

DOWNTOWN DESIGN STANDARDS

COMMENTS FROM www.OPENLITTLETON.org

DOWNTOWN DESIGN STANDARDS COMMENTS

www.OPENLITTLETON.ORG – Posted April 18, 2018 – May 1, 2018

What are your thoughts on the Introduction, Subarea, and Standards?

Answered: 8

Skipped: 2

There is a distinction between standards vs. guidelines. Staff at the open house was clear that these are standards to be followed. Yet, top of the first page, in the headline, says "PURPOSE OF THE GUIDELINES". If these are suggestions to the public, fine waste of time. Do not equivocate. If the intention is enforcement, these are standards. Please use words like rules, requirements &c. for variety, but not words allowing deviations or vagaries.

The provides a good description and checklists of the area. It is specific an yet vague enough to be open enough to new ideas that follow the character of the area. One question was will there be hight restrictions anywhere? I would hate to see a 5+ story building in main Street be allowed just because the top three stories are set back.

So my uncle was mayor of South Pasadena California in 1990. He brought my fiance and I out for dinner and a walking tour. He was telling is how he planned on changing the ally function from unorganized trash systems, dimly lit, and shotty pavement. 5 years later downtown Pasadena was booming and continues to this day. I believe dt Littleton alleys are a golden opportunity right under our noses. With lighting, a better trash removal system some murals, etc it would bring a super feel. Thoughts anyone?
Kevin Centola

Overall comment: Why bother spending time and money on design standards if they can be overridden by zoning or ignored by developers?
Small item: check document for typos - there are a couple.

When using words which are not normally used by most citizens (such as hipped or gable roofed), suggest adding definitions or showing what you mean.

One or two story on Main Street - that standard is already gone by the wayside

Not spoil views of courthouse, mountain and Carnegie Library? The city staff already did that with The Grove.

I think these standards are very important. It needs to be done before the area is ruined. I love modern architecture, and would love to see more incorporated. However, it would be a shame for downtown Littleton to be overrun with monstrosities with no design sense. We don't need the fad-based stuff that is everywhere these days (e.g. reflected in the Grove, which is unattractive and way too big, dwarfing the courthouse—it's all you see coming east on Alamo from Santa Fe—what a shame).

I like the standards for Subarea 2. I already see this area losing its character with the new construction, and would like to see the city maintain neighborhood integrity. The neighborhoods north of Main St should be preserved before it's too late. It would be a mistake to allow all the smaller houses to be torn down and replaced. The replacements I see so far tend to be too big and cover too much of the lots. It's important to preserve the neighborhood before it's too late.

Landscaping! More and more studies show that people need trees and plants around to be healthy (and they make an area much more attractive). Littleton should pay attention to this. I don't see much room for landscaping at the Grove—on the north end, it's pretty much coming right up to the sidewalk. I like the idea of homes and businesses facing Little's Creek. I sometimes find it a bit scary to walk on the path there as it feels so isolated (it's also often trashy). The creek could be a very attractive, natural landscape for Littleton.

Did the city pay for this? The introduction is spotted with spelling and other errors which should be absent from a professionally written document.

This statement is inherently contradictory - "An appeal of the Historic Preservation Board decision may be made to District Court. The Historic Preservation Board is the final review authority for architecture." In my dictionary final means final. It is absolute news to me that Prince St and Santa Fe actually serves as an official entrance to downtown. The pretentiously named little shopping center is overshadowed by the terrible motel/hotel and the horrific road design and resulting traffic congestion. I guess no one thought any car would ever want to enter the Arapahoe County Courthouse. More to the point, this is a large number of subareas for a tiny part of the city. It would probably make more sense to expand the existing historic district to include some of the homes still preserved in the area. I am distressed that all references to parking are to make it disappear. The trouble with orienting toward Little's Creek is that is also orienting toward a LOT of traffic. Like the "outdoor" seating on main street--color me poisoned by carbon monoxide befouling air and food and drink. There are so many subareas here that it is hard to keep track. I haven't walked the neighborhoods for quite a few years but have not considered Alamo residential for many many years, nor the area south to ACC. There

are some undistinguished apartments but it is mostly business, even business situated in former homes. Unless the scar of ACC can be fixed I am unsure what this area is suitable for except mixed use. You may have noticed that as traffic increases former homes become all sorts of businesses and offices. Thus the focus should be on appearance and history rather than trying to keep something long gone.

