

AGENDA

JOINT WORK SESSION CITY OF ASPEN PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSIONS & PITKIN COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

**Council Chambers
Aspen, Colorado**

August 12, 2010

8:30AM WORKSESSION

1. Review of the Aspen Area Community Plan update
 - a. Review of overall document

11:30AM ADJOURN WORKSESSION

MEMORANDUM

TO: City and County Planning & Zoning Commissions

FROM: Jessica Garrow, Long Range Planner, City of Aspen
Ellen Sassano, Long Range Planner, Pitkin County
Ben Gagnon, Special Projects Planner, City of Aspen

THRU: Chris Bendon, Director, City of Aspen Community Development
Department
Cindy Houben, Director, Pitkin County Community Development
Department

DATE OF MEMO: August 10, 2010

DATE OF MEETING: August 12, 2010 / 8:30 am – 11:30 am / Council Chambers

RE: **Review of 2010 Draft AACP**

SUMMARY: At the August 5th meeting of the joint P&Zs, the group conducted an exercise intended to clarify and more clearly define the meaning of the phrases “Small Town Character,” and “Quality of Life” – two phrases often used in the draft 2010 AACP. From a planning perspective, more specific language means a greater likelihood of reflecting an accurate consensus, and more effective implementation of the AACP. Staff will incorporate the findings of this exercise into the final document draft. (See Exhibit A and B, for the results of the exercise.)

ATTENDANCE: Staff would like to congratulate everyone for the incredible investment they have made in time and energy for the last 18 months – and remind everyone that the joint P&Zs have completed the initial drafts of all the chapters in the 2010 AACP!

This was an outstanding accomplishment. Staff is very confident that the 2010 AACP will be an important and effective document that will be recognized as charting a course for the next 10 years. While there is light at the end of the tunnel, there are still many issues to be addressed by the joint P&Zs, and these decisions will be critically important in shaping the new AACP.

Considering the heavy schedule of both the City and County P&Zs in the last 18 months, it’s not surprising that some attrition is occurring. During planning for the current AACP process, staff wanted to avoid repeating the phenomena of volunteer attrition that occurred during the process of generating the 2000 AACP.

Staff is concerned to see lower attendance at recent joint P&Z meetings, and believes the best work has been done on the AACP during fully attended meetings. For example, only five P&Z members attended the last meeting on August 5th. We strongly encourage full attendance for the final review meetings on the AACP that are scheduled for the rest of August and early

September. If you are unable to attend a meeting, it would be helpful if you could provide any comments you have via email prior to the meeting so the group has the benefit of your comments.

WORK OF THE EDITING GROUP: Staff would like to thank the Editing Group for the work they have done in clarifying the language of several AACP chapters during the last six weeks – and we will continue to appreciate your work in the next month.

REVISITING SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES: It should be no surprise that we have deferred some issues of substance during the initial review of the AACP. Staff hopes that revisiting substantive issues will result in a better plan that more accurately reflects the consensus of the joint P&Zs and the public.

As we revisit these substantive issues, staff suggests that P&Z members propose specific changes or additions to the language in the draft plan. Staff is not suggesting that we limit discussion – we’re hoping for a lively and productive discussion that focuses on specific changes to existing language.

There is one element of Robert’s Rules of Order that staff believes may be valuable as we complete the draft plan: Any P&Z member has the ability to “call the question.” This is a motion that can be made when someone believes the issue at hand has been fully argued and discussed. A vote is then taken on whether to continue discussion, or hold a final vote on whether to change specific language in the plan.

At this stage in the overall AACP process – considering the need to move toward a second round of public feedback and ultimate adoption of the Plan – this kind of motion by P&Z members can be efficient, while also reflecting consensus.

STATUS OF AACP CHAPTERS: The following table shows the steps of final review that have been accomplished to-date. It also includes a list of substantive issues that P&Z members have indentified to staff as needing to be revisited before the P&Zs issue a final draft of the AACP. The last column contains staff comments on what tasks have been completed, as well as suggestions regarding the remaining substantive issues.

