

To: City and Pitkin County P&Zs

From: Marcella Larsen

Date: April 11, 2011

Re: Staff's Rewrite of the AACP, and Response to 4/8/2011 Memo From Staff Requesting "Red-Flag" Issues by Our 4/12/2011 Meeting

This memo is divided into three parts: (1) Overview: (2) What should happen in this next meeting?; and (3) Attempted "Red Flags."

I. Overview

Hello, everyone. We have come so far, yet it's one step forward, one step back. We as P&Zs do need to fulfill our statutory duty to adopt a master plan, and we shall. We need to do that on *our own terms*, avoiding the politicization of this plan wherever possible, and always representing the *public* interest. Remember, that's why, by state statute, the P&Zs engage in master planning, and the politicians do not.

Most of Staff's edits to the AACP are good—they promote clarity and, with the exception of the growth and economy section, do not substantially dilute the substance of the plan. I commend them for their hard work; overall, this is a better document. However, let's remember again that *it is the P&Zs who write and adopt master plans*, and we should define a process that works *for us*, given the status of the current draft, and *we need to make sure that the substance is still there*. The growth and economy section is a problem; it is no longer truly philosophical nor does it provide much guidance for future development. In my view, the vision and philosophy section will need to be substantially rewritten.

I received Staff's memo for our upcoming meeting today, this past Friday, as you all did. I appreciate that Staff suggests a format for our review, but I wonder whether it's realistic: Staff is asking that we annotate their *entire* draft for *every* "Red-Flag" item we may have, to be completed between now and Tuesday—*five* days. My guess is that most of our volunteers aren't capable of that kind of turnaround. While I will be out of town for our next meeting, I done my best to comply electronically. (I only made it through the first two chapters for Tuesday's meeting.)

In addition to identifying these "Red-Flag" items, I would strongly suggest, contrary to Staff's recommendation, that you *actually compare the before (our version) and after (Staff's rewrite)*. If you don't look at the redlines, you might not realize—for example—that *every single* reference to the problems with the upzonings of mid-2000 (called "infill") were deleted from the Growth and Economy philosophy section we spent *years* drafting. Or, you might not see that there is no longer any discussion of a "modest" mass

and scale.¹ What happened to the idea that high job-generation (at low wages) isn't necessarily healthy (i.e., the argument that the Walmart should be built because it will revitalize the community because it will provide jobs)? I could go on and on ...

Personally, I am not comfortable with merely "Red-Flagging" these issues because in a few places the substance has changed rather significantly. (There, a Staff memo identifying these substantive changes would have been helpful and appropriate. It's hard enough for a citizen-volunteer who is familiar with the document to find these issues for themselves, but I imagine it will be nearly impossible for the public to understand. And, since there were many members of the public who supported the document as written by P&Z, this seems to make their continued participation unnecessarily difficult.)

Additionally, as you read through the new draft, you will see the resurfacing of some of the same ideology from (city) Staff, which we spent hours debating and ended up rejecting. There, too, all of our conclusions about the desirability of the significant upzonings from mid-2000 (called "infill") have been entirely eliminated. Which begs the question: *At whose direction?* Indeed, prior, rejected language about the untested design standards that would supposedly "fix" the failures of these upzonings has assumed new prominence in the draft.

The same is true regarding population limits, which were never a true cap in the prior AACPs, but merely something that might help guide future rezonings and other decision making. Obviously, that guide wasn't used in connection with the mid-2000 upzonings, but it should have been. Their elimination from the current draft AACP is neither supported by any citizen input, nor has it somehow become "illegal" since the 2000 AACP. (No one has ever suggested, to my knowledge, that we would stop issuing building permits allowed under the zoning that exists at the time of application because we had exceeded our population goals.)

One can only imagine what the current "recession" might inspire in terms of new upzonings. Another committee, like the one who proposed the huge upzonings mid-2000? Yet another new "revitalization"—read, upzoning—of our town? If we're okay with this forever growth model, let's just say so. But, if we're not to become another Vail or Broomfield or even Boulder, we ought to say something meaningful that isn't silenced because of a recasting of the population numbers and what they meant in the prior plans. As I said before, I believe the entire vision and philosophy section in the growth and economy section needs to be rewritten. (I have attached a redline of the former P&Z version of growth and economy, which I believe illustrates the problem--the redline is our former language, which has largely disappeared in the new draft.)

¹ Actually, you couldn't see these changes because, Staff is correct, a redline would be illegible, so significant was their rewrite.

II. What should happen in this next meeting?

I think P&Z needs to work hard to regain control of this document and make it something that reflects the *entire* public interest. As I've said before, as P&Z's we have a heavy responsibility imposed by state statute: *let's do our job*.

Let's ask Staff to prepare a memo that *identifies* the substantive changes they made, and the reasoning for each. Without such a memo, a near-impossible burden is placed on P&Z and also the public, who has no idea what has changed.

Beyond the call to do "Red-Flags" on Staff's draft, let's commit to all bring forward the issues that have been dropped, missed, deleted or whatever from the draft. Some of us may be able to get through the entire document by Tuesday, but I suspect most of us will not (I didn't). As I said before, it's not fair to ask us to identify what Staff changed, when it hasn't been identified in a memo.

Let's also understand the process that Staff undertook to arrive at the revised document that it now presents for our review. What was their internal process (for example, how were the individual action items changed)? Beyond what we've seen in terms of public comments, did they have any meetings or contacts with any groups or individuals about the plan? The public needs these types of disclosures.

Finally, let's set a schedule to get this plan finished. I'd suggest we start with the first chapter next meeting (not the introduction, which we shouldn't address until the draft is mostly done). I believe we can do a chapter a meeting, and should try to meet more than twice a month.