There are too many subareas to fully grasp. It strikes me that MUCH of the area that is still standing should be part of a historic district. This is where Littleton basically started. 60 years ago the library was still a library and the Town Hall was still a town hall. I find, at least about the library, some dismissive language. Too few of the Carnegie libraries remain standing and this one should be cherished and protected. I support a stronger and more carefully enforced historic district. What used to be the Heckethorn building on the east end of main street just before what used to be railroad tracks is a good example of how to protect the historic facade and revive the inner life of a building. No matter how tempting, there must be a limit on restaurants and bars in the area without any other entertainment venues, other than drinking.

It would be helpful if the various zoning and codes referred to as links in the draft were actually links. Even though this is a draft those links are fixed and could be provided at this stage.

What are your thoughts on Section 1: Urban Design and Site Plan?

Answered: 7

Skipped: 3

Do these standards apply to other than City and private property, such as other public property? Arapahoe County property, South Metro Fire if they build a stand along station &c?

I like the idea of hiding the parking lots to make the area look more appealing and promote pedestrian friendly aspects. It will be good to promote pedestrian and bike friendly environment as the city develops and parking areas get filled in with new buildings. Also, we should enforce parking spot requirements for residential buildings to help keep the streets from being flooded with over flow residential parking thus reducing the numbers of spots for commercial parking.

Same comment as above: Design standards have no teeth so they cannot be enforced.

I agree with the "High level of design" statement on P 29. Of course, this is

very subjective; much of the current design around Denver is faddish and not interesting at all (for instance, many of the new apartment buildings—see Broadway, and, unfortunately, the Grove). These buildings will be outdated in ten years. We need high level of design with intelligence and actual architectural knowledge.

Incomplete. Even though it's a draft, photos should be included by this stage.

I have a problem with orienting to Santa Fe and general rules about orientation of entrances. That undoes the Carnegie entrance and ignores the fact that Santa Fe is a busy highway with limited access. One of the more idiotic things along limited access busy roads is business/restaurants doors facing the street forcing ALL customers to walk sometimes long distances in all kinds of weather. Orientation should depend on location.

YES, this is important 1.1.6 Subarea 3: permeable. Why is this a problem - 1.2.7 For any buildings with residential units, primary residential entrances from a parking lot are prohibited. This could mean long walks with groceries and other goods. 1.2.10 Each block face shall have multiple building entries - this is most unclear.

Have you been to Longmont? That is a more relevant example than many of the others put forth especially in use of alleys and providing parking.

I'd like to see measures to insure the safety and security of pedestrian traffic in Littleton. Sidewalks need widths specified. Outside "patio" areas must conform to these widths to allow pedestrian passage. De-emphasize automobile use. Parking S/b limited. Parking structures not permitted at all.

What are your thoughts on Section 2: Architecture?

Answered: 6

Skipped: 4

I like the 25% rule. My biggest worry is being able to build a tall building in the mixed residential/commercial areas that block the skyline of existing houses and older residential buildings.

Same comment as above: Design standards have no teeth so they cannot be enforced.

Please see my previous comments on architecture and "high level of design." Yes to high level; no to fads. We should be careful not to overrun Littleton with buildings that will be dated in ten years, and careful not to pander to developers who want the highest-density possible to increase their profits. The developer's quick buck doesn't benefit Littleton.

Whoever allowed the 3 floor monstrosity at the west of main, obviously didn't read this. It is too tall and does not fit with rest of Main Street. It is too big and modern and does not feel like "Old Littleton". The same with the huge apartment complex on the east of downtown.

