

Your Name	In which sub-areas of downtown should buildings be built to the street?	In the definitions and objectives for each sub-district, how should the language in the regulation distinguish between existing and desired character of the downtown district?	Limit primary building materials by building type? Regulate color at all?	What should the language treatment be between discussion of “density” and “character”? Should factors such as density and FAR even be an element in the discussion and instead focus on factors such as building form or lot coverage?
Scott Melin	Probably just on Main Street.	There has been so much recent change in downtown that has eroded historic character that I think the emphasis should probably be on desired character so that as a community we can start heading back in the right direction.	Yes.	Density (or low density) is an important aspect of character, and should be an element in the discussion.
Karina Elrod	Downtown Main neighborhood definitely. While generally a Mixed Use (given main floor use for retail/office) might generally be desirable for street frontage given the significance of presence of mixed use in the downtown I can not support this at this time.	If I understand the question as what elements define character, for me that would be height, mass, green space architecture and building orientation (to a much lessor degree use).	Slippery slope but perhaps there’s a way to define “quality” material, without explicitly including/excluding material. There may be new surfaces and materials in the future we do not envision. Definitely do not regulate color.	FAR is actually very useful but technical, and hard to understand without a lot of visuals. The value of FAR is that it provides flexibility in design, where as a building form I think (?) maybe starts potentially to prescriptive.
Pam Grove	Main Street only. This will match the streetscape. For commercial buildings in MS, DT and DM, a building to the street may work, but a step-back on the lot for landscaping and a step back for the 2nd and 3rd story would help maintain the character of those areas.	<p>For Main Street and DT, we should do everything we can to maintain the historical character. For the DM and DN, there has been so much redevelopment with huge multi-family buildings that the small bungalow style housing is dwarfed and losing a foothold. There are fewer and fewer historical homes. The issue is how to we encourage the historic buildings to stay, while allowing development. We also need to maintain the feel of the area that is almost lost and create a code that expects future development to blend in with the surrounding areas. The key is reduced massing and design.</p> <p>If there are new buildings, they should reflect the character of an area near an historical area (Main Street). Our consultants should be able to advise us on this. I have sent information on how Denver does this. I have also included specifics under the section on Downtown Transition.</p> <p>We want our downtown to maintain a quaint feel but not be “fake.” That is a fine line to walk but our consultants, with their vast experience, should be able to help us fine tune our code to make sure we align our code with the Envision Plan:</p>	It would be best to limit building materials to those that are natural. Materials such as aluminum, which looks like what the View House used for their top story, does not blend in with the character of the area. Our consultants should be able to give us a list of appropriate materials for building/redevelopment in an historic area and close to historic downtown Littleton. If we prescribe too much, development could look too uniform. The colors should blend so we don’t have facades painted iridescent colors. I would think the consultants would have a recommendation on colors for historic areas and neighborhoods close to historic areas. We should, however, make exceptions for murals, especially if we decide to have them in alleys. Murals and alley art should be subject to approval.	<p>We definitely need some language around density. Builders just want to build to maximize square footage and to maximize profits. I am not against profits, but they should be reasonable. If we allow too much density parking will become more difficult than it already is.</p> <p>Yes, we should have some language about character of each area. This would include suggestions on land use, layout, density, building coverage, FAR, scale/form/massing to prevent lot-line-to-lot line buildings for residential units, roof types, step backs on the lot, step backs for 2nd and 3rd stories, roofs and landscaping for open areas.</p> <p>Density and character may vary by each character area.</p> <p>On Main Street buildings are close together and there is minimal separation. In the other four areas, separation between buildings on the lots is key to maintain the character of the area. For example, in the DM area there is a huge lot with multi-family units that dwarf the surrounding buildings. It is important to have open space on lots and well as between lots.</p>
Kelly Milliman	Buildings should be built to the street in sub-areas: Main St, mixed use district.	Language in regulation - Change is going to happen and that’s not a bad thing. The character of any new architecture should compliment existing buildings from early 20th century or later without trying to recreate that era. Having said that, my desire is to not stifle creative architecture and only limit everything to look the same (boring).	Limit primary building material - Only on Main St. Every other sub-area, no limits. No regulating color.	Density and character - I still wish density wasn’t such an evil word. Sprawl is a MILLION times worse! As I stated on Tuesday, DT was the urban hub-bub of a young Littleton. Even in the 1800s it was “densely” populated. My house was probably located out in the country!! :)
Carol Fey	Only on Main St	Call it "existing" and "desired."	Limit materials and colors to those typical of the historic era whose ambiance we are trying to have.	Yes, concentrate on building form and lot coverage. Don't use FAR--most people don't know what that is, and it's not easy to explain. Don't use density because it's a hot button word. Some people are "for" it and others "against" it depending upon their political perspective.

