

I. Should we add more time to the discussions? Are you getting all the time you really need?

Majority felt that we do need time.

Majority felt that we should extend the meeting for thirty more minutes.

2. Review of Action Items to Date: Have we accurately captured your thoughts?

- Karen: Overarching question—is this working for you? Do you feel that you are getting the opportunity to provide input? Do you feel your voice is being captured appropriately?
- Matt: feels that we should review all of Clarion’s recommendations one by one with an informal vote.
- Karen: Will highlight action items that relate to Clarion’s recommendations. We have a list for staff and LPC as well. We are organizing these into immediate, mid-term, and long-term
- Meg: Would like the action items organized topically
- Chris: Can we take the 100 items and categorize into our goals? For example, all that work toward streamlining or goals that we have already established.
- Lucia: On the action items, they are a compilation of comments or something that the whole group has agreed upon?
- Karen: These are captures of comments and then start addressing them. We want to make sure we’ve captured the comments accurately.
- Lucia: So these are individual comments that will be reviewed as a group?
- Tom: These are comments and not a fully agreed upon set of action items. We will have to review as a group.
- Sherry: Clarification on timeline?
- Karen: Discussed timeline and process, including LPC’s review and formal input later by both LPC and P&Z.
- Jennifer: When it comes to P&Z, we should do a joint meeting with LPC
- Karen: If I have missed any comments, please email me and make sure I have your comments so I have your voice while I craft the action items.
-

3. Spencer: Update on integration-team working on NCB/transition area codes and Downtown.

- This is using Article 4 as a jumping off point. They are also using Downtown Plan as jumping off point. They are using character sub-districts to inform discussion—some re-zoning happening, much in line with structure plan. Objective is to be more streamlined and using a form-based idea—not wholly form-based, but using things like street typology. Critically looking at how NCB areas with compatibility and integration of new buildings. Making the conversation less vague, looking for resolution on compatibility with densification. Once they have some solid content for people to respond to, they will be doing outreach . They are working with Peter Park and Tryba.
- Karen: AIA presentation, please come.
- Per: Will change in code eventually inform the rest of the LUC?
- Spencer: It has yet to be determined. There is probably a full code re-write in the near future. The work that we are doing, we are looking to do the best we can for the Downtown area—if our ideas relate to the rest of the City, that would be great, but we do not want to dilute the uniqueness of the character of Downtown. There could be elements that translate to the rest of the LUC. We are not doing a fully form based code. We are taking things that are applicable and using those. It is not a dogmatic, plug and play code. We are looking for street typology/frontage character as an organizing structure. A lot is still to be determined.

- Jennifer: So many pieces and players doing their own thing that we may be all going in all different directions. I am not feeling that we are coordinating very well—I don't see it as a citizen, maybe you are doing it as staff, but I am worried we will come to different conclusions.
- Karen: Next Thursday there is a joint P&Z/LPC meeting about these efforts. Part of the issue is that our section of the code has not been integrated into the rest of the code. It often comes as a surprise to the developer.
- Spencer: A lot of the conversations we are having with our consultants is more fundamental . We have a limited budget so some is being done in-house ie modeling. We do imagine our consultants highlighting difficult spots in our Downtown to make sure it works. Overall compatibility is being addressed. It's really challenging, but that's the aim.
- Karen: What I'm hearing is that you are looking for more coordination between the groups?
- Lucia: Could we see the products Spencer's team is working toward?
- Spencer: We will have deliverables soon, looking at about a month out. We are hoping to have stuff to respond to then. We want to make sure this conversation doesn't go too far into the rabbit hole. We want you to be looking at this through the lens of historic perseverance and compatibility.
- Karen: Coordination of meetings? Would CAC like more meetings with different groups to do that?
- Chris: No, data transfer. We just want their information.
- Jennifer: There's also DRAC happening. We have so many important, challenging projects going on and it feels a little separated. I want to make sure it is integrated.
- Spencer: We are coordinating. We are making sure we're all coming together. It's an inter-related dance.
- Tom: I think something else is that the transitional standards have been lagging—it's just now starting to ramp up. So now the two are just now starting to merge. This is actually perfect timing.

4. Maren's presentation: Area of Adjacency.

What are some of our options for creating predictability? What are the compatibility elements? Understanding the spatial piece of area of adjacency requires looking at some elements of compatibility.