The charts before the narrative are pretty useless. That said, this is very important: 2.1.3N New buildings and additions to buildings shall possess an architectural character that respects the traditional design principles of older buildings along Alamo Avenue and/or Main Street. These principles can be applied to both commercial and residential buildings. I am pleased in general with the historic preservation/compatibility elements.

The discussion of parking garages is almost laughable. This is the CRITICAL problem and not one solved by standards.

The rest of this section is very dry but needed for the necessities of modern structures. At least you don't have to design for outhouses. At least I hope not.

There is no mention of building height restrictions. Access views of the sky and the amount of light are poorly elucidated and easily argued away for multi-story buildings. Building height should be restricted to existing levels. Open areas should be encouraged. Large set backs should be in place. Hard building codes and zoning S/b in place. Buildings like the Vita complex should be outlawed. However, even with these restrictions, money and weak-willed city councils and city managers will cower to the developers.

What are your thoughts on Section 3: Landscape Architecture?

Answered: 6

Skipped: 4

Encourage trees and green space as much as possible. Include requirements for maintaining it once installed. Many parking lot island havens turn into a beaten down, packed dirt, shopping cart waypoint.

I like the focus on minimizing light pollution while maintaining safe environment. This can easily be achieved by using down facing lights only and requesting use of products endorsed by night sky/anti light pollution organizations. Also having landscaping is very important. I would hate to see our downtown area become a concrete jungle.

Same comment as above: Design standards have no teeth so they cannot be enforced.

So important! More trees and green-spaces please. People need these to be healthy. I would like to see generous setbacks enforced (not like the Grove). I like that this plan incorporates landscaping in the setback areas, but the setbacks need to be big enough to be meaningful.

3.1.1 Public and private open space shall be landscaped with a variety of plant materials and hard surfaces.

3.1.2 All areas of the site not covered by buildings, structures, parking areas, service areas, walks, bike ways, plazas and other impervious-surfaced functional areas, shall be landscaped. IMPERVIOUS surfaces should be, where ever possible be permeable. The increased cost is minimal compared to long term savings in stormwater requirements. This should apply to new construction and any reconstruction.

Not sure where there are private detention systems and drainage areas in the Downtown. The only ones I know of are city property and are nicely landscaped but not especially drought resistant.

All new landscape should be low water use drought resistant and designed to reduce heat islands [which mean NOT rocks and NOT pavement.

Lighting should be energy efficient but NOT the harsh white LEDs xcel energy favors. Some attempt to minimize light in the night sky should be attempted.

Trees and plants die from car exhaust, lack of light and water. The city will replace all natural elements on a regular basis without sufficient light and sky exposure and the limitation on traffic.

What are your thoughts on Section 4: Signs?

Answered: 6

Skipped: 4

Why not just reference the (almost) new sign code. Will this portion be reconciled with revision now in process? its less than helpful to sprinkle differing requirements throughout. Flipping pages from the sign code to the design standards, and then perhaps having a separate array of standards for Littleton Blvd, or other areas doesn't expedite understanding.

No concerns as long as the sign doesn't impede pedestrian traffic and matches the style of the area

Same comment as above: Design standards have no teeth so they cannot be enforced. The sign code requirements would need to be changed to fit within the suggested standards to be enforced

Good to have standards, as long as everything doesn't look cookie-cutter. And while we're on the topic of signs, the city's signs on the corner of Alamo and Santa Fe (wavy yellow and red) don't add anything attractive to draw people to Littleton. They look a little cheesy, a little desperate and uncool. Like the city is trying too hard.

This is great specificity and it would be a shame to stifle all creativity in the name of consistency. Not sure where that amendment might occur but it would be nice to allow a bit a creative signage within general guidelines.

Signs should be small and unassuming. We all have maps on our phones.

What are your thoughts on the Downtown Design Standards as a whole?

Answered: 8

Skipped: 2

Needs to be done, about 3 years ago. Good start at this point.