For the DN (Neighborhood) character area: To what standard should the regulations establish height allowed in DN? Should there be a maximum percentage or threshold allowable per block?	For the DN (Neighborhood) character area: Where should street trees be located? In the detached sidewalk tree-lawns (verge or also allow in front yards on private property?	For the DN (Neighborhood) character area: How important is it that new buildings in the Downtown Neighborhood reflect the form, scale and character of traditional single family houses?	For DM (Downtown Mixed-Use) character area: When addressing scale, should “some” OR “all” of the buildings greater than three stories be stepped back from the building front?
I would like to hear some guidance and options on this issue from the consultants before I weigh in.	I think we should encourage as many trees as possible, but I’d like to see some visuals and models from the consultants for what the various choices might look like. This question is not just about character, but also about ecology, and it’s very important to me that the ULUC process emphasize Littleton’s future environmental health.	I think it’s very important. No one living in a single-family home anywhere in Littleton wants a large structure built next door, and no one wants to feel like their neighborhood is disappearing because council chose not to protect it.	Probably they should be stepped back.
No I don’t support a percentage threshold. There should be a diversity of height but traditionally I think that happened based on lot size (?). Is there another way to encourage different height. Perhaps its by roof pitch, meaning the taller the building the greater the pitch vs a shorter building can have a smaller pitch. Also maybe corner lots should never be 3 stories (i.e. think of the approach of step backs).	Detached sidewalk tree-lawns	Not sure how to answer this but I think it’s yes and very important. I drove around today and here are my observations, there were many single family one story homes, so it felt like I was in a neighborhood vs an urban center which is a good thing, but the homes are not quality homes, nor really appear that they ever had been (very few exceptions). So do I still think the DN neighborhood should still feel like a neighborhood of single family homes, yes does it need to be the same as the single family homes that are there now, no. The character I would define as primarily single family homes maybe with a carriage house (as you see in Aria or an ADU), a duplex can very much also look like a single family, I’m struggling to envision a four-plex. There were a lot of different styles and quite a hodgepodge, I struggle to define if there is truly one “form or style of architecture”.	All buildings that have a 4th story should be stepped back.
There should be a height limit to equal three stories maximum for any redevelopment. Ideally, the limit would be described in number of feet and not number of stories. If the ground varies in height, makes sure that height is calculated correctly so there are no loopholes.	<p>Trees should be located on the sidewalk close to the street so walkways are clear for pedestrians. Trees should be allowed in front yards as long as they don’t grow so large that the branches hang over onto the sidewalk or the roots impact the sidewalks with cracks in the sidewalk and create a hazard for pedestrians. Trees give added ambiance to an area and make it look less stark and more inviting. Trees give added ambiance to an area and make it look less stark and more inviting.</p> <p>The trees and greenery on apartment properties south of Main Street give the neighborhood a residential feel and add to the visual interest of the area.</p>	If it was 10 years ago, before the developers came in and built dense, multi-story lot-line-to-lot-line buildings, I think it would be imperative to maintain the character of single-family homes. Now with large buildings dwarfing single family homes, the character has changed. All we can do is try to preserve what single family homes that are there and expect future redevelopment to provide buildings that aren’t so massive.	There should NOT be any buildings greater than three stories. Buildings on Main Street should be two stories and any 3rd story building should be stepped back so it can’t be seen from the street and keep the city streetscape. Little Town is an example of a building that is quite large and the step back is far enough that it doesn’t impact the look of the street. The mixed-use building near the end of Main Street across from the View House has a 3rd story that is not stepped back enough.
