

Dear Planning Commission,

As a Littleton resident of sub area 4, a local developer and business owner I felt compelled to offer some food for thought as you digest the codes changes proposed by the Planning Department. Since I live in Sub Are 4 and have direct experience with building in Sub Area 4, my comments will be directed there.

My takeaway, having perused the code change language is generally favorable but, it appears as though rehabs of existing homes in R5 is the preferred direction the city prefers- ostensibly to pump the brakes on growth, to keep the existing character intact, and to streamline the code to be more straightforward. Here are some quick thoughts...

**Roof Heights change from 3/12 to 5/12.** Without a variance, this will likely eliminate the possibility of three stories in Sub Area 4, a medium density, multi-family district. Each floor requires a *minimum* of 8 feet in height, and then another 1 foot for floor joists in between. If maximum roof heights are measured to **peak** and are restricted to 30', it's unlikely a third floor could be reasonably accommodated. Is it the city's intention to limit R5 to two story dwellings?

**Owner Occupied vs. Rentals.** As you may or may not know R5 is dominated by for-rent apartments now that the adjusted income units are complete. Has the city done an analysis on what a healthy ratio of rental vs. owner occupied dwelling is as the tangible impacts of these code changes are considered? As maligned as the new structures appear to be, I think the city should consider the positive economic impacts these new "anchor properties" have had to stabilize values in our area.

**Slot Home Prohibition.** We all have mixed feelings about lot homes but if front load garages are prohibited, roof heights are more restrictive, setbacks are immutable and no alleys exist, what CAN be built in Sub Area 4 properties? Maybe ask planning what CAN be built, block by block if the new codes are implemented.

**Empower the Planning Department.** Strong code is important, but so are property rights and good outcomes for Littleton. Every time a developer goes to planning with a new proposal the city should see it as an opportunity to make something special. Don't put rules and code above outcomes! Having **reasonable mechanisms for flexibility in place will be key** if these code changes stifle owner occupied development.

Thanks for your consideration.

Brad Peterson

██████████  
Littleton, CO 80120

## Colleen Norton

---

**From:** Jennifer Henninger  
**Sent:** Friday, April 24, 2020 3:00 PM  
**To:** Colleen Norton; Michael Sutherland  
**Subject:** FW: PC Resolution 4-comments from Kyle

Colleen-

So we have these comments as part of the PC record on Monday-please see below. Thanks!

Jen

---

**From:** Kyle Schlachter [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 24, 2020 2:58 PM  
**To:** Sherri Almond <salmond@littletongov.org>; pcbm@littletongov.org; David Bolt <dbolt@littletongov.org>; Craig Coronato <ccoronato@littletongov.org>; Dan Miller <dmliller@littletongov.org>; Jason Reynolds <jreynolds@littletongov.org>; Mark Rudnicki <mrudnicki@littletongov.org>; Bruce Stahlman <bstahlman@littletongov.org>; Robin Swartzbacker <rswartzbacker@littletongov.org>; Jennifer Henninger <jhenninger@littletongov.org>; Michael Sutherland <msutherland@littletongov.org>  
**Subject:** PC Resolution 4

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Dear Planning Commission:

I am writing with regards to the proposed changes to the Downtown Littleton Design Standards that will appear before you in PC Resolution 4 on Monday April 27. Many of the suggested changes improve the document and thus improve our historic downtown and our community as a whole - such as the prohibition of slot homes, facade requirements, and improved landscape requirements. However, I wish to express my opposition to one of the proposed changes. Specifically, I ask that you remove the proposed requirement that new buildings and additions be required to have a 5:12 slope instead of the currently required 3:12 slope in Subarea 4 (2.1.4N). Two things come to mind with this proposed change: the rationale for proposing it and the results of implementing it. I would argue that the rationale cited in Downtown Design Standards Change table of better aligning with character is incorrect. There is no evidence presented that 3:12 slope is incompatible with the historic character of the subarea. This proposed change seems to be arbitrary as many of the older homes in the subarea appear to have roof pitches less than 5:12. It would seem to me that requiring more prominent roofs could actually detract from the historic and diverse character of the subarea's architecture. Also, if you consider the purpose of the Downtown Littleton Design Standards:

"These design Objectives and Standards are intended to:

- improve the quality of design for new development, rehabilitation of existing buildings, additions to existing buildings, and signs within downtown Littleton
- in most areas generally reinforce, complement, or recall downtown Littleton's historic town-center character. Littleton's older town center is generally made up of three distinct areas:
  1. a commercial core focused on Main Street;
  2. largely-residential neighborhoods to the north of this core; and
  3. a mixed-use district, formerly industrial in character, to the south of the core (not including Arapahoe Community College).

- in a few areas, encourage contemporary design and innovation appropriate to downtown Littleton's future."

this proposed change does in fact NOT support these purposes. Additionally, I ask you to consider the results of implementing this change. On the surface it seems to this change, while seemingly minor, is unnecessarily restrictive and would not necessarily improve the aesthetics of new construction. A good architect will make 3:12 slope aesthetically pleasing and bad architect can design an ugly building with a 5:12 sloped roof. Please ask yourself and ask staff about the basis for proposing this change and real-world outcomes if it were approved. Especially in our current economic situation, we need to make sure we encourage innovation appropriate to Littleton's cultural and economic future. To me, there is an unconvincing rationale and dubious outcomes, and I urge you to remove this change to 2.1.4N from PC Resolution 4.

Sincerely,

Kyle

--

Kyle Schlachter

***Named one of America's [Top 40 Under 40 Tastemakers](#) by Wine Enthusiast Magazine (see the [behind-the-scenes video](#))***

\* Sender and receiver should be mindful that all incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, S 24-72-100.1, et seq.

\* Sender and receiver should be mindful that all incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, S 24-72-100.1, et seq.