III. Red-Flags

I've noted my "Red-Flags" as comments in the document itself. I think they are self-evident. I only made it through the growth chapter because it was important to me to understand the differences between the P&Z draft and Staff's total rewrite. This took a lot of time, and along the way, I noticed that the "clean" draft I was working on in Word wasn't the same as the online version (or the redline ...) so I stopped.

I'll continue to work on my "flags" and pass them on to Staff and P&Z when there is a Word document available (I can't comment on .pdfs).

Attached Documents:

1. My redlines/comments on the first two chapters of the AACP (note: the Word draft I was given is not consistent with the online version).

2. A redline of the growth and economy chapter that shows the P&Z's version with all of Staff changes taken out (note: this isn't to say that none of their changes are good, but it illustrates the problems with the vision and philosophy quite vividly)

Draft Aspen Area Community Plan

AACP Introduction

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

The 2011 Aspen Area Community Plan (AACP) is intended to describe a vision for the future of the Aspen Area that will help guide community decision-making for the next 10 years. But before moving into the substance of the plan, it's important to briefly describe the setting in which we live, and provide some historical context that brought the community to this unique point in time.

The scenic mountain views, biking along a river, unparalleled skiing, rural character, extensive Wilderness Areas, a historic downtown, outstanding arts and cultural events and the sense of a small-scale community are among the many reasons why the Aspen Area has attracted national and international visitors and compelled many to make it their home.

Since the 1940s, Aspen has taken numerous intentional steps to create an ideal environment in which to live and visit. With the concept of the Aspen Idea as its foundation, ski areas were founded in the 1940s and '50s, attracting international ski racers. Dozens of small lodges and condos were built through the 1950s and '60s.

In the 1970s, Pitkin County took ambitious steps to preserve rural character, a grass roots effort began to preserve Victorian architecture, and the City of Aspen began buying open space.

All types of recreational activities emerged over the years, including hang-gliders landing on the Thomas Open Space in the mid-1970s. Another grass roots movement resulted in the establishment of Wilderness Areas in the late 1970s. Arts and cultural events proliferated with the renovation of the Wheeler Opera House in 1984. At the same time, a range of non-profit groups focused on everything from the arts to social causes to science to international affairs.

All through the 1960s, '70s and '80s, citizen planners and local government consistently linked the beauty of the natural environment and the desirability of the area as a place to live and visit, and they identified small town scale as worthy of protection. Even then, people were worried about the unintended impacts of success.

- *In 1966, the Aspen Area General Plan worried that "The most significant change has been ... the gradual encroachment of (housing and lodges) on the countryside."*

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 1:55 PM
Comment [1]: Plans don't worry. People do.

- *The 1973 Aspen Land Use Plan was committed to “control growth and prevent urban sprawl,” adding that, “Emphasis will be placed on preserving the natural environment where new development occurs.”*
- *“ ... eliminating indiscriminate development in environmentally sensitive areas ... ” was an important concept in the 1976 Aspen/Pitkin County Growth Management Policy Plan.*
- *Maintaining “Aspen’s unique small town character and scale as one of its major attractions to residents and visitors,” was part of the 1986 Aspen Area Comprehensive Plan: Historic Element.*

With the expansion of arts and cultural institutions in the 1980s, Aspen was truly maturing as a resort economy. It was during this same period that national economic trends resulted in a proliferation of wealthy households across the country, creating an entirely new level of demand for resort properties.

Although the 1993 Aspen Area Community Plan clearly said that, “Tourism is the economic force of the community” – that statement was no longer true by the end of the decade.

“During the late 1990s, real estate surpassed retail and lodging to become the dominant factor in the Aspen economy,” according to The Aspen Economy, a 2008 report commissioned by the City of Aspen. “By 2007, real estate transactions approached \$1.8 billion, generating far more economic activity than the \$508 million of taxable sales (that year).”

Themes of the 2011 AACP

This fundamental shift from tourism to real estate as the primary economy was strongly manifested during the economic boom period of 2004 – 2008, and prompted community concerns. Although the 2011 AACP was drafted during a deep economic recession amidst little or no development, many residents remain uneasy about this fundamental shift.

Taken as a whole, the main theme of the 2011 AACP is to focus on the elements of the Aspen Area that make it such an attractive place to live and a compelling place to visit. We seek to manage future development so that it contributes to the long-term sustainability of a vibrant and diverse tourism economy and a strong year-round community.

Many parts of the 2011 AACP focus on affirming the Aspen Area’s unique ideals, which has the dual effect of sustaining a viable tourism economy. The following are some of the central themes of this plan:

- ✓ Rediscovering and reinvigorating the Aspen Idea.
- ✓ Protecting the natural ecosystems and scenic settings of mountainsides and riparian areas.
- ✓ Managing development pressures.
- ✓ Replenishing our lodging inventory to encourage a diverse visitor base.

3.28.2011 Draft AACP

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 2:18 PM

Comment [2]: I would delete this or say something more affirmative. It isn't just that people are "uneasy" about a construction economy, it is negatively affecting the quality of life and will ultimately destroy the tourist economy because no one will want to go to Aspen anymore.