Wish there had been a puzzle below...

I think there are a lot of good details here and the path forward sounds good. My 3 major areas of concern, some of which are well addressed are: light pollution, look of the skyline and visibility beyond the buildings to mountains, and parking (both commercial and residential). One item not discussed is potential use and incorporation of the light rail station and parking into the design of the area. I would like to know how that area should be treated and enhanced.

It is a nice effort and I am in agreement with the standards. However, as I have said ad nauseum, the city cannot enforce design standards so why bother?

I don't have time to read everything as thoroughly as I'd like, however, it's important to have high-quality standards and preserve neighborhoods. This should happen before it's too late. We do not need Littleton overrun by developers with money and no concern for the city and its integrity. The Grove will stand as a warning—too big, too big, too big and no design sense. I'd like to see more modern architecture, mixtures of glass, concrete, steel, but no faddish architecture that will be outdated soon.

The entire exercise is premature. Too bad the endeavor is less than professional.

I could not understand the pages with xs on the charts. I had no idea what you were trying to convey

This is a fine example why I never wanted to be a planner. The detail is overwhelming and I think the plan needs to be very very careful not to destroy the variety inherent in an area that has grown and changed over more than a century. It would be too easy to impose a bland homogeneity on an interestingly diverse area

Not restrictive enough. They should not be viewed as guidelines. They should be regulations with strict enforcement.

DOWNTOWN DESIGN STANDARDS

COMMENTS FROM INDIVIDUALS

DOWNTOWN DESIGN STANDARDS

COMMENTS on 4/18/18 Draft of Littleton Downtown Design Guidelines

MICHAEL T. PRICE, reviewer, focusing on Main Street, subarea 5 only.

1. Page 17 - spelling of Rio Grand(e). Make sure it's correct.
2. Page 22 - appears that some of the "X's" are omitted in sections 1.5.1 and 1.5.2 on the chart.
3. Page 32 - General Standard 1.4.1: this is a change from standard 5.2.4.sl. I think the original standard is much stronger and would recommend using it.
4. Page 36 - Chart section 2.1R. Are "x's" missing on this line?
5. Page 39 - in the original DDG, objective 5.3.1.o2 and o3 are important to Main Street and should be included in the new version of the DDG.
6. Page 39-standard 2.1.3N - change the word "can" in the fourth line to "shall".
7. Page 41;2.1.5N - a height should be specified where "pedestrian view" is written-for example, my eyes are 5'5" from the floor-this view is certainly going to be different for a 6'8" person versus a 5'1" person-this height should be standardized.
8. Page 42 - why is there no reference in this section to Main Street in Subarea Specific Standards?
9. Page 47-2.2.1R and 2.2.4R - the word "possible" removes these as standards-it acts more as a guideline. Need to tighten these up, perhaps using staff to approve of a certain action or material via an administrative variance.
10. Page 48 - 2.3.8 seems a redundant standard to 2.3.1.
11. Page 49-2.4.1 and 2.4.2 - the original standards 5.3.4.sl and s2 were better and more comprehensive than this version.
12. Page 49-2.5.1 and 2.5.2 - the words "street" and "sidewalk" should be better defined as to the vantage point specified. Is it across the street or in front of the building?
13. Page 50-2.5.7- should a certain height be added, similar to comment number 7 above?
14. Page 56-4.6.7- the words "unique" and "interesting" are subjective. This might be a better objective than standard.

That's all I have. I think the committee and consultants did a great job!