- Karen: The Clarion report in front of you is one that was done a year ago. We have asked them to delve more deeply into the topic now. I consider this Area of Adjacency lite—this is a draft of what they will come up with next month.
- Maren: To remind everyone, we are talking about development review. This is NOT design review of infill inside historic districts. Entire LUC informs compatibility. LPC makes a recommendation to the decision maker using 3.4.7—respect historic character in new construction. Adjacent means nearby, not necessarily touching. The area of adjacency is determined case-by-case. We are investigating ways to make that more predictable and transparent.
- Maren: Which compatibility elements are more important? What are the special considerations? That's what we need to talk about today. How is that review/comment process different than our general standards? The scope needs to be made more predictable. We also need to find a balance between prescription and flexibility. What needs to be specific and what needs to remain flexible? And consider proximity. Where do the criteria apply spatially? There are differences between abutting properties and nearby properties.
- Chris: What's the goal of area of adjacency?

- Maren: Identify the significant historic properties in the area—most are designated, but can also include those that are individually eligible. This identifies those resources that are going to remain, that will continue to provide context. We talk about new construction being a good neighbor, whether it's historic or not. It's about site design and how the buildings relate to each other. The idea there is that we are identifying important historic character and how new construction can be a good neighbor.
- Chris: Clarion found that most communities don't do this. Why are we?
- Council implemented this process in 2014.
- Maren: Is there a difference between abutting or nearby?
- Sarah: It's getting to the historic integrity question. I think it's dangerous to set a specific boundary. For one property, a four story office building might work and some it won't. I think there needs to be flexibility in defining area.
- Per: Area of adjacency provides a context to the new construction. They don't exist by themselves. They set up the setting of the new buildings. I agree with Sarah. To say it's two blocks square isn't feasible.
- Matt: I'm intrigued by what Sarah said. You're referring to Secretary of Interior definitions— aspects of integrity. I don't think that's what we do today. There's no finding of impact to those aspects of integrity when LPC looks at infill projects. Is it the elements of integrity that we're talking about? I think that is far more predictable for applicants.
- Sarah: It's about defining a process. What adversely affects a historic property? How can we use the aspects of integrity? Does it interrupt important view sheds? Affect setting? Affect association? Even though those characteristics would be different—here is a very clear process.
- Lucia: You can't have something completely open ended because it can cause arbitrary decisions. We need limits. I think we need to develop something that is based on proximity. What is it doing to things even though it isn't immediately effect? What are those effects on each kind of property? We can't have something entirely open.
- Meg: Immediately important: horizontal alignment, windows for abutting properties. Further away it's less about details, but mass and scale. How does it compare to the others?
- Chris: But isn't that already talked about in 3.4.7?
- Meg: Not with abutting/nearby defined and proximity
- Karen: Area of adjacency is meant to identify area of effect. It's the starting place for assessment of properties.
- Chris: Do we have examples of projects that used nearby rather than abutting?
- Per: Example of park-like setback, LPC said to do that they would expand Area of Adjacency, applicant was unhappy
- Matt: City's area of adjacency goes past Webster definition. When you start to add additional meaning to a word, you enter risk zone of idioglossia-language only known to insider. It needs to be understood by outsider. Given that, if you have a property that fits under Webster definition of adjacency, if it doesn't negatively affect those immediately adjacency?
- Meg: Change words, use proximity and adjacency. Doesn't change process.
- Jennifer: What if we used area of notification? We could use the same logic to use bounds of area of adjacency? Neighborhood meeting notification area could be limit. The 800 ft would be area of proximity.
- Lucia felt that was too wide of an area. That's a lot more than what's being done today.
- Jennifer: People in notification area because city feels there is an impact and they have the right to comment. Logical to use same area – how can they be affected under one process but not under other.

