

# Managing Growth

## Small Group Meeting Summary

Sessions were held on October 15, 18, and 21, 2010 in the Council Chambers Room. Policies are in **bold font**. Action Items are regular front. Public feedback is inserted directly under the relevant Policy or Action Item, and is in **large font, bold and italic**

### I. Managing Growth Policies & Action Items

I.1. Achieve sustainable growth practices to ensure the long term viability and stability of our community. ***Six people agreed and four people disagreed with this policy statement.***

***Will not work because change happens. No understanding of economics***

***Sustainable – How doe be deal with the “bust” economy***

***“Equal level of support growth in bust economies and understand growth boom times.” (flexibility!)***

***Idea sounds good but reality is government cannot and should not try to overpower the marketplace – there will be booms and busts.***

***Government can’t do much to ease busts, and too much control over booms will result in rapid cost increases, damaging community balance***

***What are key components of sustainability?***

***Define sustainable***

***Change is treated like growth***

***System needs flexibility to flow with the economy***

I.1.a Revise the GMQS to include quotas for residential demolition and replacement. (I – P, AO)

***Don’t agree***

Quotas for redevelopment are not appropriate

I.1.b Explore expanding the GMQS objective points system for all development, including demolition and replacement, that encourages community benefits. (I – P, AO)

Quota based on lack of infrastructure

I.1.c Update the GMQS to account for job generation and mitigation studies (see Mitigation Action Items in Section VII). (I – P)

I.1.d Where development quotas have been restricted to address inadequate infrastructure, explore allowing the restriction to “sunset” at such time as specific infrastructure improvements or other accomplishments have been made to ensure improved quality of life. (LT – P)

**I.2. Restore public confidence in the development process. *Nine people agreed and one person disagreed with this policy statement.***

***Confidence is only achievable if elected and non-elected public officials are on the up and up.***

***Process is totally discretionary right now. Fear/loathing/recrimination Not sure people do not have confidence in the process***

***Growth is growth: Keep it on equal footing for private and free market***

***Use housing funds to create jobs***

***Think outside the box: we need jobs***

***Process has become so complex than only wealthy can do it***

***There is a skewed public process on some issues. How do we get info out and gain public trust? (Hate seeing Council and city staff attacked) There is anger out there but not all the facts are out there.***

***Need more justice in the process.***

***The developer should be able to create confidence not the other way around***

***I don't think people agree on what the character of the community really is***

***Need alignment of review through phases of process***

***Ensure greater objectivity based on the AACP and established code***

***Regulations don't matter to elected officials. Not the land use code that needs to be amended, it's the mindset that elected officials don't have to follow them***

***The action items need to speak to process changes rather than specifics like 1.2d***

***Public confidence has more to do with the process than the regulations***

***Amend policies for greater clarity***

**I.2.a Amend the land use codes to create a greater expectation of certainty and predictability in the review process. (I – P)**

***Agree strongly***

***HPC too much on its own, integrate HPC more with overall review***

***Decrease all dimensional allowances by 25%***

***Use master planning process; include open space and contain sprawl***

***Balance growth management control with free market forces***

**I.2.b Create a publicly accessible UGB-wide 3-D model that shows what development is permitted under the land use codes. (I – P)**

I.2.c Amend the PUD regulations to address the placement of allowable mass and scale, rather than using the process to exceed underlying dimensional requirements. (I – P)

**Agree strongly**

I.2.d Amend City and County codes to establish an absolute height limit that can be achieved through a PUD or other process. (I – P)

**Agree strongly**

I.3. Our public policies should be informed by reliable data on population segments and their impacts. **Six people agreed and three people disagreed with this policy statement.**

**Data would have to come from private industries and universities.**

**Data integrity as risk of how data is grouped and interpreted.**

**Use census data**

**Education – get word out to public**

**The fear is that the data will result in limitations on development in those segments.**

**All data should be reliable – don't isolate “population segments”**

**Data needs to be interpreted well**

**Too vague**

I.3.a Use Population Segment Chart as a starting point for tracking population data in the Urban Growth Boundary. Require yearly updates to be included in City and County Annual Reports. (I - P)

I.3.b Project growth/decline in future population segments by using Population Segment Chart, build-out studies, job generation estimates, Census tracking and State Demographer's Office reports. (LT – P)

I.4. Our public policies should be informed by reliable data on new construction. **Five people agreed and three people disagreed with this policy statement.**

**Better data integrity and better data analysis toed in with new construction. Knowledge from periodicals, higher education, private industry**

**Need info on number of construction workers and vehicles on-site**

**Need reliable data**

I.4.a Ensure there is a reliable method for tracking all new square footage and redeveloped square footage, by use. Require yearly updates to be included in City and County Annual Reports. (I - P)

## **II. Pacing Construction Policies & Action Items**

II.1. Establish a construction pacing system that respects quiet enjoyment of our community and neighborhoods. *Three people agreed and eleven people disagreed with this policy statement.*

*Revenue, financial and industry vary annually*

*“Acts of God, financial risks, social & political risks, etc” vary over periods of time.*

*Explore different types of construction may have different feasibility factors.*

*Add the word “flexible” (“Establish a flexible...”)*

*We should focus on managing construction impacts (noise, traffic etc.) rather than pace*

