

## Code and Process Review Stakeholder's Group Meeting Minutes

March 7, 2017, Conference Rooms A&B, 281 N College

Not present: Brian Dunbar, Jack Mullen, James MacDowell, Matt Robenalt, Josh Guernsey, Sherry Albertson-Clark

### I. Introductions

Karen McWilliams opened meeting with staff introductions

Attendees (introduced themselves):

Anita Rehner

Meg Dunn

Per Hogestad

Sarah Payne

Lisa Ashbach

Darryl Austin

Tom Leeson

Brad Yataba

Janelle Kechter - representing Lucia Liley

Brian Cooke

Jennifer Carpenter

Chris Aronson

Steve Schroyer

Leslie Williams

### II. Meeting Schedule:

Confirmed with group: First Wednesdays from 11:30 to 1:00  
(Maybe a second meeting a month occasionally)

### III. Introduction to Project (Karen):

Have done several recent reviews of our code, this is latest iteration to assess effectiveness and address issues. We serve as model for most communities, but can always make improvements. Growing pains from recent changes. Good opportunity to look at everything.

RFP issued, replies received, put out list of project tasks and deliverables.

Consultant will have to get work to us early to mid-fall for us to stay on schedule, which is ambitious. Consultant needs to get familiar with codes/processes asap.

Initial outreach and feedback will be important.

Consultant will go through each area in the scope of work as a separate task that this committee will be able to review and comment on.

### IV. Group Discussion

Question for group: what have we missed? Or, is there something on here that we don't need to deal with? That we could take off and streamline? (see schedule through Task 8)

Steve S: qualifications of how board is put together for LPC - how is the board assembled? Who is on the board? (Concerned because he saw someone reading plans upside down.)

Chris: what is the main goal of this project?

Karen: to look at all HP codes and how they interact together and how effective they are for the community. Two major components: Ch. 14 and 3.4.7. Not intending to look at the section on the Landmark Rehab Loan program in Ch. 14. For 3.4.7, we will also be evaluating the section and the recently added content that gives LPC ability to review and provide recommendation.

Lisa: City support for HP not changing?

Karen: City support is strong - economic driver, statewide report is periodic and continues to provide research and data

Tom: charge of this committee is less policy, more process

Darryl: who is the audience/target

Karen: citizens of Fort Collins. Our community is broad/diverse. This group is mostly representative of the group, avoiding the extremes, to have the benefit of the community overall in mind. In line with existing policy. Process is the primary focus.

Tom: everything we have heard to date is that historic preservation is valued, resources are valued, but we are frustrated with the process of how we go about it. Can we maintain the ethos and yet also improve process?

Darryl: nature of frustration?

Tom: that's what we will flesh out through process. And community outreach will affect that. We have a sense of what we've heard, we want you to hear it as well and help us address issues we define.

Darryl: would be helpful to have a sense of priority - what's most important

Chris: Should be two avenues, residential/single-family and commercial that need to be treated separately. Two different animals with different client base. Our clients are more concerned about time and consistency of how proposals are treated so that there is more predictability to help them direct clients.

Lisa: Distinction applies to who has received public support. Taxpayer funded projects have more obligation to be consistent with City code. Individual property owners outside of that have some property rights that might be considered differently.

Tom: crux of problem is that City code is written to allow interpretation of code. How do we address compatibility and context so that it is written clearly and provides clear expectations.

Per: purpose of code is looking for the same thing for residential and commercial.

Chris: That's fine, but we need to be mindful of how the two are different.

Darryl: application can vary somewhat as long as there is uniformity, clarity of what is appropriate from the code for each. Rules of the game need to be clarified.

Lisa - would like to see reduction of problem where an individual homeowner perhaps should get more leniency from LPC as opposed to those who are proposing projects that take more public money, etc.

Chris - two extremes important, but also small businesses are their own category. They have limited resources.

Jennifer: look at compatibility again. P&Z also struggles with this. It is prickly and hard to get it laid out. Too explicit and you ruin creativity. Hard to convey to clients because it is pretty subjective. It's a little too subjective, so a few more guidelines would help.

Meg: code needs to address compatibility with modern architecture will also become important.

Per: it's tougher to apply to modern architecture and it's not as valued.

Karen: disparity between concern for OT neighborhoods and rest of the City, where there are many eligible resources and potential development. Need to have a City-wide approach.

Chris: 50-year radius is widening. Capacity issue? How do we evaluate 70s?

Jennifer: South College Heights is popular who love it for HP reasons, although they don't know they love it because of HP. People need to understand importance of context of neighborhood.

Especially in FC, with constrained boundaries, almost all of our City will potentially be eligible. We are going to have to face that problem.

Chris: 50-year rule? Evaluate? Friends in Boston call that new.

Jennifer: and how do you not stifle creativity and make sure neighborhoods meet the living needs of today. How do you create additions that maintain character?

Darryl: St. Louis - areas of the City with blight/burned down, standardized housing. Didn't take long until the older houses looked totally out of place. Loss of character. Lots of effort needed to educate on limitations of development to protect the character. His "transition house" next to project at Mountain and Shields is encountering projects that he didn't anticipate. Not sure how the Landmark townhomes on Mountain next to him was approved. Cool concept, sees some problems in it.

Karen: We have heard a variety of concerns; ongoing goal to hear thoughtful discussion and lots of new ideas.

We have provided list of relevant HP documents for your review.

Clarion and Associates is conducting study on area of adjacency. They are also doing the demolition by neglect study, both to give us a jump start.

Before we discuss each task, we will be going through and providing summaries of each section, with areas of concern that are identified as background information. We will provide that context for the discussions. But you will need to look carefully at the code, which is robust, in order to contribute.

Sarah: how does role of consultant fit in with this group's role?

Karen: as they finish a task, we bring it in and discuss it. Or, we talk ahead of time, see what issues and concerns we have and then they run with it. They won't be coming in each month, not part of scope.

Per: but they get benefit of our discussion?

Karen: yes, a two-way street.

Jennifer: should start here and then go to them, as long as we don't cut off other ideas they have from other communities, or stifle them.

Darryl: as we get through it, any limitations on the delivery? How will it be presented to community? What is the outreach plan for property owners and buyers?

Karen: that's related to next steps, but as for this process the information will be on our website, etc. We want all community members to participate and provide comments; but this group is the key stakeholder group. We will also do public outreach as the product.

Darryl: How are we going to deliver the solution?

Karen: in part, that depends on the solution

Sarah: rough schedule?

Karen: consultants are achieving a task each month.

Steve: separate from City Plan review process; that's a two-year project. The results of this will inform City Plan.

Janelle: RFP selection timing?

Karen: committee is reviewing RFPs right now.

This group is encouraged to attend/contribute to all of the public outreach, but not a requirement.

For next meeting:

- Distribute the Preservation for a Changing Colorado document
- Clarion study summaries