. 22 nd study session discussion.
#3313	Section 10-4-2.2 NB Lot and Building Standards	
Date:10/19/2024	I strongly urge that the code use the term "Unit" instead of "Family." It should be "Single-Unit Detached" and "Multi-Unit Dwelling." The term "family has no real semantic value in housing terminology. A family could be 14 individuals... or 2... "Family" suggests "multiple individuals" even though each unit of housing might contain a single person. Global search and replace?	The ULUC does not define family. Staff will bring this up during the Planning Commission public hearing for discussion.
#3312	Section 10-1-1.3 Land Use Matrix	
Date:10/18/2024	Yes to all of these changes! Duplexes and townhomes in our residential areas!!	Thank you for your feedback.
#3311	Subsec. 10-4-3.2.A Cottage Court Community	
Date:10/18/2024	I love this addition!	Thank you for your feedback.
#3310	Section 10-1-1.3 Land Use Matrix	
Date:10/18/2024	Please expand the availability of triplexes and multiplexes.	Multiplexes, which contain 3 or 4 units, are now being proposed as permitted in ACR and LLR as well.
#3309	Section 10-1-1.1 Base Districts	

ID	Section	Staff Response
Date:10/18/2024	I would like to see MLR either removed or edited to include triplex and multiplex options.	This section has been now updated to reflect the permitted uses allowed in these zone districts as a result of the Oct. 22 nd study session discussion.
#3308	Section 10-1-1.7 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	
Date:10/14/2024	ADUs should be allowed to be "sold separately from the principal dwelling. If the goal of city is to expand home types AND expand home ownership, why restrict ADUs from sale?"	Staff will bring this up during the Planning Commission public hearing for discussion.
#3307	Section 10-1-1.7 Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs)	
Date:10/14/2024	We should permit administrative approval of ADUs without Historic Preservation Commission review in "Historic Districts". These districts are broadly boundaried and have many non-historical buildings within the boundary. If the ADU is built on a parcel with a historic landmark building, then it should go to HPC for review.	Staff will bring this up during the Planning Commission public hearing for discussion.
#3306	Subsec. 10-1-1.6.A Accessory Uses	
Date:10/14/2024	Link to "overnight accommodations" definition is not working (see: 13. d. 1)	Thank you for your feedback. The link should work in the final version of the code.
#3305	Section 10-1-1.3 Land Use Matrix	
Date:10/14/2024	I'm glad to see Cottage Courts being allowed on more residential parcels. Thank you for expanding this. Please add triplex/quadplex to the Specific Use column for "Duplex"	Thank you for your feedback. A triplex/quadplex would fall into the multiplex or townhome categories depending on how the units are configured.
#3304	Section 10-1-1.1 Base Districts	
Date:10/14/2024	I'd prefer the residential districts list "triplex" and "quadplex" along with duplex. We need more small scale housing types and the bigger parcels, especially, could easily accommodate triplexes and quadplexes.	Thank you for your feedback. A triplex/quadplex would fall into the multiplex or townhome categories depending on how the units are configured.
#3303	Subsec. 10-4-3.2.B Duplex and Twin Home Conversion	