Finally, there is deep disagreement about whether this was a deep economic recession or more of a correction, at least in our real estate market.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 2:03 PM

Comment [3]: This oversimplifies the matter and misses the larger purpose which is to move toward a responsible and sustainable community—it isn't JUST that we want to like living here and hope that tourists will come.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 2:07 PM

Comment [4]: There is no mention of scale and mass, nor is there anything about "infill"

- ✓ Promoting a unique and interesting downtown for a diverse visitor base.
- ✓ Exploring residential design concepts that reaffirm our small town heritage.
- ✓ Exploring physical planning and design concepts for the West of Castle Creek Area
- ✓ Improving and linking alternative methods of travel, including commuter trails and transit.
- ✓ Continuing to acquire open space and improve recreational opportunities.
- ✓ A renewed focus on environmental stewardship, from water and air to reducing greenhouse gases.
- ✓ Preserving historical architecture, helping us tell the unique story of our past.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 2:06 PM
 Comment [5]: A vital downtown should be for more than just the visitors ...

Providing a critical mass of affordable housing remains a long-standing goal of the community, so those who work here can have an opportunity to make Aspen their home, and become vested members of a strong year-round community. The plan includes an emphasis on the livability and quality design of Community Workforce Housing. The 2011 AACP acknowledges problems in the City and County housing mitigation strategies, and seeks to re-examine such requirements to ensure that new development fully offsets its impacts. For the first time, the 2011 AACP calls for all new development to provide housing for all the new employees that are generated. At the same time, the plan focuses on the need for additional local-serving business.

In addition to housing, the 2011 AACP also focuses closely on the day-to-day lives of year-round residents and commuters. That includes a new chapter called the Lifelong Aspenite, which focuses on services ranging from day care to education, from public safety to senior services. This new chapter invites collaboration between a wide range of government entities, taxing districts, non-profits and other organizations.

Planning Area

The Aspen Area Community Plan is the Comprehensive Plan for the area within the Aspen Urban Growth Boundary. The map below depicts the planning area. The City is shaded in blue, and the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) is outlined in orange. The portions that are not shaded are located in unincorporated Pitkin County. The UGB includes Red Mountain, East of Aspen neighborhoods, the Airport Business Center, the Airport, Buttermilk Base area, and portions of the Castle Creek and Maroon Creek valleys.

While the boundaries of the planning area are limited, we recognize that the Aspen Area is an integral part of the Roaring Fork Valley. We are dependent upon our commuting workforce, second homeowners, tourists, and those who live here full time. As a result, this plan recognizes the interconnectedness of all those people who make Aspen work as a community and as a resort.

Public Engagement Process (sidebar)

One of the primary goals of the 2011 Aspen Area Community Plan process was to undertake the broadest public feedback effort possible, in an effort to gauge community consensus on a vision for the next 10 years. This initial effort was described as “direct democracy,” and was intended included everyone who “lives, works or visits” the Aspen Area.

Phase I began with extensive educational outreach, including the State of the Aspen Area Report: 2000-2008, and The Aspen Economy, a white paper on the history of the local economy. Educational outreach was followed by an attempt to identify shared values, explore common ground and articulate community consensus. This effort included a series of focus groups, large meetings that used instant voting technology, and social networking tools. Phase I of the public process included more than 1,000 participants, and won four awards.

The purpose of Phase II was to further articulate the community’s vision and philosophy, while drafting carefully worded policies to implement community goals. This process included the joint City and County Planning and Zoning Commissions, resource experts and the public.

Phase III was the final adoption process, including the joint P&Zs, the public-at-large, the Aspen City Council and the Pitkin County Board of County Commissioners.

Purpose of the Plan

Simply put, the 2011 AACP is intended to reflect community aspirations. As we encounter new challenges and changing conditions in the future, this plan is intended to be used as a compass, to help steer us in the right direction.

The 2011 AACP is not intended to provide an exact road map to follow for the next 10 years, step-by-step. It is simply impossible to anticipate all the twists and turns that will face the Aspen Area in the future.

At the same time, this plan recognizes that community goals are often inextricably linked: sometimes they complement each other, and at times they come into conflict. Preserving a healthy and beautiful natural environment, providing recreational opportunities, maintaining historical architecture and providing arts and cultural events are all shared community values that are also foundations for an unparalleled resort experience. But there are fundamental conflicts as well.

A community plan is not intended to be a tool that easily reconciles all community goals in every instance. Instead, it is a broad, aspirational plan with an articulated vision for the future that serves as a reminder of what’s important to the

community. As a community we are constantly in a state of weighing and balancing a variety of competing goals.

Good Local Governance (SIDEBAR)

As part of this aspirational plan, it's worthwhile to reflect on some of the most critical principles of "good governance."

It's helpful to recognize that the word "governance" did not originally refer to some kind of governmental structure as we know it today. The word "governance" comes from the Greek *kubernao*, meaning "to steer."

In the spirit of this plan, a community can find its path through collaboration and leadership not only through the processes of local government, but from the private sector and a wide range of local organizations, groups and individuals.

Good governance is transparent, participatory, educational, inclusive, collaborative, civil, consensus-oriented, responsive, effective and efficient, follows the rule of law, and is accountable.

Transparency means that the process of decision-making and implementation is carried out so the public can readily engage in debate, and that reliable information is freely available. Modern technology should be used to help convey and illustrate facts and information.

Informed *participation* is made possible by our constitutional rights to freedom of association and freedom of expression. Providing reliable information and *education* allows for informed debate and discussion.

Inclusiveness means ensuring that the public feels they have a stake in decision-making, and does not feel excluded. Participation can evolve into *collaboration* across public and private sectors that can serve the whole community.

Civility sets the tone of productive community discourse. Civility means encouraging active debate on the issues, but discouraging personal affronts. To be *consensus oriented* means weighing different interests to reach a broad agreement on what is in the best interest of the whole community.

Good governance requires that institutions and processes are *responsive* to the needs of the public within a reasonable timeframe. *Effectiveness and efficiency* means producing results that meet the needs of society while making the best use of resources.