Chapters	Editing Group Review	Outstanding Issues	Staff Comment
Env Quality	Complete	Connection to Managing Growth related to Floor Area Reductions for energy Consumption.*	The Editing Group had a specific question regarding one Action Item (See Exhibit C).
Transportation	Complete	None	
Aspen Idea	Complete		Staff to determine if Institute will be partner in Action Items

Lifelong Aspenite	To be reviewed later this month.	None	Staff + Resource Experts will implement P&Z & Editing Group comments.
Historic Preservation	To be reviewed this week.	None	
Parks, Rec, Open Space and Trails	No need for Edit Group review	None	P&Z asked staff to implement minor language changes.
West of Castle Creek Area	To be reviewed later this month.	Some P&Z members have requested that the plan include a focus on the lower Castle and Maroon Creek areas (including Highlands), either as part of the West of Castle Creek Area Chapter, or elsewhere, as an integrated component of the Plan.*	This Chapter will be the basis for a more specific <i>West of Castle Creek Sub Area Plan</i> to be generated in early 2011, per Land Use Action Item 1.a. The Castle & Maroon Creek Valleys contain a mix of City and County jurisdictions, and a mix of commercial, recreational, institutional and residential uses. The Plan currently includes no specific direction for future growth in these two corridors, though the Managing Growth section includes many initiatives that will impact the area. The group needs to discuss this issue.
Housing	After August joint meeting, new draft chapter goes to Edit Group for final review, if time allows.	Consolidation with Frontiers Group, APCHA and P&Zs	The Housing Frontiers Group had been working with APCHA to make some changes to the draft chapter. They will be invited to an upcoming P&Z meeting to review the changes. The P&Zs can incorporate their proposal as you see fit.
Growth & Economy	Complete	Define UGB Boundaries <hr/> Lessons from Infill 2005/07 <hr/> Population trends	Pitkin County staff will present options for amendment of UGB boundary in Airport area. <hr/> Staff to present Infill review, 2000 to Present; P&Z to discuss additional AACP language. <hr/> Staff presents statistical trends

			in population segments; P&Z to discuss additional AACP language.
		Managing Growth Etc. (Identified by Editing Group)*	P&Z to discuss additional AACP language (See Exhibit C).

* See specific list of “outstanding issues” identified by Editing Group in Exhibit C.

ESTABLISHING A LIST OF SUBSTANTIVE TOPICS TO REVISIT: Staff suggests that the P&Zs begin the August 12th meeting by establishing a tentative list of substantive topics to revisit – understanding that we can’t entirely anticipate the way the discussions will go, and other substantive topics might be proposed for discussion.

A tentative list will allow staff to establish agendas for the five P&Z meetings scheduled in August, and be prepared with relevant background information. A tentative list will also allow staff to schedule agendas for the six meetings of the Editing Group scheduled in August. In other words, staff won’t forward draft chapters to the Editing Group until substantive discussions are completed, and the P&Zs have issued a final draft for review by the Editing Group. Staff is prepared with background information for most of the substantive topics listed above for P&Z discussions at the August 12th meeting.

UPCOMING SCHEDULE: The following is the schedule for AACP meetings in August. Please reply by e-mail to identify the meetings you will not be able to attend.

Thursday, Aug 12, 8:30am – noon in Council Chambers: Decide on an approach to the document review. Begin discussions on follow-up items.

Thursday, Aug 19, 10am – 1pm in Sister Cities: Continue discussion on follow-up items.

Tuesday, Aug 24, 4:30 – 7:30pm in Sister Cities: Continue discussion on follow-up items. Review draft plan.

Thursday Aug 26, 8:30am – noon in Rio Grande: Continue review of draft plan.

Tuesday, Aug 31, 4:30 – 7:30 in Sister Cities: Review Housing Chapter with Housing Frontiers Group and Housing Board.

Thursday, Sept 2, 8:30am – noon in Council Chambers: Complete review of draft plan.

Additional meetings for the public process and final plan adoption will be scheduled for the fall and winter.

ATTACHMENTS:

Exhibit A: Results of exercise regarding “Small Town Character”

Exhibit B: Results of exercise regarding “Quality of Life”

Exhibit C: List of Outstanding Issues identified by the editing group

What is Small Town Character?

The following chart reflects an exercise conducted by the joint Planning and Zoning Commissions on August 5, 2010. The intent was to provide more specific language on the meaning of the phrase: Small Town Character.

Built Environment	Community
Small buildings with a few large civic structures	Small town with big city culture
Variety of building heights in downtown	Socio-economic integration
Open space, small parks between buildings in downtown, room to breathe	People say hello on the street
Open space in residential areas, i.e. yards and small parks	Value and tolerate individuality
A range of views: medium range and long range	Civic engagement and dialogue
Strong aesthetic experience	Respectful discord
Messy in an artistic way	Living close to work
Modest, understated, organic	Emotional sense of belonging
Design that respects historical context	Attachment to place: Responsible caretaking
Welcoming, non-exclusive and casual gathering places	Personal investment in community is primary, versus Aspen as commodity

What is Quality of Life?