ID	Section	Staff Response
Date:10/14/2024	Why must "At least one entrance must directly face the street"? Having one entrance face the street doesn't help anybody looking for a different unit, and if one unit can survive without facing the street I don't see why all units cannot do the same. There are single family homes whose entrances do not face the street, and they seem to do just fine.	This is a design standard requested by some City Council members.
#3302	Section 10-4-2.2 NB Lot and Building Standards	
Date:10/14/2024	It looks like lot sizes, maximum heights, and minimum setbacks have not changed except for the newly added housing types. Isn't there an opportunity to house more people on existing, smaller lots?	Staff will bring this up during the Planning Commission public hearing for discussion.
#3301	Section 10-2-3.2.L Multiplex Building Type	
Date:10/14/2024	Why must multiplexes be limited to four residential units? Are we precluding even more dense housing from being built?	The ULUC categorizes a building that contains 5 or more primary dwelling units in it as "multi-family residential." One of the purposes of the NHO code amendment is to encourage housing that does not fall into the multi-family category.
#3300	Subsec. 10-1-3.8.B Bicycle Parking	
Date:10/14/2024	Is the threshold of 15 / 50 vehicle parking spaces before bicycle parking requirements kick in too high? Why do Corridor Mixed (CM), Multi-Family Residential (MFR), Business Center (BC), and Industrial Park (IP) not have any bicycle parking requirements for residents or employees, regardless of parking spaces?	This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.
#3299	Section 10-1-1.1 Base Districts	
Date:10/14/2024	Why limit so many districts to single-family & duplexes? If the buildings meet building & safety codes, why not allow builders the option to create a triplex, or fourplex? Why not allow citizens & families to choose those in a free market?	This section has been now updated to reflect the permitted uses allowed in these zone districts as a result of the Oct. 22 nd study session discussion.
#3298	Section 10-4-2.2 NB Lot and Building Standards	

ID	Section	Staff Response
Date:10/12/2024	<p>Delete the entire table of 10-4.2.2. This table guarantees my generation and my daughter's generation won't have a chance of home ownership.</p> <p>At the very least make the minimum lot twice as small, the maximum height twice as high, and delete the rest.</p> <p>We have decades of boomer created housing shortage to reverse.</p>	Staff will bring this up during the Planning Commission public hearing for discussion.
#3297	Section 10-2-3.2 DT Standards of Design	
Date:10/12/2024	<p>Overall the proposed changes are extremely limited. I suspect this wouldn't even relegalize a large portion of the housing stock that currently exists in Littleton.</p> <p>In general, the restriction on private property rights imposed the ULUC favors inflated housing prices that only benefit the people born before 1980 or those that came in to the world with rich parents.</p> <p>The proposed changes are so small they almost seem performative. I would be shocked if an additional 100 units were added through these changes over the next 5 years.</p>	Thank you for your feedback.
#3296	Subsec. 10-1-3.7.B Parking and Access in the DT Districts	
Date:10/12/2024	Given this section only applies to larger lots, just delete the entire thing. We shouldn't have large lots in downtown littleton in order to maintain it's character.	This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.
#3295	Subsec. 10-1-3.7.B Parking and Access in the DT Districts	
Date:10/12/2024	Regarding A.1, delete the mention of bicycle parking as DMS is literally excluded in 10-1-3.8B. Let's not pretend this section is about anything but cars.	This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.
#3294	Subsec. 10-1-3.8.B Bicycle Parking	

ID	Section	Staff Response
Date:10/12/2024	<p>Rename the section 10-1-3.8 Alternative Mobility to 10-1-3.8 Human Centered Mobility</p> <p>Alternative implies that cars are the only rational way to get around, which is very upsetting to those of us who have realized that auto-centric development is guaranteed to be financially insolvent.</p>	<p>This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.</p>
#3293	Subsec. 10-1-3.7.A Parking and Loading	
Date:10/12/2024	<p>The minimum parking column in table 10-1-3.7.A.1 should be deleted. Developers are more than capable of deciding how much parking to offer so as to secure an economically viable product for both themselves and future buyers. Additionally, the minimum parking requirements are absurdly high. Even Parker allowed multifamily construction with less parking. Minimum Parking requirements are greatly reducing my hope for the future by ensuring development is economically unviable.</p> <p>Delete all mentions of parking space size requirements.</p>	<p>This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.</p>
#3292	Subsec. 10-1-3.8.B Bicycle Parking	
Date:10/12/2024	<p>It is really frustrating that the area of town that would benefit the most from bicycle parking, the DMS district, is exempted from this section of the code. Millenials, Gen Z, etc do not like driving cars and would prefer the opportunity to not worry about parking. 1 car space can park 20+ bicycles, which is a net benefit for business owners.</p>	<p>This topic is outside the scope of the current code amendment proposal. However, this is a topic that Planning Commission and City Council could consider in the future.</p>