The *rule of law* means a fair legal framework that is enforced impartially. It also means there is predictability and fairness in government review processes.

Accountability is key to effective local government, and accountability cannot thrive without transparency and the rule of law. For a community to thrive, the private sector and local organizations must also be accountable to the public.

Good governance is an ideal that can be difficult to achieve in its totality. However, to ensure sustainable human development, actions must be taken to work towards this ideal with the aim of making it a reality.

Accomplishing Community Goals

It's important to remind ourselves that the Aspen Area community has achieved many ambitious and impressive goals over the years. Sometimes the process has been long and controversial, and just as often those achievements have ultimately become a norm for the community, taken for granted as a shared value. Here are just a few examples:

- ✓ **Red Brick Center for the Arts**
A former school on Hallam Street, today's Red Brick Center for the Arts was purchased for \$3.6 million by voters in August 1992. The tally was 526 in favor, and 523 opposed.
- ✓ **Pedestrian Malls**
The two downtown pedestrian malls that are widely enjoyed and appreciated today were controversial subjects. One City Council action denied design funds in 1975 – finally approving full design and construction funds in 1976.
- ✓ **Housing and Day Care**
In 1990, there was extensive debate on establishing a .45% sales tax for affordable housing and day care. It was a close vote, with 53% in favor. In 2008, opinions had changed – it was reauthorized with 66% in favor.
- ✓ **Historic Heritage**
The Aspen City Council established the Commercial Core Historic District in 1974, ultimately resulting in the preservation of structures like the Elks and Brand buildings. It was controversial at the time, but now we now take for granted that such buildings will be protected forever.
- ✓ **Mass Transit**
Paid parking was the subject of widespread ire, and even picketing outside City Hall, but Council approved it as part of the Aspen Transportation Implementation Plan in July 1993. Paid parking was part of the reason why RFTA ridership doubled in the mid-1990s.
- ✓ **Backcountry Preservation**
In 1994, Pitkin County adopted Rural and Remote Zoning, along with a new Transferrable Development Rights (TDR) program amidst extensive debate. Today, it's accepted as a program that has preserved more than 5,840 acres outside of the Urban Growth Boundary.

Achieving important public policy milestones is never without lively debate and discussion. We hope the 2011 Aspen Area Community Plan includes important

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 2:12 PM

Comment [6]: This is confusing. Human development sounds like personal development; is that what you mean?

new policies that will ultimately become critical turning points for the community over the next 10 years. *Nothing worthwhile is ever easy.*

We hope this plan captures the broad outlines of our aspirations as a community, and that it will help steer us into a future where our challenges come only from our continued success.

Going Forward

The Aspen Area has a long history of planning for our future – from the first growth management codes in the 1970s to the first Aspen Area Community Plan in 1993. This update continues our tradition of comprehensive city-county planning.

Without implementation, comprehensive plans are meaningless. Annual performance review is critical to the continuing viability and relevance of this plan.

How to Use the Plan

The Aspen Area Community Plan shall be adopted by ordinance in the City of Aspen in conformance with Section 4.8 of the Home Rule Charter of the City of Aspen. It shall be adopted by resolution by the Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission in conformance with Section 30-28-108, C.R.S. There are subtle differences in the application of the plan in the City of Aspen and Pitkin County:

Pitkin County

Pitkin County recognizes the AACP as an advisory document as described below:

All land use applications are subject to the Policies in the Land Use Code, including one (section 1-60-20) that says “It is...policy....to ensure that the use and development of land...and any actions committing such land to development or change in use should consider Pitkin County’s Comprehensive Plan.” The County Land Use Code specifically requires consideration of Comprehensive Plans as a criterion of approval for certain types of land use reviews, (including special review, location and extent review, Code amendments, rezoning, activities of local and state interest, and growth management exemptions). Reference to Comprehensive Plans in the Land Use Code as a basis for reviewing and taking action on a land use application has the force of law, and where such reference is made, Plans (including the AACP) may be used accordingly.

City of Aspen

In the City of Aspen the AACP shall be used as both a guiding and regulatory document as described below.

The Use of Guiding Provisions in the Plan:

The entire AACP should be considered a guiding and philosophical document to assist the City Council, appointed boards and commissions, City staff, and the citizens of the City of Aspen, in establishing priorities for future legislation, work plans, budgets, and the further development of future community goals. The guiding “Vision” and “Philosophy” statements contained in the AACP should be considered as aspirational and goal setting tools to assist the Aspen community in achieving its long range objectives and ambitions for the continued health and vitality of the Aspen area, its residents, and guests.

The Use of Regulatory Provisions in the Plan:

The Land Use Code of the City of Aspen, Chapter 26 of the Aspen Municipal Code, currently requires applications for certain land use development to be consistent with the Aspen Area Community Plan. Provisions of the AACP that are intended to be regulatory and therefore subject to the consistency standard of review contained in the Land Use Code are expressly identified as such in the “Policy” or “Action Items” sections of each Chapter of the Plan. Each regulatory provision has been written with sufficient specificity so that proponents of new development are afforded due process of law; reviewing bodies do not retain unfettered discretion in approving or denying development applications; and, decisions by reviewing bodies can be clear for reasoned judicial review.

Applications for land use development that are required by the land use code to be consistent with or in compliance with the AACP shall include an analysis section entitled “Consistency with the Aspen Area Community Plan.” The application should address those provisions in the AACP that are identified as regulatory and provide an analysis explaining how the proposed development will be consistent with the AACP.

An application for land use development shall not be denied by any reviewing body on the grounds that the proposed development fails to comply with any provision of the AACP that is not specifically identified as regulatory.