*Need coordinated construction management (IPD: Integrated Project Delivery)*

*Should limit development in other ways*

*Changes dramatically year-to-year; the amount of development creates impacts*

*Everyone should have the right to build*

*Allow construction to occur at a pace that is within the community’s resources*

*Favor private property not the call of government*

*Manage construction through methods such as tolls*

*Does this include redevelopment?*

*Need to manage impacts of construction*

*Pacing will have negative impacts on cost of living*

*Pacing has nothing to do with cost of living*

*Pace of construction is already self-regulating (boom + bust)*

*Could have system that adjusts on the fly if things get really crazy as economic climate changes*

*Number of scrape and replace projects should be slowed down*

*Pace system would smooth out booms and busts*

*Pacing should be loose and subjective, not arbitrary*

*Quiet enjoyment is a good goal*

*Permitting process may not be best tool for pacing*

*Mitigate construction impacts instead of pacing*

*Pacing could mean costly delays to those waiting for permit*

*Policy ignores the marketplace and external factors*

*Pace will be regulated by market conditions*

**Regulation of pacing will set the pace**  
**I don't see how this is different from existing GMQS**  
**Short-term quiet enjoyment should not overrule long-term community health and vitality**  
**After going through land use approval, more uncertainty re: when you can get permit = impediment to reinvestment**  
**This policy makes development more expensive**  
**Concerned there is a not a good example of this working – two others agree**  
**Needs to be flexible to adapt to market conditions – big challenge**  
**Where is the economic sustainability in this chapter?**

II.1.a Establish a “target” year, determined to be acceptable in terms of construction activity, to be used as baseline for a building permit cap. (I – P)

**Fluctuations in the economy should be considered in the pace**  
**This doesn't make sense**

II.1.b Amend and coordinate City and County codes to pace the level of construction activity on an annual basis. (I – P)

**Perhaps use a “sliding scale” rather than a “fixed scale” (example: fixed would be “We only allow 10 permits.” While sliding would be “We allow 10 permits, but it is variable based on factors such as the economy, unique opportunity, etc.)**  
**Don't just quantify, try to qualify based on current conditions.**  
**Pace the rate of construction in the commercial core, per block to keep businesses viable**  
**Building permit process should be quicker and more efficient**

II.1.c Amend codes to include residential demolition and replacement (“scrape and replace” development) in the pacing system. (I – P)

**Don't think it should extent to scrape and replace; need marketability to sell home**  
**Needs to be a reasonable timeframe to wait – say 6 months**  
**We won't see the same frenzy again so it doesn't matter so much**

II.1.d Explore exemptions for certain development, including creation of affordable housing, conversion of free-market housing to affordable housing, and projects that apply for a building permit and act on it within one year of a development order. (I – P)

**Also consider external environment and how it affects project feasibility (e.g. the one year frame may be affected by external considerations)**

**I like that this would make projects competitive with each other to be the best for the community (employee housing, art, public spaces)**

**Public projects should not be exempt (four others agree with this statement; one disagrees)**

**For projects with free market and affordable housing, it should not be fast-tracked; consider entire project**

II.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 that have not undergone significant redevelopment to date. (I – P)

**People who live here full-time should be exempt from pace restrictions**

II.1.f Establish a percentage square footage increase that is allowable per year . (I – P)

**Remove “allowable” and substitute “desirable”**

**Use sq. ft. total as a variable factor**

**May be premature and not a priority**

**May not be an issue over the next decade**

**Need more detail to explain this item**

II.1.g Explore the role of vested rights as a tool in a pacing system. (I – P, AO)

**“vested rights” could be “variable” in the pacing system,**

### **III. Residential Sector Policies & Action Items**

III.1. Ensure City and County codes are consistent in the vicinity of city/county boundaries to discourage jurisdiction-shopping, and prevent sudden shifts in the character of neighborhoods. ***Four people agreed and six people disagreed with this policy statement.***

***Just let individual cases negotiate a solution (variances)  
Not really concerned with jurisdiction-shopping; lots of regulations already, except when government doesn't apply rules to itself  
Hard to disagree with principles in this section overall; action items should be reviewed on neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis  
Define jurisdiction shopping  
Too much use of the word "discourage"  
I don't think this is a big problem  
Residential should always be compatible with the neighborhood  
Maybe "sudden shifts" are natural  
Establish city-county cooperation in boundary areas  
Establish guidelines for appropriate development based on topography, water resources, infrastructure etc.***

III. 1.a Amend City and County codes to implement the policy. (I - P)

III.1.b Establish an Inter-Governmental Agreement regarding annexation policy in the area within the Urban Growth Boundary. (I - P)

III.1.c Explore mechanisms for a joint review of development in the Urban Growth Boundary. (I - P)

III.2. 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 and protect the quality of our rivers and streams;
- Limit consumption of energy and building materials;
- Limit the burden on public infrastructure and ongoing public operating costs;
- Reduce short- and long-term job generation impacts, such as traffic congestion and demand for affordable housing; and
- Limit zoning variances to reduce impacts on the neighborhood and the community.