DOWNTOWN DESIGN STANDARDS

COMMENTS on 04.18.2018 Draft of Littleton Downtown Design Guidelines

PAUL KASTNER, Architect, Historic Preservation Board member

1. Page 12: Provide "Existing" and "Desired" character images for review.
2. Page 13: Provide "Existing" and "Desired" character images for review.
3. Page 14: Provide "Existing" and "Desired" character images for review.
4. Page 15: Provide "Existing" and "Desired" character images for review.
5. Page 16: Provide "Existing" and "Desired" character images for review.
6. Page 17: Provide "Existing" and "Desired" character images for review.
7. Page 17: Consider revising "New buildings higher than two stories should set their upper floors back from the face of the building sufficiently to maintain the smaller scale of the street." to more definitive statement such as "must", "**will**" or "shall".
8. Page 18: Provide "Existing" and "Desired" character images for review.
9. Page 19: correct spelling of "Existing".
10. Page 19: Provide "Existing" and "Desired" character images for review.
11. Page 19: "Desired Character" Consider adding statement that future redevelopment maintains similar massing to the existing buildings.
12. Page 20: Provide "Existing" and "Desired" character images for review.
13. Page 29: Add Carnegie Library as a focal point for Main Street. 14. Page 33: Add photos for review.
15. Page 42: Add photos for review.
16. Page 42/43: Consider adding language not allowing temporary enclosures similar to the Sommers Oil Building. 17. Page 43: Add photos for review.
18. Page 44: Add photos for review.
19. Page 44, 2.2 Building Materials: Consider adding language not allowing temporary enclosures or materials similar to the Sommers Oil Building exterior seating.
20. Page 47, 2.2.3R: Consider adding language that paint colors shall "blend" or "compliment" existing paint colors.
21. Page 48: Add photos for review.
22. Page 49: Exterior lighting must conform to Littleton Lighting Standards. Reference standard .
23. Page 48: Add photos for review.
24. Page 65: Add photos for review.
25. Page 66: Add photos for review.
26. General Comment: Consider adding "Terms Related to Compliance" similar to the 2011Downton Littleton Historic Preservation Design Guidelines (page VII)
27. General Comment: The 2011 Downtown Littleton Historic Preservation Design Guidelines overall appear to be more thorough and detailed. The sections for residential compliance is easier for a homeowner to follow.

DOWNTOWN DESIGN STANDARDS

COMMENTS

ROBIN SWARTZBACKER - May 2, 2018

p. 7

REVIEW PROCESS

The Downtown Littleton Design Standards **will be** formally adopted by the City Council. These standards **will then be** used by the Development Review Committee (DRC) in their review of the SDP (Site Development Plan), and PDO (Planned Development Overlay) applications following the normal SDP and PDO review process and submittal requirements described in Title 10, City of Littleton Municipal code, Chapter 7, for SDP review, and Chapter 9, for PDO review. Design review within the Historic District and for buildings on the list of merit or designated as a historic landmark will be provided by the Littleton Historic Preservation Board. An appeal of the Historic Preservation Board decision may be made to District Court. The Historic Preservation Board is the final review authority for architecture.

Comment – curious about the verb tense. Once (hopefully) this is adopted seems more logical to say “The Downtown Littleton Design Standards **was** formally adopted...”

p. 14

Desired Character

The northern end of Prince Street establishes a sense of arrival to downtown just as does the Bowles/South Santa Fe/Alamo Street intersection. The retail development at the corner of Prince Street and South Santa Fe Drive (Riverbend) sets a good precedent for this entry. Additional future development adjoining this development should be similar in character and material without duplicating it.

Comment – What about the rest of Prince St? Since the original did not include anything farther south, I’m guessing nothing more can be added?

p. 29

1.1 BUILDING AND USE ORIENTATION

Objectives

Utilizing the following design methods, new commercial and residential development should foster a sense of place that is in-keeping with the pedestrian-scaled, walkable nature of historic Downtown Littleton:

Facades. Orient front facades and main entries toward streets and/or public open spaces.

Building Edge. Create a generally continuous building edge to the street and/or public open space.

Ground Level. Activate the street level and/or public open space with pedestrian active uses at the ground level.