We should try and reduce drastic changes between heights of buildings within those sub-areas. And yes, there should be a percentage of max height allowable per block.	Street trees should be on Main St but not placed right in the middle of the dang sidewalks! I think trees should be allowable all over a property. Creates a feeling of nature, helps the environment, win-win.	I think new buildings in the DN should reflect the style of traditional single family homes. That’s what makes that area so unique, even with the newer developments already in place.	All the buildings over 3 stories should be stepped back.
Yes, there should be a max.	Both places. Trees in the tree lawn though should be the kind that will do well there--the city’s arborist Dave Flaig knows this well.	It is very important. Those traditional houses are the character that we’re trying to preserve.	There should not be buildings greater than 3 stories! A third story should be stepped back.

For MS (Downtown Main Street) character area: Allow open space (for example, in the form of plazas)?	For MS (Downtown Main Street) character area: Which should take precedence promoting primarily “simple, rectangular” building form OR requiring varied massing of buildings?	For MS (Downtown Main Street) character area: How strong should parking language in Main Street character district differentiate between requiring parking only in the rear “structured or screened” at the street or the rear?	For MS (Downtown Main Street) character area: Are surface lots prohibited adjacent to and visible from Main Street?
Yes. Breaking up the built environment of a main street with a plaza or open space can be a great enhancement to character (i.e., the plazas in the middle of Old Town Ft. Collins).	Probably requiring varied massing of buildings.	I’d have to see some visuals of the different options.	Yes.
Yes	We should stay as closely aligned to the historical buildings and era of architecture for that significant time period for Littleton. If that is/was “simple rectangular” than that’s what it should be.	For the latter “structured or screened at the street or the rear”, that sounds like there could be a parking structure on Main St. abutting to Main Street? If that’s the intent then no. I think parking should be in the rear could be a structured or screened, or could be a parking lot like we have in areas now. What we should not allow is any access to the parking from Main Street (even though we have that in a number of cases now). The only concern I have with my statement is if Bradford Auto Body were to get redeveloped how would the building in the back be accessed? Is there an alley or alternative access or is Main St the only access point?	Surface lots should not be visible from Main St.
On Main Street, the only open space consists of restaurant patios and Bega park, both which we should keep. If there is land that becomes available and there is room for a plaza (like in the parking lot near Reinke Brothers) or behind some other building, that would be great. It would be nice for people to sit and gather. If there is open space on Main Street then there should be requirements that is landscaped or developed in such a way (benches or tables) that it fits in with the surrounding area.	Massing of buildings should blend in with the rest of Main Street. At the west end of Main Street, near the Melting Pot, the zoning is B2. The rest of Main Street is zoned for CA. In B2, we could have high rises on Main Street. We need an overlay for B2 on Main Street to limit the height and massing. The View House did a much better step back than the mixed use building across the street. Ideally, we should have step-backs of 2nd stories like Little Town. This building is big, but the sight line from the street is such that you don’t see the 2nd story. The streetscape and character of the block are maintained.	<p>Parking on Main Street should be in the rear to maintain the streetscape. If we allow large parking structures, they should be off Main Street and blend in with the district when it comes to design and massing. In other words, nothing higher than three story structures should be allowed in these four downtown districts.</p> <p>Screening would be helpful. On Alamo, there are paved parking lots. If something could be done to make those more attractive, that would be helpful.</p> <p>Parking should not be allowed in front on Main Street. There is only one place that parking in the front is allowed on Main Street and that is next to the mixed-use building. This is a place that is reminiscent of the 1940’s when parking became popular. If this area is redeveloped, a building that goes all the way to the street should be allowed in order to fit into the streetscape. It should not be higher than three stories and the second and third story should be stepped back.</p>	Yes. With one exception, we do have surface lots in the front of buildings on Main Street. We need to keep it that way. If we tear down buildings for parking, we will lose some historic buildings. Once they are gone, they are gone forever. Savannah wanted to tear down their beautiful old houses to make room for parking. Thank goodness the historical-minded citizens stopped it and now Savannah has maintained their beautiful historic houses.
Yes, more places to gather, rest, reflect. Bega Park is a beautiful open space!	Definitely like varied massing of bldgs on Main, however, most of the original architecture is rectangular.	I don’t think we have a huge parking problem on Main. We have a problem with people having that perception! And it’s good for people to walk a block or two or three, especially after dinner. I do think we need to have ample handicap parking.	Surface lots should be prohibited.