***Three people agreed and seven people disagreed with this policy statement.***

***Controlling location and size won't accomplish "in order to" items***

***I'm only really concerned with the last bullet point  
Stream corridors are important  
4,000 sf basement exemptions should apply throughout county  
Don't see how smaller homes result in this list of outcomes  
Small town character includes large homes that are here  
Avoid discussion of size of homes; not government's responsibility  
Agree primarily about size  
Reduce hard cap and eliminate sub-grade space  
Do you want rows of homes the same size?  
Shouldn't tie home size to limiting energy consumption or  
environmental degradation  
This document appears to stop growth, not in favor  
This will push people out of cemetery lane where locals still live need  
to avoid this regulation***

III.2.a City and County Planning and Zoning Commissions should jointly and comprehensively examine and improve the following code regulations:

- i. City 8040 Greenline regulations
- ii. City slope requirements (FAR, Density)
- iii. City and County Stream Margin Review
- iv. County site plan review on slopes
- v. County slope requirements (FAR, Density)
- vi. County scenic review (*I - P, P/OS, AO*)

III.2.b Explore prohibiting development on slopes of 30% or greater. (*I - P, AO*)

III.2.c Amend County code to reduce the maximum "hard cap" for house sizes within Urban Growth Boundary from 15,000 s.f. to 7,500 s.f. Amend City code to create a 5,000 sq. ft. hard cap. (*I - P*)

***Why limit to 7500 sq ft on large county lots? Makes more sense closer to city limits  
5,000 sf limit on duplexes (Cemetery lane) limits value going forward for those who haven't yet redeveloped***

III.2.d Amend the City and County codes to reduce or eliminate FAR exemptions for items such as sub-grade space and garages. (*I - P*)

***This is not necessary. This penalizes those who haven't already rebuilt; won't reduce mass and scale above ground – two others agree***

III.2.e Ensure the viability of the County's Transferable Development Right (TDR) program when making changes to the hard cap on house sizes in the County. Scope of work would include:

- i. Estimate future TDR supply;
- ii. Review potential adjustments to ensure adequate demand, such as reducing the FAR awarded for a TDR;
- iii. Explore a sliding FAR scale for TDRs based on scenic or other value related to the sending site;
- iv. Explore potential for inter-jurisdictional TDR exchange between County and City;
- v. Explore other possible “awards” for receiving sites (aside from FAR). *(I - P)*

III.2.f Evaluate the City and County TDR programs to ensure they are serving a valuable public purpose. *(I - P)*

III.2.g Explore a new square footage buy-back program, such as a Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) program or a conservation easement approach, for projects that are vested for more than 5,750 square feet to encourage owners not to exceed that size. *(LT - P)*

III.2.h Amend City and County codes to address proper location and solar orientation of homes. *(I - P, B, CI)*

III.2.i Expand and strengthen the County’s “scenic zones,” especially along Highway 82 toward Independence Pass, up Castle Creek Road, and up Maroon Creek Road, to limit the visual impacts of growth. *(I - P)*

III.2.j Amend the County code to establish a sliding scale FAR for substandard size parcels in the AR-10 zone. *(I - P)*

III.2.k Amend City and County codes to make variance criteria more stringent in order to limit the impact of those variances on neighborhoods. *(I - P)*

**III.3. Protect the visual quality and character of residential neighborhoods by reducing site coverage, mass, and scale. *Three people agreed and six people disagreed with this policy statement.***

***Allow some variety in design***

***Do you cap what happens going forward and allow what has been done already?***

***Not sure community is concerned with this***

***How do you define each neighborhood***

***What do residents of each neighborhood want?***

***Hard to have one policy for every neighborhood***

***It’s hard to define community character; lots of variability around town***

***Trees can obstruct views as much as homes do***

***Neighborhood character includes larger homes***

***This policy would change and not protect character***

***Why reduce now?***

III.3.a Amend City and County codes to reduce allowable site coverage and create Residential Design Standards customized by neighborhood. (I - P)

III.3.b Explore the potential of form-based design standards, and volumetric floor area calculations. (I - P)

III.3.c Study development in historic town-site areas of Aspen and other similar mountain communities such as Crested Butte, Steamboat Springs and Telluride in order to create standards that preserve visual quality and character. (I - P)

**III.4. Encourage permanent residents to remain in existing free market homes. *Five people agreed and five people disagreed with this policy statement.***

***Good idea***

***Property taxes are running people out***

III.4.a Explore incentives to encourage local residents to stay in the homes they own, such as

- i. Voluntary RO deed restrictions, temporary or permanent;
- ii. Reduced property taxes;
- iii. City/county fee abatements; and
- iv. Faster processing of land use applications and zoning permits (I - P, AO, APCHA)

***How will faster processing keep people in home?***

## **IV. Lodging Policies & Action Items**

IV.1 Lodging should be modest in bulk, mass, and scale in order to:

- Create certainty in land development;
- Prioritize maintaining our mountain views;
- Protect our existing lodges;
- Protect our small town community character and historical heritage;
- 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.

***Two people agreed and eleven people disagreed with this policy statement.***

***“Lodging should be modest” is meaningless. Is Vegas modest?  
Like the maintaining views concept  
Existing lodging needs to be able to adapt with the times.  
Incentives might make it work.***

**How does “modest in mass and scale” affect solar? Green roofs?  
Don’t like the “oversight” of this section.**

**They have to be big to work!**

**Too much to swallow in one statement – too broad**

**Mass/scale/bulk always a roadblock**

**Modest is a subjective term – (another person agreed)**

**Is Limelight modest? The Stube? Could kill everything**

**How do you read the word “protect”?**

**Consider ways to enable a small lodge**

**“Modesty” in mass and scale not a necessary policy**

**Curious about lodging units, feel city staff are wrong, rooms are bigger and nicer. Where is that information? Can we retrace that study? HPTF-related study**

**Don’t agree we are losing lodging**

**Why and where do we need lodging. Need study**

**I feel the tenor is we need more rooms but will make it difficult to do**

**Don’t think this will achieve goals. Ignores economics of lodging. Too**

**much locals point of view and not the tourists and operators**

**If lodging is modest, it can’t afford 100% mitigation for affordable housing on-site. Viable lodging is essential -- can’t achieve all priorities in chapter.**