Views. Coordinate the forms and orientation of buildings to frame views of attractive features along streets, and across open spaces. Examples of attractive features include:

- Views of Geneva Lodge

- Views of the Carnegie Library
 - Views of the Arapahoe County Courthouse
- Focal Point.** Provide an attractive focal point at the terminus of streets or designated view corridors. Examples include:

- The end of South Hill Street

Historic Entry. Orient buildings, primary facades, and screen walls to maintain and complete the 'C' shaped entry into downtown from South Santa Fe Drive and Bowles Avenue.

Comment – Holds true for all sections, not just Buildings and Use.

Objectives: While I like the way the Objectives are written; my concern is they lose teeth (as a perception) without being numerical as in the original. (i.e. 1.2.1.o1 To orient front façades and main entries towards streets and/or public open spaces...) Objectives hold an important role and my fear is they will be taken as less important than standards or ignored in the present format.

1.1.2 Street-facing **acades** shall be designed to Include components such as:

- High quality materials
- Large windows and entries
- High level of design and details

Comment – Looks to be a typo

p. 30

1.2.8 For mixed-use buildings with a residential component, **at least some** of the residential entrances shall be directly accessible to the street.

Comment – While it isn't much different, 1.2.5 only uses "some" instead of "at least some". Is there a reason to add "at least" in this one?

p. 43

2.1.13R **Subarea 1, 2, 3, 4 & 8: In general**, additions shall be visually subordinate to the original building either in scale, character, or material. **However, exceptions** to this approach may be appropriate if the use requires greater space, or if the original building is already larger in scale.

2.1.14R **Subarea 1, 2, 3, 4 & 8: In general**, additions shall expand and complement the existing architectural character of the building through the use of the same or very similar roof forms and materials, window shapes and patterns, wall configurations and materials, and entry design. **However, exceptions** may be appropriate if the original structure is not of sufficient quality to emulate, or where a contrasting relationship would be better.

Comment – Remove "In general" as it is not necessary with the inclusion of "However, exceptions..." sentence.

p. 46

2.2.6N **Subareas 1 & 3: A substantial amount** of the facades visible to the

street shall be composed of modular brick, or brick that matches the size used in the existing city offices building (in subarea 1).

Also 2.2.12N-2.2.14N

2.2.9N **Subarea 5: The great majority**, if not all of the facade facing Main Street and, for corner buildings, the facade along an intersecting street (not including windows, doors and their framing systems), shall be composed of modular brick.

Comment – 2.2.9N has more teeth the way it is written. Is there a reason not to use “The great majority” instead of “A Substantial amount” in 2.2.6N and 2.2.12N – 2.2.14N

p. 47

2.2.4R **Avoid** resurfacing or replacing wood siding with other materials such as metal or vinyl siding **if possible**. Where such resurfacing or replacement is the most feasible alternative, use materials and detailing that follows the original cladding pattern and detailing as closely as possible.

Comment – Why not use “Do Not” instead of “Avoid” since the sentence already has the caveat “if possible”? Makes a more powerful statement if the intent is to not use metal or vinyl.

p. 64

4.4.5 Sign illumination shall not create **objectionable** glare to pedestrians, motorists, and adjoining residents.

Comment – Seems very subjective, is there an industry standard that could be used? Or a best practice? Or is there a need to leave it so wide open?

p. 67

4.6.10 **Subareas 3:** Projecting signs shall be **encouraged**, but used so as not to conflict with the wall signs or awnings. They shall not be closer than 50 feet apart, and no more than 3 in number for 300 square feet of street frontage. Projecting signs eight (8) square feet per sign face or less may be closer and/or more frequent.

4.6.11 **Subareas 3, 5, 6 & 7:** Projecting signs, if lighted, are **encouraged** to be externally lit. Internally lit sign cabinets are prohibited except where the sign face is composed of metal with back lit cut out letters or logos. Internally lit channel letters, logos, or iconic forms, with or without exposed neon, are also acceptable, if in keeping with the historic nature of the subarea.

Comment – Guessing there is no reason to more than encourage? Its easy to ignore “encourage” if there is a true desire for this request.