- Maren: put a pin in the number question, it will come up later. Slide on Character of the “Area of Adjacency”—these are ideas that have already come up. These have come up over the course of the last five years. One of the things we want to establish is a set of criteria—what’s important for historic compatibility? Some of these things are for general compatibility, but what rises to the top for historic compatibility? Does anything jump to mind that you would think should be added or respond to?
- Lucia: I think the one that has caused the most difficulty has been size/mass/bulk/height.
- Developers can deal with setbacks/stepbacks. Are we supposed to be doing build out according to Downtown Plan or does historic go further? How do we build the downtown we want if we can’t go up higher/bigger? Uncommon. What is the City standard on this?
- Jennifer: Would lay down in front of the bulldozer to retain criteria for size/mass/bulk/height. That’s the most important. That is the one that will make or break us for the historic downtown. It needs to be defined, but needs to be defined with the importance of historic downtown valued more than new construction. You can’t make it smaller by articulation. Sometimes the answer is that it’s just too big. Just because there’s enough space on lot doesn’t mean it should get the go ahead. Somehow we need to define it down and get a better direction for it. If people knew when they are building with historic buildings around it, they need to know transparently that is going to be an issue.
- Lucia: We need better understanding of what we are trying to protect historic structures from. I’m not suggesting that developers shouldn’t scale back, but there’s a point where people say it’s too simplistic ie it’s bigger than the height of the historic so it can’t go up.
- Maren: We will have basic standard for buildings, we would have other standards for buildings with historic area of adjacency.
- Matt: Two-three years, the bank towers will be historic. Is height and scale—are we only talking about limiting height because the historic stock currently is all under 4 stories? In two years we will have buildings that are too short.
- Maren: There’s a preponderance issue that Matt is indirectly bringing up - you have x number of 3 story and y number of 11 stories.
- Per: Meg mentioned it earlier-there are ruling lines, setbacks, stepbacks. You can be taller.
- Lucia: It’s not about a set height, but we need to articulate how you can be compatible despite height.
- Sarah: What’s the effect of construction against EACH historic structure. Compatibility is not the same for each building.
- Maren: Case study—Living Oaks. This is the map of their area of adjacency. You have a range of architectural style, typology, commercial and residential. It’s one of the best examples of one I can think of that has a mixed area of adjacency. You’ve got a little bit of everything. The way this works currently is that people come in with a design context, then we do area of adjacency, and then we look at compatibility.
- Chris: How far is that area of adjacency?
- Maren: It’s between 450-500 ft out.
- Per: Those houses were defined as park-like, setbacks, etc.
- Maren: In terms of referential design, it was not looking at each property the same. They did not reference the houses in design.
- Per: LPC wasn’t talking about specific things with the blue buildings (Laurel School District)—it was more about general characteristics.
- Maren: Setback on both block faces were important. There were things called out in the review: window proportion and orientation, pattern, and detailing. The flat roof relates to nearby

commercial buildings. The materials were really interesting. In this example, they had terra cotta panels that were different in scale. We are looking for ways to integrate new, sustainable materials. We see our problems in this example: it would be hard for them to come in and know predictably what the area of adjacency is, but allowed us to have that flexibility.

- Maren: We could have metric approach. 250 ft is close to what we currently do. 500 ft is about a full block out. This is a 1000 ft buffer. The area of notification would be a little smaller than that.
- Jennifer: Could we use the character sub-districts to help with this?
- Spencer: The beauty of the metric approach in my eyes is that we could address transitions—it would address sub-districts and transitions.
- Karen: The circle does not mean that all buildings in that circle have importance and those that do may not have equal importance so I want to clarify that.
- Spencer: Maybe there is a way to look at the different variables. Maybe abutting properties are looked at differently than nearby/adjacent? Maybe the scale influences the adjacency determination. Maybe it can be a more nuanced conversation.
- Sarah: I like that approach. A taller building is going to have more affect more than smaller ones.
- Matt: But which element of integrity is being affected by height?
- Sarah: May affect one or all seven. We have to evaluate all aspects of integrity every time.
- Maren: We are running out of time, we are providing a foundation for our conversation next month. Do we have any final thoughts? Does anyone fundamentally disagree that height relationship with area of adjacency.
- Meg: I like that. Clarion did not address rural properties. Something about property line versus structure/building needed in the report. You don't want to include an empty lot. They didn't include any rural aspects to this. I think we have those situations. I think the conical idea works, but need to specify that we are looking at buildings.
- Maren: Circling back, is there a difference between abutting and further away? Is that a general direction we should pursue?
- Majority yes, Per: but there are always key buildings. Parks, view sheds, etc. that are critical to historic area that could go beyond area.
- Lucia: You might have different things you look at the further away you are.
- Per: That can be, but I don't want to exclude that a key building could be outside of area.
- Spencer: Living Oaks example, further out the broader the look.
- Matt: irony that we are looking at eras of history Can stand on the 200 Linden Street and see National Bank Tower. To me, to acknowledge that both of those are working together and acknowledge that our history is not about one single era. We are acknowledging the best of the best of those eras.
- Jennifer: You have to take historic district differently. There are some buildings that are outliers. They don't contribute to the feel of the historic district the way that most of them do. There are two or three of them. I think we need to learn from our mistakes. If they proposed today, I don't think they would be allowed. You can recognize them for what they are and recognize that they don't feel right.
- Matt: Mountain and College
- Jennifer: Those buildings aren't the same style, but the mass and scale fits.
- Spencer: There is this debate everywhere about whether scale and height should be limited.
- Jennifer: To me, what we're talking about is historic downtown. We are not downtown Denver.
- Lucia: What's the right mix that doesn't keep you locked in time, but allows you to make the bold buildings? Example of DC.

- Meg: What we're saying is historic core is different than Canyon sub-area.
- Chris: Don't just apply one element from Old Town Square to other sub-areas.
- Jennifer: What we're trying to protect is keeping it from losing vibrancy and losing what's there.
- Matt: No, each stands as each and the diversity adds value.
- Jennifer: We have different ideas of historic core and what should be protected. Outside of core different.