

Downtown Code Revision Survey Results

ID	Are you a (check all that apply)	Have you read the proposed code revision?	In your view, are the changes positive or negative	What specifically do you like about the code revisions?	Do you see any potential challenges with the proposed code revisions? (Please reference code section or summary table number)	What, if anything, would you change and why? (Please reference code section or summary table number)	What questions or issues would you like City Council to address?
1	Resident;	Yes	3	They seem reasonable.	Perhaps institute parking maximums in addition to making the spaces smaller. However, space dimensions like those at Buck can be extremely tight and result in under use.	See above.	Infill development downtown is low quality. Town character is important and the removal of unique homes to be replaced by unattractive density is not helping Littleton. Development is important, but there are more attractive and practical ways to densify.
2	Resident;	Yes	4		Parking space size of 18-feet or less discourages pickup truck parking in those areas	Parking space size should be increased to 20-feet or more to accommodate full-size pickup trucks	
3	Resident;	Yes	4	Seem reasonable for a homeowner, w/no intent for a significant impact to neighbors.	No		I believe ADUs should be considered.
4	Resident;	Yes	3				
5	Resident;	Yes	5	Reduce parking areas, noise control.	No	I would round the required parking down, not up. There is just too much parking paving in the city and too much accommodating the car.	More permeable parking for areas not used very much such as church parking lots. Also too greatly encourage the use of all parking areas all day and night long, eliminating single use parking lots. This would mean utilizing private parking during off hours. There are legal issues, but let's try to resolve them to further eliminate duplicative parking downtown.
6	Resident;	Yes	4	Work hours being extended can mean more timely projects			
7	Resident;	Yes	4	Construction hours	Unhappy with decreased parking sizes		
8	Resident;	Yes	5	These changes clarify lots of points in the code that currently are vague or opaque.			
9	Resident;	Yes	1	It appears to allow buildings to be built sidewalk to sidewalk and does not allow for exposed ground for plants which are needed for the environment and without which floods will be an issue. I also object to the removal of the wording about parking spaces related to handicap parking	See previous answer	See previous answer	It appears to me that the city code has been changed to allow developers to maximize profits by building sidewalk to sidewalk without concerns about the impact of crowding more people into a small area and crowding out plants and trees which help reduce crime and help the environment

Downtown Code Revision Survey Results

10	Resident;	Yes	5	I appreciate the clear & concise clarification and communication in relation to construction project work and noise nuisance times. As noted in the Health and Sanitation Title 7 and within the Noise Control information of Chapter 3. This in fact reads, (7:00) A.M. Monday – Friday and seven o'clock (7:00) P.M. to eight o'clock (8:00) A.M. Saturday – Sunday and Holidays observed by the City, no person shall operate or cause to be used or operated any equipment used in construction activities within any residential or business district. I also appreciate the clearness of the definition alterations found in 10-2-1 as the The distance in linear feet, measured on a horizontal plane, between the building's outer wall and each of its lot lines. In all zoning districts except for the Planned Development (PD) district. 10-3-1: P being Permitted use, reads easier, thank you. 10-4-1: Standards Related to sight design is much better worded than the original sight triangle and visual parameter subset.	During the very informative February 10th Envision Littleton Kick Off event, one man inquired about empty evening downtown Littleton Parking Lot usage.	Not that big of a deal but the Zoning Code Initial Quick Fix Document's Chapter 3 is spelled incorrectly, I believe I would run spell check.	Not as of current.
11	Resident;	Yes	5	Setback expansion and consideration for the difference between outer wall and outer perimeter	SETBACK (line 71) I don't foresee potential challenges with enforcing I would expect some folks not to like the setback changes and challenge them during the review and approval process to even potential lawsuits.	7-3-5 (J): not sure how construction is defined between commercial construction or private/residential construction. For commercial construction I agree with the time changes. For private/residential construction done for improvements to the exterior of homes, interior improvements and self completed projects I do not agree with the 7pm stop time; these should continue to be 9pm. I don't see then need to reduce hours on Holidays.	10-1-2 BUILDING: is "weather-resistant roof" defined somewhere in detail or referenced back to established national codes/specs? On line 46; with the removal of "structure" what is allowed to be above this height restriction? Line 109: how is a "major site development" defined? Line 118/132/133: How is "brief" defined for the understand of the applicant?
12	Resident; Developer;	Yes	3	More specificity as it relates to building height and building envelope is helpful	Not at this time	Building height (10-1-2) definition is better. However, where do we find the chapter that references the statement "the calculated building height shall exclude any portion of the structure eligible for exemption under the provision of this Title"	None at this time
13	Resident;	Yes	5	N/A	N/A	N/A	Accessory dwelling units