The following chart reflects an exercise conducted by the joint Planning and Zoning Commissions on August 5, 2010. The intent was to provide more specific language on the meaning of the phrase: Quality of Life.

Community	Essentials	Mobility	Environment
Welcoming	Good jobs	Easy access to variety of places:	Clean Air
Lively/Vital	Adequate pay	Downtown, rivers trails, parks, work, public lands, fun	Clean Water
Diversity: People, ages, activities, buildings, ideas	Housing		Open Space
Fully integrated	Safety	Freedom of movement: Walk, bike, bus, car	Scenic Quality
Volunteer ethic	Adequate health care		
Enough time to: Recreate, meditate, congregate, participate, quiet enjoyment			
Broad, inclusive and respectful civic engagement			
Being Open: Views, skies, minds open to change			

Exhibit C, List of Outstanding Issues Identified by Editing Group

The Editing Group has identified a number of issues and statements that they believe should be revisited by the entire P&Z group. Staff has formatted these issues by chapter, and has included the original language and then a comment on what the Editing Group felt needed to be brought back for a larger discussion.

Environmental Quality

1. Action Item 1.c in Renewable Energy: “Evaluate potential energy requirements and quantify greenhouse gas emissions if the Urban Growth Boundary was completely built out according to current zoning. Consider whether floor area should be decreased to conserve energy and reduce trips. (LT – P, EH, CI, T, R, B, U)”
 - a. The Editing Group wanted to review this with the full P&Zs. Does the group want to wait to reduce floor area (as called for in the Growth Management Chapter) until after the results of this study are completed? An argument could be to do it now (reduce floor area now because of other reasons like neighborhood character or construction impacts) or focus on this first and then use it as a main argument for reducing floor areas.

Transportation

1. Transportation Philosophy: The Philosophy includes the following paragraph related to the Airport. “The airport is an important component of our multi-modal transportation system and we support its mission to provide safe, efficient, reliable and environmentally-responsible airport services and facilities. *We recognize that the airport offers an opportunity to help achieve some of our transportation goals by reducing the number of people coming to our community via vehicles, and from other airports.* It is essential to integrate the airport with alternative modes of transportation to diminish reliance upon rental vehicles.”
 - a. This paragraph was written awkwardly, so the Editing Group attempted to clarify the language. The Editing Group did not make edits to the second sentence (in Underline Italics) but felt it was confusing and wanted some feedback from the full P&Zs on what was originally meant.

Managing Growth & Economic Sustainability

1. Statement from Philosophy: “We have a longstanding history and strong ethic of growth management. Beginning in the mid-1970s, land use regulations were based on the desire to preserve the natural environment, a socially diverse community, and the unique heritage of our built environment. Growth management has evolved from a system originally designed to keep growth from out-pacing traditional infrastructure and fiscal capacity to a system that also directs growth to address changing community priorities and needs.”

- a. The Editing Group wanted the group to consider if it is possible to sustain our economic future without the “growth” in “growth management.”
2. General Policy Addition
 - a. The Editing Group felt that a new policy and action item that states something along the lines of “Growth should be transitional in character throughout the UGB to ensure that the entire UGB is not built out the same way throughout” should be added to the document.
 3. Policy 1 under Residential: “Ensure that City and County codes are consistent within the Urban Growth Boundary, with respect to the location, size and dimensional standards of homes to discourage jurisdiction-shopping, and reduce real estate speculation.”
 - a. The Editing Group added the second part of the sentence (“with respect to the location, size and dimensional standards of homes to discourage jurisdiction-shopping, and reduce real estate speculation”) in an effort to explain the policy more clearly. Because “reducing real estate speculation” was a topic of intense conversation when the P&Zs were writing this chapter, the group wanted to bring this back.
 4. Policy 2 under Residential: “Control the location and reduce the size of homes in order to:
 - protect the natural visual quality of river and stream corridors and mountainsides;
 - protect our small town community character and historical heritage;
 - reduce environmental degradation;
 - limit consumption of energy and building materials;
 - limit the burden on public infrastructure and ongoing public operating costs; and
 - reduce short- and long-term job generation impacts, such as traffic congestion and demand for affordable housing.”
 - a. The Editing Group wanted to add “Limit variances to reduce externalities” to the bulleted list in the Policy and felt some discussion by the full P&Z might be needed.
 5. Residential Action Item 2e: “(e) Explore other possible “awards” for receiving sites (aside from FAR). (I-P)”
 - a. The Editing Group raised the issues of TDRs in general and wanted to discuss if the TDR Programs should be continued. This would be a dramatic departure from current city and county policy, so the group wanted to raise the issue with the entire P&Zs.
 6. Lodging Policy 1: The original Policy stated, “Lodging development or redevelopment downtown should be modest in bulk, mass, and scale.” It also included the following staff note, “staff note: review this when we get to AABC area conversation.” The Editing Group revised the Policy to state, “Lodging should be modest in bulk, mass, and scale.”