How to Read the Plan

The Aspen Area Community Plan is divided into nine different chapters. Each chapter contains:

- ✓ **Vision**
The Vision for each chapter is the first item you will read. These are short statements intended to outline community aspirations.

- ✓ **Philosophy**
The Philosophy is a longer explanation of the Vision statement. It addresses each topic area in more detail and often provides a brief overview of historical context.

- ✓ **What's Changed Since 2000**
Outlining recent history relevant to the chapter.
- ✓ **What's New in the 2011 Plan**
Summarizing new policy direction, compared to the 2000 AACP.

Linkages

Outlining ways chapters and topics are related to one another.

- ✓ **Policies**

Policies are based on the Vision and Philosophy statements for each chapter, and are intended to direct decision-making. For the City, the vast majority of Policy Statements are guiding in nature, but there are some Policies that can be used to regulate development (see the "How to Use the Plan" section for more detail). Reference to "guiding" or "regulatory" Policies is specific to the use of the Plan in the City of Aspen. In the County, policy categories are for descriptive purposes only. Each policy falls into one of seven categories that are intended to identify the underlying purpose of each policy. For City purposes, categories 1 – 6 are "guiding" and category 7 is "regulatory." Each category is outlined in detail below:

1. Community Goals – These statements articulate our broad community aspirations. They help guide decision-making on a variety of topics.
2. Collaborative Initiatives – These statements suggest collaboration between a variety of groups, including the city, county, non-profits, other government agencies, businesses, etc. Additional work may result from the collaboration, but the first step is working with interested and affected parties.
3. Incentive Programs – These statements do not direct regulatory code changes, but look to implement new voluntary programs and policies.
4. Work Programs – These statements describe potential departmental work programs. They may require work from one or more departments. They do not direct code changes, but may direct internal city/county policy changes.
5. Data Needs – These statements clearly identify the need for new data gathering. Data gathering may ultimately support code changes, budget priorities, work programs, and initiatives.
6. Proposed Code Amendments – These statements are guiding, and provide direction for future code changes. These code changes range from exploring the creation of a development pacing system to updating

3.28.2011 Draft AACP

affordable housing mitigation levels. These policies will require follow-up and prioritization by appointed and elected officials.

7. Regulatory – These statements are regulatory in nature. Any development application submitted subsequent to the adoption of the 2011 AACP, which is required to show consistency with the Aspen Area Community Plan, will have to show consistency with these policy statements.

A series of Action Items are located at the end of the plan, following the chapters.

✓ **Action Items**

A series of Action Items are located at the end of the plan, following the chapters.

The Action Items represent a set of tools to implement the Vision, Philosophy, and Policies. They are in no way an exhaustive list of everything that could be done to further community goals, but they provide a possible road map toward implementing the community's shared vision and philosophy. The Action Items are found in their own section, toward the end of this document. In the Action Item section, the policies are re-printed, with a list of directly associated Action Items.

Each Action Item identifies a department or agency that should be responsible for the implementation of the Action Items. In addition, each Action Item is identified as something that should be pursued immediately (labeled with an "I"), or in the long-term (labeled with an "LT"). Each Action Item also includes the entities that are responsible for implementing the plan. The list on the following page identifies the entities referenced in the plan.

A – Airport
ABC Group – Airport Business Center Neighborhood Group
ACRA – Aspen Chamber Resort Association
AO – City Attorney's Office
APCHA – Aspen/Pitkin County Housing Authority
ARD – Aspen Recreation Department
Aspen K-12 – Aspen School District
Asset – City Asset Department
AVH – Aspen Valley Hospital
B – Building
CDOT – Colorado Department of Transportation
CI – Canary Initiative
City Manager – City Manager's Office
CMC – Colorado Mountain College
County Manager – County Manager's Office
CR – City and County Community Relations
EH – Environmental Health
EOTC – Elected Officials Transportation Commission
E/SW – Engineering and Stormwater

Fire – Fire Department
HHS – Health and Human Services
HPC – City Historic Preservation Commission
KF – Kids First
L – Landfill
LE – Law Enforcement
LPHA – Local Public Health Agencies / Boards of Health
LM – County Land Management Department
P – Planning
PH – Public Health
P/OS – City and County Parks and Open Space Departments
PW – County Public Works Department
RFTA – Roaring Fork Transit Authority
SE – Special Events
SkiCo – Aspen Ski Company
SrS – Senior Services
Streets – City Streets Department
T – City Transportation Department
U – City Utilities

The Aspen Idea

Vision

We are committed to sustaining and revitalizing the **original intent of the** Aspen Idea.

Philosophy

The Aspen Idea is a fundamental awareness that mind, body and spirit can be fully integrated parts of a whole and balanced person, and this interconnectedness entails the cultivation of all three. At a basic level, this valuable concept can help us balance our every-day life.

The concept is attributable to Walter and Elizabeth Paepcke, and a circle of friends from Chicago who began convening intellectuals, artists, skiers, philanthropists and philosophers in Aspen after World War II.

The Aspen Idea is a legacy that has established Aspen as a place known for its arts, culture, athletic endeavors, philanthropy, lifelong education, spiritual pursuits, environmental consciousness and humanitarian service. We also value authentic engagement with others, including civil discourse about the kind of community we want to create and maintain. The Aspen Idea is a core element of the community's heritage and identity, enriching our quality of life and reinforcing Aspen's national and international profile.

Despite its central role in forming Aspen's character, the Aspen Idea can sometimes feel like a historic chapter in our past, rather than an enduring and uniting concept that defines our community and sets us apart in a unique and positive way.