**This is language not given in P&Z meetings. This is hijacked. How did that happen?**

**What does “modest” mean?**

**Make it easier to remodel lodges**

IV.1.a Use the City’s 3-D model of the downtown area to illustrate the maximum development that could result from the City’s existing zoning and Lodging & Commercial Design Guidelines. (I - P)

IV.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)

IV.1.c Explore the creation of new solar and view easements. (I – P)

**IV.2. Lodging amenities should be designed to facilitate interaction between visitors and residents. *Four people agreed and eight people disagreed with this policy statement.***

**Want to see public use at the base of Aspen Mountain ?(or Lift 1A area)...like the sundeck, with cafeteria, changing area, warming area, etc. “A place to put your boots on” that isn’t a hallway.**

**Think this is irrelevant. Lodging is for tourists, but hopefully there is interaction with residents.**

**It's nice when all types of people mix in town.**

**Base Village example separated residents and tourists – a travesty  
Limelight and Sky Hotel are good examples; locals at pool etc.**

**If this is targeted against private clubs, isn't that a market decision?**

**Lodging products differ; large branded hotel vs fractional, B&B**

**Want lodge to be private; no need to bring town into lodge; worry it will lead to public use of private spaces**

**Badly written policy**

**What's the point? I meet visitors on the street etc**

**What about just "Lodging should be welcoming?"**

**You can't prioritize mountain views, it counters idea of density in town**

**You need a certain mass and scale to make it economically feasible for a project; remove "modest in bulk, mass and scale" from policy**

**Lodging should address burden of impacts, but not necessarily reduce**

**Laudable, but I disagree with "should"**

**Pie in sky.**

**Too sweeping**

IV.2.a Amend the City and County Land Use Codes and design guidelines to require that any on-site amenities be conveniently accessible and welcoming to both visitors and residents. (I - P)

IV.2.b Encourage a diversity of amenities from lodge to lodge to ensure a balance within the community. (I - P)

**IV.3. Maintain and encourage a diverse and balanced lodging inventory. Six people agreed and six people disagreed with this policy statement.**

**Diversity of price us important. Mix within buildings is nice too.**

**Perhaps incentives?**

**I read this as "provide cheap lodging." Noble aspirations but you can't sell a low-end lodge**

**Market will take care of this**

**Accept "messy vitality" – no set percentage of each lodging type.**

**High-end lodging is OK when demand is there. It's who we are. It's the type of resort we are and it needs to be protected and nurtured.**

**Conversion of homes to lodging would work well re: B&B (Whistler example)**

**How do we use already built structures?**

**Timeframe/approval process needs to be accelerated for those projects that meet these needs/community desires**

**Would like this document to be run through a lodging economic expert! Vetted for viability.**

**Definition important. Diversity of room size is good. Devil in details**

**Should include fractionals, homes and lodge rooms**

**In U.S. people not as accepting of small rooms**

**The 100% mitigation required in the Housing chapter does not allow moderate prices and results in over-mitigation. Long-term benefits like property tax and sales tax should count as mitigation.**

**This is code for cheap, small and affordable**

**Incentives OK for affordable lodging but not public funding**

**Creative policies encouraging an increase in economic viability would be a good idea**

**Support lodging that caters to diverse visitors not just jet-setters**

**Agree in principle, but worry how that will be used**

**There's nothing here that promotes lodging**

**Make it easier for redevelopment or new development**

**Statements in this section don't promote lodging but restrict it**

**It's all: 'you can't do this or that'**

**Agree with "diverse" – remove the word "balanced"**

**Low price-point lodges don't provide a lot of amenities**

**This is Aspen ... we don't need to cater to a lower middle-class clientele; you won't draw people here on a budget; we don't have a demand for cheap rooms**

IV.3.a Update the City and County lodging database that includes information on size, age, bed base, and amenities provided. (I – P)

IV.3.b Explore amendments to the Land Use Code that places a priority on lodges that replace what is being eliminated. (I – P)

## **Disagree**

IV.3.c Explore methods to maintain the inventory of smaller lodges. (I - P)

**City codes and mitigation requirements preclude the development or maintenance of small-scale lodges or affordability. Too long a process, too many government exactions**

IV.3.d Explore the potential for incentives to encourage voluntary deed-restricted economy/moderate lodging. (I - P)

IV.3.e Explore amending the City and County codes to allow for bed and breakfast-type lodging in residential neighborhoods. (LT - P)

IV.3.f Amend City and County codes to allow for flexibility in lodging unit sizes and configurations that can respond to seasonal and economic change. (I - P)

IV.3.g Explore amendments to the City and County Land Use Codes that would incentivize small room sizes and diversity of room sizes through increases in floor area and building height. (I - P)

**Disagree**

**This is incompatible with other goals in the document and contradictory; gets smaller rooms but in conflict with modest scale and height**

IV.4. Prevent the further loss of lodging inventory. **Four people agreed and six people disagreed with this policy statement.**

**Depends on the lodging. In moderation could be good.**

**This contradicts IV.1 (reduce the impacts part)**

**Change to “encourage retention of existing lodges and grown and expand the.” Restore loss of bed base**

**Determine what level of lodging we want to have. Keep what we have? Get back what we lost? There need to be some parameters or definitions here.**