- a. The policy was revised to apply equally everywhere (originally it only applied to downtown). As now written, the Policy is not as nuanced as written in the West of Castle Creek Scenic Policy: “Density, size and scale of new development and redevelopment in the West of Castle Creek Area should maintain the open views of the natural environment seen as one travels through this portion of the Highway 82 corridor.”
7. Lodging Action Item 1.a and 1.b: The original Action Items stated, “*1.a Use the City’s 3-D model of the downtown area to illustrate the kind of development that existing zoning and the City’s Lodging & Commercial Design Guidelines would result in. (I-P) 1.b Define “modest” and amend zoning based on the findings of 1.a. (I-P)*”

The Editing Group did not make substantial changes to 1.a, but did change 1.b to state, “*1.b Amend zoning and the City’s Lodging & Commercial Design Guidelines based on the findings of 1.a if necessary to ensure modest and appropriate development. (I-P)*”

- a. The Editing Group wanted to bring the changed language to the group to ensure it still gets the group where they want to go. Specifically, the changed language of Action Item 1.b no longer asks us to define modest, and simply states that development should be modest and appropriate. Does the full P&Z feel it is important to include defining modest as an Action Item?
8. The Editing Group wanted to have a discussion about rolling back what infill codes and the commercial design guidelines allow today.
- a. Staff Note: The “Infill Codes” of 2005 were amended in 2007 to the code in place today. In addition, new commercial design guidelines were adopted in 2007 in an effort to ensure development and redevelopment is not homogenous and is more consistent with community values.
9. Lodging Policy 2: “Lodging should be designed to facilitate interaction between visitors and residents through the promotion of lodge amenities and local businesses.”
- a. The Editing Group wanted to revisit the question of supporting on-site lodge amenities, considering job generation and mass & scale issues. A different approach would be to limit on-site amenities in favor of “downtown as amenity.”
10. Lodging Action Item 3.b: The Editing Group added the following Action Item, “3.b Explore methods to maintain the inventory of smaller lodges. (I-P)”
- a. The Policy for this Action Item states, “Encourage development or redevelopment to maintain a diverse inventory.” The Action Items did not originally refer to maintaining smaller lodges, so the Editing Group wanted to bring this back to the full group for discussion.

11. Lodging Action Item 4.a: “Amend City code to eliminate the provision for new multi-family free market residential as the only use on a parcel in the Lodge Zone District. (I-P)”
 - a. The Editing Group wondered if lodge meant multi-family free-market residential, and if so, do we actually want FM multi-family to be allowed in the Lodge zone district. The Editing Group want to discuss this with the full group.
12. The Editing Group noticed that there is no mention of Highlands in the Commercial section of Managing Growth and wanted the full P&Z to discuss if that should be added, or if the other Policies and Action Items covered Highlands adequately.
13. Commercial Action Item 3.d: “Explore code changes to allow restaurants and bars on the Pedestrian Malls by right, while requiring retail to gain conditional use approval. (I-P)”
 - a. The Editing Group wanted to have more discussion about this topic with the full P&Z.
14. The Editing Group noticed that there is no mention of mass and scale in the Public Sector/Institutional/Non-Profit section and wanted the full P&Z to discuss if any language should be added.
15. Pace of Construction Action Item 1.e: “Establish an objective list of community benefits through which an applicant may earn “points” under a pacing system to gain preferential treatment such as being moved toward the “head of the line,” such as awarding points for older homes to give them priority in the pacing system. (I – P)”
 - a. The Editing Group wanted clarification from Jack regarding his idea to award points for older homes. Do they get points only if they maintain the home, or do they get points if they demolish?

Sustaining the Aspen Idea

1. Housing Policies and Action Items: Policy 1 states, “Ensure that housing is available for visiting artists and presenters.”

The Action Items state, “1.a Explore options for housing guest artists and presenters of local non-profit organizations. 1.b. Create a program in which owners of Accessory Dwelling Units are incentivized to provide seasonal housing, or occasional use housing, to local non-profits. 1.c Explore using web-based arts calendar/center to promote and coordinate shared housing opportunities for visiting artists.”

- a. The Editing Group was uncomfortable with this section and would like to review it with the full P&Z because it prioritizes a user group for affordable housing eligibility.