There are promising opportunities to raise the profile of the Aspen Idea while widening and broadening the perception of Aspen. A collaboration including local business, ACRA, the public sector, key institutions and non-profits can explore strategies to collectively rediscover and reinvigorate the Aspen Idea. We can illustrate how the experience of Aspen can stimulate mind, body and spirit.

Many different non-profits and the public sector produce arts and cultural events, many local businesses focus on recreation and other groups have a strong spiritual component. It is difficult, and perhaps unnecessary, to categorize one activity as only focused on the mind, or only related to the body, or the spirit. For example, skiing, backcountry hiking or hang-gliding are about the body and physical health, but often include a strong spiritual component. Attending a concert or a seminar on the classics can stimulate the mind and the spirit at the same time.

In a seasonal resort environment, it is understandable that many local organizations are in competition to attract attendance and customers. **But if the**

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 2:24 PM

Comment [7]: The language I inserted was deleted from the P&Z draft and changes the vision we discussed. There was concern that the Aspen Idea was being misused and misunderstood.

recent recession has revealed anything of value, it is that collaboration across the private and public sectors can result in a bigger picture that is somehow greater than the sum of its parts.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 2:21 PM

Comment [8]: I don't think it's appropriate to comment on the value of a recession (if there really was one in Aspen). I would change this to "However, collaboration ..."

A collaborative approach to reinvigorating the Aspen Idea can create common ground among those who live, work and visit the Aspen Area, while strengthening a diverse visitor base into the future.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 2:27 PM

Comment [9]: The idea of social stratification from the P&Z draft has been lost here. That idea was that this was a way to bring not only diverse tourists together, but also locals with broad socio-economic backgrounds.

What's Changed Since 2000 + What's New in the 2011 AACP

What's Changed Since 2000

A number of local institutions and non-profits have expanded their programs and facilities and since 2000. The following are just a few examples:

- Aspen Music Festival Music Tent (2000)
- Spiritual Paths Foundation at Community Chapel (Est. 2000)
- Aspen Ideas Festival (2007)
- Doerr-Hosier Center at the Aspen Institute (2007)
- Shigeru Ban-designed Aspen Art Museum (Approved 2010)
- Aspen Environmental Forum

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 2:28 PM

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

A 2004 Economic Impact of the Arts Study showed that total expenditures by audiences for arts and cultural events average \$31.3 million in the summer, and \$4.8 million in the winter.

At the same time, there has been some disconcerting recent developments regarding some local institutions, including the closure of the Silver Lining Ranch, a non-profit supporting children with cancer; and the closure of The Given Institute, which has been sponsoring retreats, conferences and public lectures since 1972 under the auspices of the University of Colorado.

What's New in the 2011 AACP

This chapter was originally titled "Arts, Culture & Education" in the 2000 Aspen Area Community Plan. The new title reflects a desire to reinvigorate and sustain the concept of the Aspen Idea.

This new chapter also focuses on the accessibility of events and educational opportunities related to arts and culture, and also suggests a set of standards to consider when developing new facilities or reburishing old ones.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 2:32 PM

Comment [10]: I deleted the planning jargon "essential public facilities because it's too narrow

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 2:29 PM

Deleted: essential public

Finally, this chapter calls for exploring methods to address the further loss of quasi-public institutions.

Linkages:

This plan recognizes that community goals are often inextricably linked: sometimes they complement each other, and at times they come into conflict. The Aspen Idea is the basic underpinning of our tourist-based economy. It is manifested in many ways, including our outdoor lifestyle, arts and cultural events, continuing education and the preservation of the natural environment.

Policies

I. REVITALIZING THE ASPEN IDEA

I.1. Revitalize and sustain the original intent of the Aspen Idea. (Community Goal, Collaborative Initiative)

I.2. Encourage collaboration among non-profit organizations, local government and local businesses. (Community Goal, Collaborative Initiative)

I.3. Foster greater inclusivity and participation in cultural events from within the spectrum of community residents and visitors. (Community Goal, Collaborative Initiative)

II. ARTS FACILITIES

II.1. Maintain the legacy of the Aspen Idea by enhancing and preserving our non-profit and quasi-public facilities and spaces and ensuring that development of new facilities is consistent with community goals. (see also Growth Management & Economic Sustainability Chapter) (Community Goal, Collaborative Initiative)

Managing Growth for Community & Economic Sustainability

Vision

We are committed to managing growth in order to achieve the community values and goals that are expressed in this plan. In the broadest terms, these goals include a thriving and sustainable year-round community and a unique and vibrant resort in the context of a healthy natural environment. We recognize that all of our community goals can and should benefit those who live and work here, as well as those who visit.

The community goals we seek to achieve in this chapter include (in no particular order):

- Providing affordable housing for a “critical mass” of local residents.
- Managing the impacts of development to maintain a high quality of life.
- Preserving mountain views and the natural ecosystems, including riparian areas.
- Maintaining a high quality of life and resort experience.
- Planning for a tourism economy that is supported by future generations of diverse visitors.
- Facilitating a diverse, unique and vital downtown area.
- Supporting a vibrant non-profit sector, including arts and cultural organizations.
- Preserving the historic character of the built environment so we can “tell the story” of Aspen to future generations.
- Replenishing the lodging base with a focus on diversifying the lodging inventory.
- Encouraging a local business sector that provides basic products and services for everyone, and encouraging an appropriate level of local-serving business.

Philosophy

This community plan recognizes that managing growth and economic sustainability are closely inter-related, and have therefore been combined into one chapter for the first time in order to identify how they work together.

The City and County growth management systems are effective tools that can help the community reach desired goals. The management of development through growth management and other land use tools influences our three intertwining economies:

- Resort tourism
- Development/Real estate
- Year-round Community

None of these economies stands discrete and alone; they are inextricably connected at a number of levels. The economic impact of growth management and other land use tools have been debated for many years, and should continue to be a focus of discussion, study, and visual and economic modeling.

