

Provided below are some of my comments on the 'changes to the City's codes with respect to construction and zoning' sent to me by Ryan Thompson. I live on Bemis street and have firsthand experience with the issues being reviewed.

I moved my family into this neighborhood due in part to its historic charm about 30 years ago. My neighbors and I have invested a great deal of time and effort restoring our turn of the century houses to their old glory and were extremely proud of the historic nature of everything around.

We all thought the Zoning was clear, and knew that even if some changes were made around us – changes would conform to the existing zoning, considering that the City proudly touts that on prominent signs as soon as you enter the downtown corridor.

We thought that the vision of the Littleton Blvd Corridor Guidelines requiring new structures to "complement" the adjacent single-family dwellings to ensure that its historic nature remained intact would be followed.

That was not the case, and we endured more than 2 yrs of construction disruption, including vibrations of our homes, ruining our street and cranes swinging equipment over our houses. We now live with the unwarranted and overwhelming Vita Development on Bemis and Littleton Blvd. This behemoth certainly does NOT complement the existing historical residence, and at more than 336,000 SF is larger than anything in the area, exceeding the maximum B-2 Zoning standard, and absolutely dwarfing the 'Prince' of this area - the historic courthouse.

With that project, the vision for, and atmosphere of this area has been forever lost, much like our ability to park in front of our houses on weekends and evenings, as well as the ability of emergency vehicles to access our community.

Reading through the construction code changes I am not reassured that this travesty will not repeat itself.

**My main concern is that development plans and construction issues are still not looking out for the existing communities.**

- The verbiage I reviewed did NOT include notification and comments from affected communities in the early stages of project consideration, nor the City's various development stages. Involving the affected communities ASAP is especially important to acceptance of ANY project.
- The community and City Council meeting discussions have merit and are one of the only avenues for community feedback to the City. Affected communities must be guaranteed enough lead time to actually attend meetings and comment on development plans.
- Why is the City Council's review and comments of no consequence?
- Please be sure to address weekend/holiday work. I do NOT think this should be guaranteed from the start, but rather something that is only done out of necessity and with notifications of the community. We all cherish our weekends and the plans we have made for them and should be advised of construction activities and associated noise and traffic issues.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these matters

*Deborah Gallegos/GC31*

*Debogal31@gmail.com*

Email received by **Ryan Thompson, Littleton Community Liaison & Mediation Coordinator**  
4/17/20 1:15pm:

Ryan, I concur with Deborah's changes.

Isabel Lopez

Received via email  
April 13, 2020 5:05pm

To Littleton Planning Commission,

Sorry for the late input; Colleen and I talked about a later submittal for this, and I'm even beyond that.

Regarding Item 6a on tonight's meeting Agenda:

I. I request that Planning Commission **please recommend** some of the proposed changes to City Council, specifically:

**1. yes, please restrict construction activity hours.**

Title 7, 7-3-5 J Definitions and Standards, Construction activities

**2. yes, please send notices of Planning Commission and City Council project application reviews to tenants.**

10-1-9 C Planning Commission Review Procedure

10-12-4 B 3 e Council Review Procedure, Mailed Notice

- I have spoken for notification of tenants on every application review that notifies owners only.
- whether tenants are residents or businesses, they are likely highly-impacted by the proposed application. They are contributors and stakeholders that the City of Littleton must serve.

**3. yes, please change "permitted by right" to "permitted"**

10-3-1 Land Uses

- appreciate removing the implication of undue excess "rights" to owners/developers

**4. yes, please round up quantities for parking requirements.**

10-4-9 A. Parking and Loading, Parking Required.

II. Planning Commission, please **do not recommend** the following.

I believe these changes have not been adequately explained, or justified. And I believe that the impact of these changes would be harmful to the future value of properties and to the future quality of life in the city:

Reference draft Ordinance 17-2020:

Title 10

**1. No, do not weaken setbacks.**

10-1-2 Definitions

Setback

These allowed encroachments would:

- reduce the higher quality of the established neighborhood character in all of Littleton
- and increase the impact of built structures on their neighbors,
- and increase the impression of visual clutter and density,

- and serve only short-term interests of applicants, not act in the best and long-term interests of residents and owners.

**2. P4 should strongly require historical preservation evaluation and input for all broadly- and well-defined proposal sites.** This is too weak.

10-1-8 Preliminary Project Plans

D. too loose, do not use "may"

- community development direction must provide a report to the Historical preservation board...  
- and should define what is "any aspect of historical preservation". (is it in an established district? or in a proposed district, or in an area for which a historical merit survey is in progress or completed?)

**3. P4: No applicant presentation, or else allow/require staff and public input also.**

10-1-8 Preliminary Project Plans

E. Planning Commission Review and

F. City Council review

No, do not allow the applicant to make a presentation, unless the staff and the public are also allowed to present for consideration by the decision-makers.

- staff should be allowed/required to present a technical evaluation.

in many P4 reviews in the past, staff has been asked questions that they were not prepared for, because staff reviews are not required for P4s.

staff reviews should be required for P4s, especially if the applicant is allowed to present.

- if the applicant can present, then categorically the public should also be allowed to comment.

City Council should benefit from the comments of their electorate and the general public, regarding these development proposals, especially at this time of radical change and City rezoning.

The public should always have an opportunity to comment, when an applicant is allowed to comment.

**4. No, do not weaken requirements for Accessory Uses and Structures.**

10-4-4 Accessory Uses and Structures

E. do not delete the constraint on residential structures in T and CA! There is no good rationale for this (only behind-the-scenes pressure from short-term profit-seekers); and it would harm the future city.

F. 6. No, this is a sneaky way of potentially allowing larger structures.

- ADUs are already poorly defined in terms of impact on our neighborhoods.

- This impact has not been defined for the public and future neighbors who would live near these dwellings.

G. 5. Where did minimum 5 feet come from? what are the pros and cons of less, or more separation? This has not been justified in terms of benefit to the future City.

**5. No, do not make parking spaces smaller!**

10-4-9 Parking and Loading

A. 6. dimensions

- First, Littleton's historical area on the North side, Littleton Blvd and Main Street, from Broadway to Santa Fe, would be permanently and negatively compromised by this change!

Larger parking spots are an essential part of the Mid-Century Modern and 1890s environments. They are required in at least Design standards, to maintain the feel and character of the Mid-Century Modern.

This change must not be made to all parking in the entire city. It might be appropriate for south side redevelopment; it would be destructive to the environment and character and value of our historic areas.

- Second, this is simply a bad idea. Where are the parking lot accident statistics? Cars are not getting smaller. I think this would guarantee more damage to vehicles in parking lots - how many hundreds more accidents in how many decades? Why change this, there is no good reason in terms of functionality and this would reduce protection and convenience for everyone in every parking lot from now on. Unbelievable, that this is even considered.

- Third, the only rationale for this is from some developers who want to put in more intense development on large lots, and want our City to have the same rules as some other jurisdictions. That is not a compelling rationale, and it is *not a benefit to the City*. This change would not make Littleton any more attractive to development - we don't need to attract this type of development.

- Fourth, this change would result in parking that conflicts with the established character, both in look and feel, and in functionality and user safety, of the people and the City.

Littleton can and should remain different from other jurisdictions, regarding safety and quality-of-life Code requirements.

#### **6. No, instead stop the proposed "Unified Land Use Code" process in its tracks.**

- The proposed "Unified Land Use Code" is not conducted to the standard-of-practice for any legitimate or positive, professional and productive Project Management process.

- Coming out of the moratorium, categorically Littleton should have in place the more restrictive and protective practices.

Thank you for your consideration.

Pam Chadbourne