No--as per KKC’s books, those spaces are not part of urban character or a "walkability."	Require varied massing	Better use strong specific language if you want people to know what you’re talking about.	Yes, again, according to KKC writings, these have no part in urban character--or historic character for that matter.

For DTT (Downtown Transition) character area: How does the city administer building height to ensure a transition from two to three stories up to five stories?	For DTT (Downtown Transition) character area: How heavily should roof forms be regulated?	For DTT (Downtown Transition) character area: Where should regulations be on the spectrum of uniformity in design requirements? Strict uniformity almost at the expense of losing visual interest, OR complete freedom in design to the point of a hodge-podge?	Should the Downtown Mixed south of Alamo and the Downtown Transition permit higher densities and taller buildings?
We administer it to ensure that transitions between character types are gradual. There are too many abrupt breaks between character types in downtown, and these have rightly frustrated the community.	Maybe I don't understand the question. Roof forms are an important feature of character, but I don't think they should be more heavily regulated than any other feature of character, such as setbacks, etc.	We have to carefully balance so that character is enhanced and maintained, but not to the point of causing uniformity. Littleton is too rich a community (historically, culturally, visually, etc.) to settle for anything "cookie cutter."	I'm reluctant about additional density anywhere in downtown, but I'd like to hear from the consultants about how various options support or don't support Littleton's future economic viability before I make up my mind about this particular question.
I define transition as an area that assumes the structural character and form of abutting area but with different land uses. For example businesses now occupy what were homes (i.e. Graceful Cafe). It is "single family" in form but operates as a business. I think there needs to be a DTT between Main Street and Neighborhood. It should assume the form of neighborhood (with some modification) but allow for the uses of Main St. The same would apply for DTT around Alamo (It's a mix of neighborhood form and to a lesser degree Main Street form). I think it can work here too that it assumes the form of a neighborhood but allows for the uses of Main St. This feels right for Littleton Transition area to the north and south of Main St.	If we proceed with my recommendation of 13, then I would say we do not regulate. This area can be the most eclectic given it's role to be a "transition".	I'm leaning closer to hodgepodge	Yes I think it can support that, but not at 5 stories.
The limit in the downtown area (football) should be three stories. Write the code in such a way that developers cannot find loopholes to make buildings taller than they should be.	There should be a range of roof options to allow for interest and variety. Roofs should be visible from the street for residential units. For commercial properties, a flat roof would work and step backs to maintain the streetscape. This area is the most authentic with a mix of commercial and residential buildings. In some cases, the residential buildings are being used for commercial space.	We don't want to be too strict or a hodge-podge, so we should strive for something in the middle. I advocate design guidelines to make sure new development blends into the area and is appropriate for an area close to an historic area (Main Street). Denver has guidelines for buildings near historic areas to make sure the two adjacent areas blend together well. They use a concept called based plane to control massing and height. This concept could be used in all for character areas. Purpose of Base Plane, Height and Bulk Standards and Rules of Measurement: The concept of a zoning "base plane," together with zone district regulations for maximum building height and bulk, are in-tended to appropriately site and scale new buildings in response to an existing or planned neighborhood scale and character. The use of an imaginary "base plane" tied to the original grade of a property, from which both building height and bulk plane are measured, protects neighborhood character by preventing excessive building height (whether measured in feet or stories) possible through manipulation of finished grade.	The maximum height should be three stories in all areas four character areas. Density should be regulated to help manage parking issues. The higher the density, the more cars and this will aggravate the parking situation in downtown.
Stepbacks?	Roof forms - regulated depending on sub-area. I like flat roofs as long as there's something unique on the roof, like trees/canopy, etc. Green roofs should be written into the code.	Uniformity is BORING BORING BORING. But need a balance between uniformity and hodge-podge.	Yes, mixed character south of Alamo is appropriate. Per the Comp Plan, Policy H&N 4, most residents agree that we need mixed-use, especially near transit options.