For example, preserving scenic views, riparian areas and a pristine natural environment are important aesthetic and philosophical values held closely by local residents, but these efforts have also contributed to a highly attractive resort, and resulted in substantial economic benefits across the board. Studies have repeatedly shown that

3.28.2011 Draft AACP

Page 15 of 103

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/11/11 10:01 AM

Comment [11]: Flag this entire section and compare it to the prior draft. This vision changes the substance of the P&Z draft, which said:

" We are committed to managing returning to sustainable land use practices through which both the zoning and pace of growth in order to achieve the community values and goals are guided by restraint and respect for the physical scale and historic character of our small town. We recognize the physical limits of our valley and that are expressed in this plan. In the broadest terms, these goals include uncontrolled growth will result in an unsustainable need for more Community Workforce Housing, infrastructure, and services. We desire to be a thriving and sustainable vibrant year-round community and a unique and vibrant resort in the context of a ; therefore we want our economy to be healthy and diverse while maintaining our small town character.

We are committed to returning to sustainable land use practices guided by the following priorities:

- Manage the pace of growth;
- Preserve the physical scale and historic character of our small town;
- Preserve mountain views and the natural environment. We recognize , including the safe enjoyment of an outdoor lifestyle;
- Prioritize the use of renewable building and energy sources over non-renewable resources;
- Encourage redevelopment that all of our community goals can and should results in a diverse lodging inventory, affordable commercial and residential uses, and discourages projects with minimal community benefit those who live and work here, as well as those who visit.and/or adverse impacts;
-
- Provide affordable housing for a "critical mass" of local residents.
- Facilitating a diverse, unique and vital downtown area.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/11/11 10:02 AM

Comment [12]: Flag the entire section. There is little remaining of the philosophies set forth in the P&Z draft. We need to look over this entire section and give it some meaning. This reads as more of the same ...

open space and opportunities for recreation reflect a kind of natural capital that enhances the economic well-being of the entire community.

As the resort matured in the 1980s, additional venues for arts and cultural groups complemented the already outstanding recreational opportunities and scenic views, and the development economy began growing dramatically. A 2008 economic study commissioned by the City of Aspen found that by 2000 – for the first time – the economic activity related to the development industry eclipsed and surpassed the economic activity related to the tourism industry.

While the development industry has been hit hard by the current recession, to assume that it will not make a rebound during the 10-year life of this plan would be irresponsible. Therefore, one of the broad themes of this plan is to manage future development so that it contributes to the long-term viability of a sustainable, diverse tourist-based economy and a strong year-round community.

Ensuring a Sustainable Tourist-Based Economy

Our long-term sustainability as a visitor-based economy depends largely on our ability to remain an attractive, welcoming and accessible place for future generations. Aspen has a long history of loyal visitors who return at a rate of about 70% -- far higher than other mountain resorts.

At the same time, we recognize the importance of looking to the future, and considering the interests and needs of the next generation of residents and visitors. As a resort, it's important to ask ourselves: How will Aspen continue be relevant in the next 10-20 years? Some of our local businesses and institutions have anticipated these questions, and adjusted their programming. Aspen has a history of innovation and reinvention, and that creative and groundbreaking spirit should serve us well in the future. We support a working group to generate strategic planning that supports the tourist economy.

There are a set of basic principles that have served the Aspen Area well for decades. These include:

- preserving scenic landscapes,
- protecting the natural environment,
- creating an extensive trail network,
- providing unparalleled winter and summer recreational opportunities,
- maintaining our unique architectural heritage,
- supporting arts and cultural institutions,
- maintaining a safe community,
- facilitating an interesting, vital and walkable downtown, and
- maintaining a sense of place.

This fundamental set of values evolved over the years by responding to changing conditions. The Community Workforce Housing program has provided a service to the resort by providing working residents a place to live, and reducing pressure on our challenged transportation system. Today, we seek to bring the lodging inventory into balance by encouraging economy/moderate lodging. We also strive to improve the everyday quality of life by finding better methods to manage the impacts of development.

Residential Sector

While some potential remains for residential development on vacant lots, the primary source of future residential construction will be redevelopment. The Aspen Area's recent track record shows that residential redevelopment typically means the demolition and replacement of existing homes with larger structures.

Current city and county zoning regulations should be reviewed and amended to better protect and preserve environmentally sensitive and scenic areas through various methods, including allowable house size. Zoning that protects environmentally sensitive and scenic areas has been in place since the mid-1970s, and has been updated from time to time. This plan calls for a renewed focus on these zoning rules. At the same time, this plan also focuses on the neighborhoods on either side of City/County boundaries, where allowable house size differs dramatically and can result in sudden changes in neighborhood character.

Protecting and preserving environmentally sensitive and scenic areas is an essential part of maintaining a sustainable resort in the long-term.

Lodging Sector

During the last 10-15 years, an aging lodging infrastructure, shifting expectations of travelers, and high financial returns for alternative uses such as 2nd homes has resulted in a declining lodging inventory. More specifically, dozens of moderate to economy lodges have converted to other uses. New lodges have tended to be in the deluxe category, with large rooms and extensive amenities.

The formulation of a strategy that replenishes the lodging base, and favors economy/moderate lodges is important to the long-term sustainability of a tourist economy that purposefully seeks to attract a diverse visitor base. Without "entry-level" lodging, we limit the ability of future generations of visitors to experience the Aspen Area and its surrounding public lands. It's undisputed that many of today's longtime locals and second homeowners first experienced Aspen thanks to "entry-level" lodging. The concept of providing equal access to Aspen has been present in long range plans dating back to 1976.