**Study economic impacts of increasing or decreasing incentives.**

**Look at the entire economic environment in UGB, then evaluate.**

**Need to increase lodging inventory – have had near disastrous loss**

**Promote maintenance of inventory**

**If you want less expensive rooms, need more inventory**

**Consider building inventory to meet maximum high season need**

**Makes only traditional lodges OK, what’s wrong with fractionals?**

**Traditional lodges are an impossibility today**

**The client doesn’t care how it is owned**

IV.4.a Amend the City Code to eliminate the provision for new multi-family free market residential as the sole use on a parcel in the Lodge Zone District. (I - P)

IV.4.b Explore allowing the conversion of existing multi-family free-market buildings to lodging uses. (I - P)

IV.4.c Amend the City and County Land Use Codes to eliminate the provision of free-market residential incentives in the lodge program. (I - P)

**Disagree**

IV.4.d Amend the City and County Land Use Codes to eliminate the ability to convert lodging to other uses. (I - P)

**Disagree**

## **V. Commercial Policies & Action Items**

V.1. Ensure that the City code supports development that reflects the contextual architectural heritage in terms of site coverage, mass, scale, form and a diversity of heights. **Three people agreed and six people disagreed with this policy statement.**

**Use “integrated” instead of “reflects the contextual architectural heritage.”**

**Encourage more street-side amenities**

**Don’t want us to look like Vail.**

**Part of architectural heritage was empty lots and broken-down buildings post 1893.**

**“Reflects” is too strong**

**Don’t want to box in owners and limit redevelopment opportunity**

**Can’t enforce diversity of heights; just set limit**

**No need to copy Victorian heritage**

**Good to have transition into present and future styles**

**Past shouldn’t be good just because it’s the past**

**Don’t agree with “ensure”**

**If “reflect” means “the same as” or “mirror,” I disagree**

**Not enthusiastic about this; need to be open to creativity and innovation that reflects the needs of the marketplace, so commercial ventures are successful – one other agrees**

**Our architectural heritage has evolved past Victorian; we should keep evolving**

**New development must conform with existing codes**

**Not “reflect” maybe “harmonize” or “integrate”**  
**PUDs and COWOPs should not exceed code too much**  
**Downtown should be allowed to develop with historical feel and new ideas**  
**Victorians should be most prominent and everything else subordinate**  
**Too much height is not pedestrian-friendly because of shade and ice**

V.1.a Generate scenarios at various levels of development, considering the Commercial Design Guidelines and Historic Preservation Guidelines to ensure they implement the policy. (I - P)

V.1.b Amend the Commercial Design Guidelines, Historic Design Guidelines and zoning as needed to implement the policy. (I - P)

V.1.c Re-evaluate the assumptions behind the Infill codes, such as what is the appropriate historic pattern of development to model. (I - P)

V.1.d Engage in a community dialogue about the appearance and function of the commercial zone districts and amend our codes to reflect the community will. (I - P)

**V.2. Facilitate and assist essential businesses that provide basic community needs.**  
**Seven people agreed and three people disagreed with this policy statement.**

**No – let them work out their own economic and business problems.**  
**Be specific, we’re talking about pharmacies, movie theatre, groceries**  
**Concerned about unintended consequences**  
**Work with developers to create deed-restricted commercial space**  
**Did a good job with the Isis**  
**City could dedicate land or buildings for this**  
**Not just essential, but new “up-starts”**  
**Don’t want to lose pharmacies etc.**  
**Who determines what’s “essential”—too many different opinions**  
**Only a few things are truly essential**  
**We need to separate what sounds good from what can actually work**  
**Futile for government to intervene; we’re not wise enough to play god**  
**Sounds good, not achievable**  
**Can of worms**  
**How do you distinguish if someone closes because they’re bad at business?**  
**Define essential**

V.2.a Identify products and services that are considered basic community needs. (I - P)

V.2.b Create an inventory of existing essential commercial uses and businesses and establish measures to keep them viable. (I - P)

V.2.c Establish a working group including representatives of City, ACRA, Aspen Retail Association, CCLC and other groups or individuals to reach out to property/business owners who provide essential products in an effort to explore succession planning, including cooperatively-owned stores. (LT - P)

V.3. Create a commercial mix that is affordable, balanced, diverse, vital, and meets the needs of year-round residents and visitors. **Four people agreed and four people disagreed with this policy statement.**

**Disagree with “affordable” – just “diverse”**

**Like commercial exaction.**

**Sounds good; I have no idea how you do it**

**I don't know if we have enough locals to create enough demand for much more retail**

**How is this achieved? Do you work with landlords; sounds nice**

**Very subjective**

**Don't make rules so restrictive there are negative outcomes.**

**Parallel 15 had to go through too many hoops**

**Need to allow for exemptions rather than hard and fast rules**

**Like overall intent of this section**

**Let the market decide**

**Population won't support certain businesses enough. Don't turn to the public sector for help.**

**Futile for government to intervene; we're not wise enough to play god**

**I have a problem with the word 'affordable'—subject to opinion, can't define; things are more affordable on-line and downvalley**

**The reality is we have no control over what kinds of business want to be here**

**We should create a friendly environment for business**

**How can we change Building Dept practices, fees so they aren't an obstacle to renovations in downtown; should speed up process for downtown renovation**

**Re: “balance” there will always be an ebb and flow; market will correct imbalances; market will determine mix based on national trends; i.e. recent trend towards high-end outdoor lifestyle clothing  
Commercial shouldn't be dominated by one sector**

