



Public Workshop 2

Reno Park Historic District Design Guidelines

Thursday, November 10th, 2016

The City of Arvada is collecting comments from the public on the Reno Park Historic District Design Guidelines document. The guidelines are intended to assist property owners in developing projects in the district that will preserve historic resources, accommodate change and maintain the character of the district.

Agenda

Introduction	6:00pm
Presentation of Design Guidelines	6:15pm
Workshop Exercise: Comment Sheet	7:00pm
Question and Answer	7:30pm

Comments

Printed copies of individual chapters of the Reno Park Historic District Design Guidelines document are on each table. Please provide comments below on each chapter of the design guidelines document.

Are you a (Check all that apply)?

- Property Owner in the Historic District
 Design Professional
 Real Estate Professional
- Arvada Resident
 Other _____

1. Do you have comments on how to use the design guidelines document (see design guidelines Introduction)?

For more Information contact:

Cheryl Drake
 Senior Planner
 City of Arvada
 Planning & Zoning Div.
 8101 Ralston Road
 Arvada, CO
 80001-7000

(720) 898-7435
cheryl@arvada.org

Consultants:

Winter & Company
 1265 Yellow Pine Ave
 Boulder, CO 80304
 303-440-8445
www.winterandcompany.net

Turn the page over for additional questions and space for comments.

Different Types of Design Review

Please read through the following design review descriptions. Then, check the design review option you think is most appropriate for the Reno Park Historic District.

The way in which design review occurs also can vary. While most cities use a process that requires compliance, some are “advisory,” in that they require a review step, but compliance is voluntary. Others are linked to incentives and bonuses that the city may offer in exchange for projects that incorporate elements that the city seeks to promote. When, for example, a city offers a bonus for including certain desired uses or features in a development, then compliance with the design guidelines may be required.

Option 1: Advocacy Program

In this approach, there is no formal review function. Design guidelines are simply distributed as a “handbook,” to use as an educational tool. Property owners are encouraged to use the guidance. There is an initial cost to establish the system. To be effective some on-going promotion of the guidelines is desirable. The degree of predictability of the outcome of this approach is relatively low.

Option 2: Advisory Design Review

Some communities mandate that a proposal for improvements must be reviewed, but no compliance with the recommendations is required. The objective is to provide a forum for discussion of design, at which a review committee can seek to persuade the owner to follow their recommendations. The objective is to raise the bar in terms of quality. Advisory review is relatively easy to administer, because formal hearing procedures need not be followed.

Anecdotal reports indicate that in an Advisory Review, “good” projects get better, but “not so good” projects remain so. This may suggest that those who are already following the guidelines as sound principles of design do benefit from the critique, while those who are not interested simply go through the steps required.

Option 3: Incentive-Based

Sometimes communities use the guidelines with special incentive programs to allow for flexibility. For example, if a project would like to encroach into the front yard set back to allow for a deeper back yard. It may be awarded if the project is reviewed using the design guidelines.

With this type of flexibility, compatibility with context can become even more important, and therefore design review may be required in order to determine that the benefit is appropriate for a specific project. In this case, the owner voluntarily enters into the program, but then compliance is required in order to receive the benefits.

In this approach, the owner voluntarily enters the process, in order to receive the benefits available. Once doing so, compliance with the guidelines is required.

Option 4: Regulated District

In this approach, both the design review step and compliance with the findings are required. This appears in the more conventional design review overlay districts. Review may be required for all construction work, or only for that which hits a defined threshold. Larger projects that exceed a certain square footage, lot coverage or height are examples.

This approach requires formal administration, with proper due process. Hearings are noticed, and the owner and other affected parties have the right to be heard. Record keeping also is more formal.