DOWNTOWN DESIGN STANDARDS

COMMENTS as track changes in the draft document

TYLER HARDY

1. COVER:

As a general summation, this document does little to nothing in offering enforceable benchmarks in which to guide development in Old Littleton.

The document has an alarming absence of resident involvement, and appears written and developed with input from developers or individuals who stand to benefit from development in Littleton. It is entirely void of addressing what is arguably the most serious issue facing Old Littleton: zoning.

The proliferation of R-5 multifamily zoning in an existing single-family landscape has been the largest complaint repeated by residents. Unfettered development and the city's allowance of projects like the slot homes on Nevada (1 built, another just approved) must be addressed, but it is not.

There is nothing in the document that is enforceable. Design definitions are almost intentionally vague; in other areas they are in absolute contradiction. In more than one instance direction is offered to suggest adhering to existing old look and feel is "desired," while simultaneously encouraging new modern design. Neither of these are defined and appear in opposition of one another — allowing developers to play free and wide in a very gray space, often at the disadvantage of residents.

Another critical piece absent from this document is any vision. It's a bit perplexing that a 70+ page document on design standards can be so void of a long-term vision. It is unclear what mission this document looks to serve.

2. INSIDE COVER

This document has been prepared by
BRYANT FLINK ARCHITECTURE + DESIGN, Ltd.
With the help from City Planning Staff,
Community Leaders, and the Citizens of the City of Littleton.
This is an adapted manual based on the previously
adopted Standards and Guidelines dated March 13, 2006.

Comment [TH1]: It seems disingenuous to suggest citizens of Littleton played a major part in the development of this document. Oddly enough, the document was written without a single downtown area resident.

3. PAGE 15. SUBAREA 4: NORTHWEST RESIDENTIAL

DESIRED CHARACTER

New development, whether residential or commercial/mixed use, should continue the residential character as much as possible, and maintain the traditional gabled roof, porch, lap siding character of the neighborhood even with higher density building types. New buildings should be clad in either horizontal lapped, shingled or stucco. Complementing the older residential character of the neighborhood is desirable.

Comment [TH2]: Hard to see how this is enforceable. The existing look and feel has already been adulterated by poorly approved projects that do little to "blend in." These can now be used as precedence to approve ongoing projects. The slot homes on Nevada are a great example, and the city just approved 5 more to be built — this time in the middle of single family homes.

4. PAGE 39: NEW CONSTRUCTION GENERAL STANDARDS

2.1N. NEW CONSTRUCTION GENERAL STANDARDS

2.1.1N Buildings shall be designed to provide human scale, interest, and variety while maintaining an overall sense of relationship with adjoining or nearby buildings.

Comment [TH3]: Is the City of Littleton willing to concede recent developments which are now complete stand in strict opposition to existing architecture? If not, these seeded properties are now a precedence in which developers can use to justify continued terrible design.

2.1.3N New buildings and additions to buildings shall possess an architectural character that respects the traditional design principles of older buildings along Alamo Avenue and/or Main Street. These principles can be applied to both commercial and residential buildings.

Comment [TH4]: "can be applied" but will they?

5. PAGE 40-41: SUBAREA SPECIFIC STANDARDS

2.1.1 N **Subarea 4:** New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall respect the forms and character of existing older residential buildings in the subarea. Blending into the existing character is required because the size of the subarea is too small to absorb many differing forms without losing an identifiable character. Such forms and architectural elements that establish this character are:

- Sloped roofs such as simple gabled or hipped roofs, with occasional gambrel roofs, that are compatible with historic character.
- Porches and raised ground floors;
- Vertically proportioned windows;
- Simple rectangular building forms with 'add-ons' such as bay windows, rear 'sleeping porches', vestibules, etc.

Comment [TH5]: This is where I take serious issue with the intent of this document. If there were to be any "teeth" to this document, it should be here. However the existing character of Old Littleton has been watered down to 4 bullet points. It is within these 4 bullet points which are so overly broad that developers much abide.