**Are there zoning changes or credits to owners to provide lower occupancy-cost spaces?**

***Some kind of subsidy or space buy-downs could create lower cost space***

***We have a lot of small, locally-operated businesses compared to most other communities***

***Government regulations are hurting the creation of new businesses and are restructuring redevelopment of old buildings for rejuvenation of downtown core***

***Government cannot create a commercial mix, market should***

***The Isis project was an example of government creating commercial spaces and it didn't work well re: the retail that is located there***

***National trends determine retail mix***

***It's a question of demand***

***Encourage tourist-based economy over locals; visitors over ourselves, especially considering Amazon etc.***

***Overall, like policies but not action items***

V.3.a. Conduct a Market Study to identify the level of demand and availability within the Aspen Area for products and services by residents in order to determine if code changes are needed. (I - P)

V.3.b Explore incentives, such as Growth Management, for non-prime commercial space including basements and alleys. (I - P)

### ***Support this***

V.3.c Explore amending zoning to encourage locations for products and services identified as needed in the Market Study. (I - P)

V.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)

### ***This is a bit heavy handed,***

V.3.e Identify what types of business are over-represented in the downtown and consider a system to manage imbalances, such as quotas, limited prohibitions, zoning, etc. (I - P)

### ***Needs clarity.***

#### ***Like the quota idea.***

V.3.f Explore creating a program to require a portion of development to be restricted to a limited list of commercial uses, which would be charged lower rents or rental rates based on percentage of sales. (I - P)

**Explore mitigation and/or RETT to ensure locally-serving businesses in Aspen**

**Reference local-serving.**

**Needs clarity.**

V.3.g Explore adopting an Existing Use Zone District in specific areas in order to prohibit new uses from displacing existing ones. The new Zone District might allow a limited list of commercial uses subject to a conditional use process. (I - P)

V.3.h Explore the potential to use public sector or non-profit owned commercial spaces to implement policy. (I - P)

## **VI. Public, Institutional, and Non-Profit Sector Policies & Action Items**

VI.1. Ensure that PUD and COWOP processes result in tangible community benefits and do not damage the built environment through mass and scale that significantly exceed land use code standards. **Six people agreed and seven people disagreed with this policy statement.**

**Needs clarification.**

**Why COWOP only for public projects? Clarify that this includes public/private partnership projects. → change the section name**

**Add SPA to the list**

**Nonsense: people vary over time, always instant amnesia of what people have done to their environment.**

**Usually a gang of the same people have disproportionate influence. Don't think every project has to have community benefits; some are unnecessary/contrived**

**Agree that mass/scale should not exceed code**

**History of approving projects that are over-scale**

**PUD and COWOPs must comply with city codes**

**Change the names of these processes or eliminate them**

**Can these projects go to vote?**

**Please define the words in this section:**

**Sustainable/Reasonable/Balance/Basic community needs/essential  
Maintain consistency, don't forget regular codes; objectivity not subjectivity**

**Strongly disagree; this renders process meaningless; PUD and COWAP are important processes**

**If you do this, then you should approve applications administratively**

**Yes, yes, yes; existing codes allow too much, reduce by 25%**  
**What does “significantly exceed” mean?**  
**Mass and scale is contradictory in the plan i.e. on-site housing, we need to figure this out as a community**

VI.1.a Amend COWOP section of City code to include full Planning & Zoning Commission review of projects as if the proposal were a Conceptual & Final PUD. (I - P)

VI.1.b Review City and County Planned Unit Development (PUD) and COWOP chapters with the intention of strengthening language to require strong and demonstrable community benefits in perpetuity in exchange for any dimensional variance, and limit the capacity to exceed land use code standards. (I - P)

VI.1.c Conduct a comprehensive study of PUD and COWOP projects from the past 5 years comparing the code in place at the time and what was actually approved, e.g. dimensional standards, community benefits, etc. (I - P)

**This is very important to do – this decision needs to be made based on accurate info**

VI.2. Preserve and enhance our non-profit and quasi-public facilities and spaces. (see also Aspen Idea Chapter) **Eleven people agreed and two people disagreed with this policy statement.**

**Utilize existing space (public or private) in exchange for a benefit.**  
**Make it easier for existing non-profits to redevelop and expand – three others agree**

**If non-profits can't generate or raise money they are gone. Progress will still happen even if delayed.**

**This chapter provides too much support for non-profits. Properties in UGB should generate money.**

**Don't agree with action items**

**Non-profits don't necessarily need access to someone else's facility**

**No blanket preservation of all non-profits; need strategies to preserve functions not buildings**

**Need exists for gathering space, even new City Hall**

**All gathering spaces should be at street level**

**Strongly agree Red Brick a good example**

**Only if the non-profits still have a useful purpose**

VI.2.a Address the future loss of civic buildings and spaces through a variety of methods including public-private partnerships. (I - P, City Manager, County Manager, non-profit groups, etc)

VI.2.b Explore community partnerships, amendments to codes, and other methods to ensure the continuation of publicly-accessible spaces used and/or owned by non-profits, institutions and civic organizations. *(I - P, City Manager, County Manager, non-profit groups, etc)*

VI.2.c Explore providing a multiple-use community gathering place that serves as a hub for activities. The center should be easily accessible and close to complimentary community amenities. *(LT – SrS, non-profit groups)*

***This and D are duplicate action items***

VI.2.d Explore establishing a multiple-use community gathering place that serves as a hub for activities. The center should be easily accessible and close to complimentary community amenities. *(LT – SrS, non-profit groups)*

