

DGC Committee Hearing Meeting Minutes # 3

March 24, 2022

2 p.m. – 5 p.m.

City and County of Denver ([via Zoom](#))

1. Roll Call and Introductions: 13/21 Quorum Achieved (majority = $\frac{1}{2} + 1$)= 12

Name of Committee Member		In Attendance?
Cheryl Hoffman		X
Christy Collins		X
Courtney Anderson		X
Don Larsen		X
Eric Browning		
Daniel Krausz		
Josh Radoff		X, leaving at 4pm
Paul Hutton		
Adam Meltzer		X
Chris Gorham		X
Travis Hendrix		Personal Emergency
Tom Hootman		X
Eric Entlich		
Jonathan Fertig		X
Jeff Tejral	Non-Voting	
Austin Krcmarik		X
Renee Azerbegi		
Darcie O’Conner Chinnis		
Keith Fox		X
Scott Rank		X
Stephen Sanderson	Non-Voting	
Antonio Navarra		X

2. Discussion and voting on **DGC**

a. #P1 501.3 Restoration and Maintenance of Honeybee Populations

• Support (Committee)

- Noah Wilson – supports the proposal. It’s a hot topic of research. See educational opportunities throughout community. Don’t support the way everything the way it’s currently written but do favor a revised

version.

- Committee Questions/Comments
 - Jonathan – process question. thought that there would not be option to speak further today?
 - Christy – did announce that at the end of last hearing. Left off last meeting with a motion but lost quorum.
 - Kevin – any motions?
- Motion: Motion to reject as written on screen: **Passed (12 votes yes, 0 vote no, 0 abstained)**
 - Jonathan – motion to reject because of concerns expressed 2/17
 - Josh R – are there other areas where pollinator support is available? Don't have a sense of what a site by site proposal would look like? If there are 3rd party existing policies that can be duplicated then it's reduced effort. Otherwise support rejecting now and revisiting later.
 - Christy – from process standpoint, past point of making new proposals. Landscape proposal passed with pollinator support.
 - Austin – there is more pollinator support in proposal 32.
 - Josh seconds.

b. [#140](#) 501.X Passive solar on individual lots

- Committee Questions/Comments :
 - Question on code path for residential projects. Christy and City team will figure out what is appropriate for each building type vs/ mandatory/elective, right now it is not a requirement for residential project.
 - Jonathan- seems like an old way to address passive design. Christy addressed this because Passive Haus is an option, this would be just a prescriptive first step to look at passive design.
 - Adam: I don't know how many residences are south facing with direct view, could be tough to achieve in an urban environment.
 - Josh: Is this considered a passive heating approach?

- Courtney: Happy medium, some requirements to work towards, shouldn't harm a project but would be something to consider.
- Jonathan- moving in wrong direction, work toward proven design instead. This approach may lead to overheating building, not centered in data, wishy washing passive solar application is an outdated concept and we shouldn't support this.
- Josh- agreed with Jonathan, would support data driven requirements such as envelope-side U values and air leakage and thermal bridging. Would be more like a proven design strategy. Not supportive of this proposal, but would like to see an approach more aligned with Passive House certification.
- Scott: Agree, this is stand alone piece but doesn't belong here on its own. Wouldn't want to do harm, and b/c it is not related to other measures in context.
- Motion: Motion to Reject: Josh Radoff
 - **Vote: Motion to Reject, Passed (13 votes yes, 0 vote no, 0 abstained) Adam to Second.**
 - Kristen: can this be revised by passive haus experts on the committee by a subcommittee?
 - Jonathan: no, as a passive haus expert, want that adopted wholesale. 3rd to reject.
 - Cheryl: support for tabling this conversation.
 - Adam: Passive House is In residential Chapter 4 as an option.

c. [#112a](#) 901.3.2 Dwelling Unit Deconstruction

- Committee Questions/Comments
 - Cheryl: very specific. How frequent is this type of structure built before 1930 that would do this? Is that only ADU?
 - Christy: yes there are lots of SFR neighborhoods built prior to 1930. Not limited to ADU.
 - This would fall under demo permits. Is that included in this? Would it be in mandatory code?

- Christy: We'd need to implement processes within City for this.
- Scott: do you know percentage of stock that this would apply to?
 - Kristen: about 1/3. Portland covered first third, then bumped up to 50-60% of stock. Got third of stock by looking at what year homes were built in Denver to get a threshold.
- Jonathan: Do houses built before 1930 make up the percent of buildings getting demolished or from other eras? Missing out by choosing this year.
 - Christy: We talked about this internally, general sense is that salvageable and reusable materials, there are more in pre 1930 than 50's-60's builds. Wanted highest potential of reusable materials, which would be primarily for decorative purposes.
 - Kristen: did put a lot of thought into 1930.
- Austin: Does this make asbestos or lead based paint harder to abate because of prevalence in home of this era. Would want them certified lead and asbestos free before deconstruction.
 - Kristen: for this to be relevant and marketable, could write in something specific about salvaging items that are not asbestos or lead containing materials.
 - Cheryl: In commercial deconstruction, must abate first. Purpose is to keep someone out of harm's way. Intent is right but verbiage needs to be modified.
- Adam: have lived in Portland and Denver. Is a good proposal that can be better by increasing the year to 1940.
- Cheryl: Says contractors need to be familiar. Language is more of placeholder and would need development in future to clarify certification or familiarity with proper deconstruction. Tie in Landmark to this.
- Antonio: agree. Most homes of this era are double brick façade. Is

there a way to modify exception for unsafe structure. Is it 105.1?

Kristen has example language from Portland.

- Antonio would like to see landscape and hardscape materials added too.

Scott: Demo contractor is required to submit a permit application.

Can that process say they've received proper training or certification?

- Christy: Yes, agree this would be ideal.
- Antonio: can we make two different demo permit categories for this? Like the idea as well. How do we track this, do we trust the contractor's discretion? Christy responds that a pre inspection would be preferred but would want to avoid adding too many more inspections.
- Kristen: salvaged materials are listed. If market doesn't support those materials, they must be recycled.

- **Motion: Motion to Modify passes**

- **Motion: Motion to Approve as-is, with modifications intended, by Antonio. Second by Adam.**

Antonio modification: change year to 1940. Exemption for unsafe language from Portland. "structurally unsafe or hazardous to human life", salvage landscape material and steps, stone.

Scott: add to modification to remove the asbestos from exemption because it's already required within state code.

- **Vote: Motion to Approve with modifications by**

subcommittee: Passed (X votes yes, X vote no, X abstained) by Antonio.

Seconded by Scott.

Antonio will be on subcommittee

- Motion: Motion to approve as written on screen:

- **Vote: Motion to Approve with modifications: Passed (12 votes yes, 0 vote no, 0abstained)**

d. [#48b](#) 501.3.6 Glare Requirements

- Committee Questions/Comments
 - Cheryl: clarifying how what is mandatory within DGC versus building code.
 - Christy: will determine at the end what is mandatory versus elective within DGC.
 - Adam Includes lit signage?
 - Kristen: not in here but could add.
- Motion: Motion to Modify by Adam. Seconded by Cheryl.
 - To add illumination of exterior signage with language from LEED credit.
 - Modification pass by 10

Vote: Motion to modify X votes yes, X opposed, X abstain
- Motion: Motion to approve as written on screen: by Courtney. Seconded by Adam
- **Vote: Motion to Approve with modifications: Passed (10 votes yes, 2 vote no, 0 abstained)**