Please, no buildings higher than 3 stories--and certainly not five. WHERE DID 5 COME FROM?!!	Very important. Please no flat roofs with structures jutting out sideways or upwards as is so popular right now.	Closer to strict.	No

Should there be minimum height requirements, in addition to maximum height requirements, for parts of downtown (typically 2 stories)?	How should the unlisted uses be treated? Instead of prohibited, could they be reviewed by either the planning director or board?	Is beekeeping a use that should be an accessory use in all DT character areas?	How should non-sales tax revenue generating businesses such as tattoo parlors and body arts studios be treated in Downtown character areas? The existing land use table is somewhat restrictive limiting the use to only conditional in B-2, B-3 and CA.
Likely yes, otherwise a much smaller building will be out of character.	Unlisted uses should be allowed planning commission review. Otherwise, a potentially very valuable, creative, and community- and character-enhancing use could become a missed opportunity simply by operation of law.	Yes, absolutely. It’s been proven and proven again that pollinator numbers are collapsing, and that globalized, industrialized food systems are a main driver of climate collapse and other ecological degradations. Any sustainable future will prioritize local food production, and this is something we need to encourage anywhere we can in our land use and zoning.	Being somewhat restrictive with these uses seems right to me. Littleton needs sales tax revenues, and needs to plan and design for sales tax revenues.
No	Planning board	That’s a strange question. Sure if you could have it in your back yard in neighborhood, don’t see why you couldn’t have it in your rooftop in mixed use.	Think Tank tattoo parlor really did a good job with it being a second floor studio. The concern was/is what does store front look like, as far as signage, advertising (images of tattoos on body parts) if it were in a retail space on a first floor. The classy places like Think Tank would never do that but then how do you control the ones that would not be of that caliber or class. I think we should keep conditional and would allow in Main and Mixed Use.
The minimum should be one story and the maximum should be three stories. Two stories, with a possible thirds story setback, for Main Street is ideal.	If the land use is not listed, then it would have to be treated as an exception. This could be dangerous, however, because a someone could come in a find a loophole and build something that doesn’t fit in with the character of the area. If we had comprehensive list of what was allowed and what wasn’t, those that wanted to use the land for something that didn’t complement the area would not find Littleton attractive. We want to attract “good developers.”	I don’t know enough about the pros and cons of keeping bees in an urban area. Bees have a positive impact on our environment. Are hives appropriate for an urban area? I am not sure.	I am not sure why tattoo parlors and body arts studios don’t pay taxes. Tattoos have become very “main stream.” A lot of people have them. Nevertheless, tattoo parlors have a certain ambiance that may not come across as wholesome by some people.
Should be min and max height requirements.	Yes	YES beekeeping should be accessory use!	A mixture of cool businesses in DT helps pull in all kinds of patrons that will spend their money at sales tax generating businesses.
No	No because we have experience of a planning director approving things that shouldn't have been.	Yes	OK so long as the form of the building conforms to requirements

Please add any additional comments or thoughts
I'd like to hear from the consultants on some of these questions, simply to know what the viable options are, what best practices are, etc. The process between council and the consultants needs to be iterative - a give and take - to ensure that expertise and the community's wishes are constantly informing one another so that the best decision is reached.
I like four main characters defined (main, neighborhood, transitional and mixed use). I think some of the boundaries are off. Would like to spend a little more time looking and discussing that. I feel very strongly that there should be a DTT between Main and Neighborhood. I don't think we should go to 5 stories anywhere. 4 stories could be fine in Mixed Use. Everything else seems reasonable can go to 3 stories. Though would like Neighborhood to have and be able to sustain a variety of stories (1, 2 AND 3) how can we do that? Maybe through menu of roof pitches, i.e. when one or two story can have minimum of 3/12 pitch vs a 3 story would be required to have a 5/12 minimum pitch. We have to find a way to protect/conserv
The examples in the first Envision Studio, overall, were larger than in the second Envision Studio. I am still not quite sure why we continue to see massive buildings as examples for downtown. Why are we thinking about 4 and 5 story buildings in an historic area where all the buildings are 3 stories? I don't understand why there is such a push for big, massive, dense, high buildings in the examples provided by our consultants. Nore Winter is a highly accredited urban planner for historic areas, yet I can't see where his expertise is shining through to help us maintain our historic areas.
How do we look forward when so much of the character in the areas north of downtown have been destroyed? How do we preserve the old buildings we have and not have the owners sell them to developers? Is it education or is it code revisions or both?
N/A
None