***Trying to build a facility that is all things to all people ends up being no benefit to anyone***

***No shortcoming in unique gathering places***

VI.3. All new or expanded non-profit facilities should be located within the Urban Growth Boundary, and preferably within the City limits. ***Six people agreed and four people disagreed with this policy statement.***

***Non-profits should be located where they can best meet their mission Needs clarification. Two people agreed with this statement.***

***Density in UGB helps prevent sprawl***

***Why only “non-profits?” change to “public, institutional, and non-profits.”***

***Don’t agree; seems targeted to Aspen Country Day***

***Distinguish that this refers to event venues, not offices.***

***Some entities need to locate where their work is supported and where their mission is fulfilled.***

***“all” is a strong word – some scenarios will not work inside the UGB***

***Clarify the intent of this policy to support non-profits, encourage infill/growth only in UGB. Word this more positively.***

***OK to be outside UGB if it supports mission – two others agree***

VI.3.a Examine the Pitkin County code to ensure it implements this policy and amend the code accordingly. *(I – P)*

## **VII. Mitigation Policies & Action Items**

VII.1. Ensure that new residential development and redevelopment mitigates all reasonable, directly-related housing impacts. (See Colorado Revised Statutes 29-20-

**104.5) Seven people agreed and ten people disagreed with this policy statement.**

**Define “ensure”**

**Loading too much on development**

**Can’t afford to do anything -- Is that the intent?**

**Mitigation is good but words like “all” are too vague**

**How far does this mitigation need to go? Forever?**

**This is not practical. Needs to be case-by-case.**

**Mitigation is the wrong word; should be replaced by fees that directly result from development**

**Too “cerebral” – mitigation already paid through a lot of fees**

**Fees need to be detailed exactly what they are for**

**Include mitigation for number of vehicles**

**This all sounds like anti-development; some things needs to be redeveloped**

**Again, who decides**

**We have too much affordable housing already**

**This plan seems to define jobs as negative, something that requires mitigation and not something that is appreciated**

**Plan seems to focus only on what we don’t want, not what we do want**

**Redevelopment will not be able to provide all, this mitigation**

**Could be too extreme in some examples**

**What about stifling businesses?**

**Define “reasonable”**

**Mitigating for everything is not reasonable**

**City is always behind, can never keep up with impacts, and they are real**

**No easy consensus, this stuff is really tough**

VII.1.a Conduct a comprehensive review of all residential mitigation options. (I - P)

VII.1.b City and County shall conduct an updated study on short and long-term job generation impacts of both part and full-time residential development. The study should account for different job generation rates based on property types and neighborhoods, e.g. downtown condos, West End, larger county properties. (I - P, APCHA)

VII.1.c Create a “mitigation menu” based on the job generation study, including:

VII.1.c.i Incentivize the provision of on-site affordable housing. This could include prioritization in receiving a building permit, points in growth management, and other tools. (I - P)

## ***On-site will impact mass and scale – what do we really want?***

VII.1.c.ii Recalculate City and County cash-in-lieu payment amount to reflect the job generation study, as well as all actual costs of providing off-site affordable housing, such as the soft costs of locating developable property, planning, designing, conducting the appropriate public processes, identifying buy-down properties, etc, as well as the traditional hard costs of construction (*I - P, APCHA*)

VII.1.c.iii Consider establishing an official list of deed-restricted housing projects and potential buy-down properties that developers could buy into to mitigate their affordable housing impacts. (*I - P, APCHA*)

VII.1.c.iv Explore public-private partnerships to create affordable housing. (*I - P, APCHA*)

VII.1.c.v Consider amending the County code to allow for the creation of housing credits that developers can buy for their own mitigation. (*I - P*)

VII.1.c.vi Amend the City ADU program to require mandatory occupancy when used as mitigation for housing impacts. (*I - P*)

## ***Forget ADUs – they don't work, they're unoccupied***

VII.1.d The City should examine the County's fee/mitigation policy regarding Resident-Occupied (RO) homes and consider changes to City codes. (*I - P, APCHA*)

VII.2. Use mitigation policies as a tool to bring the lodging inventory into balance, with a focus on product diversity. ***Five people agreed and twelve people disagreed with this policy statement.***

***I agree that lowering mitigation for desired lodging is useful (lower-priced anything requires lowering costs/fees)***

***I don't agree if this means raising costs for undesirable lodging***

***This is a function of the market.***

***Mitigation as a tool won't solve imbalance***

***Lodging owners/developers should be able to follow market trends.***

***Lodges need to be able to follow consumer tastes, and be willing the change quickly***

***In favor of affordable lodging***

***Who defines "balance?"***

***What kind of "balance?" If you mean high-end, say high-end***

***Mitigation should not be a "tool"***

***Times have changed***

**How do we encourage a tourist-based economy? Can we do this by allowing desired development and not just preventing undesirable development?**

**What is “balance” in lodging? Who determines it?**

**Concerned with ambiguity of language “imbalance” “reasonable”**

**Lodging diversity is good**

**We need to be attractive to many different people**

**Yes but worried about building too much in neighborhoods**

VII.2.a Conduct a study that assesses the job generation of different types of lodging products. (I - P)

VII.2.b Implement mitigation policies, based on study results, to encourage flexibility in unit sizes, configurations and other elements to create a diverse lodging inventory. (I - P)

VII.2.c Conduct a comprehensive study of City lodging projects from the past five years to determine the successes and shortcomings of the 2005/07 City lodging incentives, and revise accordingly. (LT - P)

VII.3. Ensure that impact fees fully offset the associated costs of development on the community. **Four people agreed and three people disagreed with this policy statement.**

**Define “ensure”**

**“fully” should be changes to “some” or something less than everything**

**Good principle but could be taken too far**

**Needs to include an opportunity to negotiate**

**City should welcome job-generating business and not kill business**

**The current 60% mitigation requirement already stifling; 100% would be way too much; should be more like 50%**

**Many “new” employees are already here and living in affordable housing**

**Mitigation needs to be reliable, not negotiated with every project; maybe a point system; no double-dipping**

**Agree with policy, but needs to be more stable, predictable**

**If city wants jobs and vitality, stop charging high fees**

**Funding social services needs should not be assigned to development**

**Good aspiration but from a business perspective is it cost-prohibitive?**

***Will stop all development and end up crippling public goals and funding mechanisms by not allowing anything to happen – foundation of sand***

VII.3.a Review the effectiveness of existing impact fees in the City and County with regard to schools, parks, roads, Transportation Demand Management, stormwater, etc, and revise as necessary. (LT - P, AO)

***Parking should be mitigated***

VII.3.b Explore an impact fee dedicated to capital improvements for health and human services. (I - P, HHS, PH)

## **VIII. Maintaining our Tourist-Based Economy Policies & Action Items**

VIII.1. Maintain and improve the Aspen Area's tourist-based economy. ***Fifteen people agreed and two people disagreed with this policy statement.***

***Change to “maintain, improve, and support.”***

***This is very important → this is our main economy.***

***But, how much should we spend on this?***

***What is the right balance of tourists and locals? Right now things seem focused on tourists too much.***

***Would like to see more skier amenities (cafeteria, shops, warming area, etc) at the base of the mountain (i.e. something like the sundeck at the base).***

***We do a lot of this stuff already.***

***If we stay true to our core we will be attractive to tourists.***

***This statement is not just about marketing – it has implications on our laws and codes.***

***Action items seem geared to the private sector and ACRA. While these are worthwhile goals, the public sector needs to be involved.***

***Like a lot of the action items.***

***Explore making Aspen attractive for other industries to come here.***

***Keep professionals here. Consider how to get our youth to come back. Industries that tie to our lifestyle (sports gear, design, marketing, science, green industries)***

***Tourism is a volatile industry to rely on → we need to diversify.***

***It's not just about snow and skiing***

***There's no more "American hospitality" here. People don't make friends anymore. We should hire more Americans → word of mouth brings people here, and foreigners can't bring people in.  
We have to produce what we promote (glitz, glamour, and money).  
Careful consideration of potential projects and funding  
Tourism is part of sustainability definition  
Real estate and development IS tourism  
Need to value second home owners as tourists/visitors; important to economy/community  
We're not only a resort economy  
This is too narrowly focused  
More "soft industry" to provide economic diversification (other person agrees)  
Support film industry  
We manufacture creativity and talent  
Highlight local businesses that operate nationally  
Pro-active against a non-snow economy  
Use social media to connect community; to provide world-class experience  
Focus on built environment; that's what helps tourist economy  
Aspen is transitioning from a ski town to a 12-month visitor-based economy with continued emphasis on the mountain recreation industry and the creative arts  
Drop "maintain," just "improve"  
Plan should identify key elements of tourist economy i.e., air travel, lodging, resort programming, activities transportation within resort, marketing/communications/guest services – once that's done, write a strategic resort business plan; then business development initiatives, circle back with data and examine the land use plan and zoning  
Add focus on non-event elements i.e. restaurant/lodging  
Policy needs language on improving lodging and new lodging development***

VIII.1.a Establish a collaborative working group with entities that have amenity space, such as major institutions, the public sector, SkiCo and larger lodges, to develop event ideas that keep Aspen relevant for the next generation. (LT - P)

***This kind of collaboration is a great opportunity  
We already do this  
Should be immediate  
Don't lose sight of baby boomers***

**Make sure we bolster our current events is we find them worthwhile  
→ don't just make up new events**

VIII.1.b Encourage adaptable use of public spaces for events. (LT- P)

**Special events should come with a damage deposit mitigation fee  
(covers police, fire, clean-up etc)**

VIII.1.c The working group should conduct field trips to explore what other resort communities are doing to attract visitors. (I – P, SE)

**Figure out our identity first  
Concerned about the cost of these trips.**

VIII.1.d The working group should conduct periodic analyses of our competitive advantages and disadvantages, and then explore ways to ensure that the resort amenities appeal to new visitors. (LT - P)

VIII.1.e Reinvigorate the Sister Cities program by placing an emphasis on sharing new ideas to attract visitors. (LT – City Manager)

**Shouldn't be used to attract visitors; more cultural  
Never seen value of this program re: tourism**

VIII.1.f Proactively promote the diversity of community events, activities, and experiences that communicate the Aspen Idea. (LT - P)

**Promote wilderness experience through hiking**

VIII.1.g Explore the creation of an “Aspencorps” that enables visitors to learn new skills and volunteer their time in the Aspen community. (LT - P)

**Interesting idea. Collaboration is important for this (especially with  
non-profits)**

**It's already easy to volunteer**

**Need to figure out the housing for this one.**

**This could cater towards long-term summer visitors and 2<sup>nd</sup>  
homeowners, but the time poverty with most guests means their time  
will be spent doing vacation things**

**action items are silly**

**action items in this section lack strength**