The need to accommodate a diverse visitor base is also a well-known fact of our dual season resort – while the winter visitor tends to reflect a higher-end demographic, the summer visitor is more family oriented. Finally, we also recognize that adequate economy/moderate lodging provides a place to stay for those who produce and participate in many of our critically important special events, workshops, and other activities.

We recognize the financial challenges of bringing our lodging inventory into balance by encouraging economy/moderate lodging and the viability of existing small lodges. This plan strongly encourages exploring a wide range of models, including additional zoning incentives and possible public/private partnerships.

Commercial Sector

This plan calls for exploration of the existing balance between local-serving and tourist-serving businesses, and to determine if the level of local-serving business is appropriate to serve year-round residents.

Due to high land and leasing costs, we are concerned that businesses providing basic necessities for both residents and visitors could be replaced with alternative uses that bring higher financial returns. A comprehensive investigation of this issue was undertaken by City staff in 2006/07, and ultimately recommended outreach to businesses, the potential future use of publicly-owned property, exploring community-based cooperatives and other possible tools.

Additionally, this plan calls for a unique and vital downtown area that serves a diversity of visitors, addressing the interests of future generations as well as the differing make-up of winter and summer tourists.

Public, Institutional, and Non-Profit Sectors

Active and influential civic and non-profit organizations, many of which found their roots in the legacy of the Aspen Idea, provide cultural experiences and educational opportunities. They are integral to our character and we depend on their continued strength. They also set us apart as a well-rounded resort with a wide range of choices to balance mind, body and spirit. It is critical to find ongoing methods of supporting these organizations.

Pace of Construction

The intense periods of construction activity that occur during national economic booms can reduce our every-day quality of life and the long-term sustainability of the visitor-based economy. Although significant improvements were made to construction management practices during the last economic boom, this plan calls for a renewed focus on managing the impacts of intense construction activity.

While citizen plans going back to 1976 and various surveys have shown consistent support for some kind of pacing system, specific methods have met with substantial opposition in the past, and none have been implemented. A comprehensive effort to explore pacing models must be deliberate and transparent, including substantial public outreach and feedback.

Mitigating Impacts on Community Infrastructure

The City of Aspen and Pitkin County currently require new development and redevelopment to at least partially offset its impacts on the community, including fees and other mitigation tools which provide for parks, schools, affordable housing, air quality, renewable energy systems, and the transportation system.

Some of our mitigation methods are sound and reliable, but others may not be achieving community goals in the most efficient manner. With the recent adoption of the Affordable Housing Certificate program, the City should comprehensively re-evaluate its "menu" of affordable housing mitigation to ensure the viability of this new certificate program. The

County should re-evaluate the housing mitigation fee exemptions currently granted in the building permit process.

Both City and County mitigation strategies require further examination, research and potential changes to ensure that:

- Mitigation tools are effective in reaching community goals.
- Job generation and other impacts are being accurately calculated.
- New development and redevelopment offsets its impacts.

At the same time, this plan establishes a new goal of requiring that all new development fully offset the impacts of job generation by providing housing for 100% of the new employees generated. This policy is in part a response to the 2007 Affordable Housing Summit in Aspen, which concluded that the Aspen Area continues to fall behind in its effort to provide Community Workforce Housing (CWH).

The continued conversion of locally-owned homes to 2nd homes is just one trend that erodes the amount of workforce housing in the Aspen Area. Other long-term trends include substantial increases in downvalley home prices, limiting options for Aspen Area workers. In addition, the Aspen Area is on the cusp of a long-term trend that will result in more and more local workers retiring in affordable housing. While this is a minor factor at this time, baby boomer demographics clearly show that current Community Workforce Housing will steadily convert to affordable housing for retirees during the next 20 years.

This plan anticipates a continued reduction in the number of both free market and affordable housing units that will be occupied by working residents in the Aspen Area in coming years. These trends will reduce the ability of local businesses to hire local workers to support the tourism economy – and will result in even more profound impacts on our already challenged regional transportation system.

For these compelling reasons, this plan calls for every new development – public or private – to offset its job generation by providing affordable housing for 100% of all new employees. This will require considerable changes to current growth management practices, which currently reduce housing mitigation requirements if certain community benefits are provided.

What's Changed Since 2000 + What's New in the 2011 AACP

What's Changed Since 2000

In 2000, the Aspen Area Community Plan re-adopted the Aspen Area Urban Growth Boundary (UGB), in an effort to prevent further urban sprawl. The concept was to encourage higher density development that met community goals in urbanized areas, with much lower density development outside of the UGB.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 5:26 PM

Comment [13]: Flag. This statement is inaccurate in terms of what the plan actually said or how the "concept" actually worked in Aspen. Please quote the plan instead.

During the economic downturn of 2001-2003, the City of Aspen focused on allowing more **development** within the City. At the same time, the Economic Sustainability Committee identified its top priority as replenishing the lodging base.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 5:26 PM

Deleted: "infill"

Just as new code changes were adopted to encourage infill and lodging, the national economy dramatically improved and several major land use applications for the downtown were submitted. The public expressed serious concerns that the downtown would lose its character, and turn into a series of tall monolithic buildings. At the same time, some longtime local-serving businesses such as Aspen Drug were converting to other uses. The City Council responded by adopting a moratorium in April 2006.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:16 PM

Comment [14]: Flag. The upzonings encouraged penthouses and fractional interests, which, as far as we know, aren't actually providing lodging (the so-called "lock-offs")

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 5:34 PM

Comment [15]:

In 2007, the Council adopted extensive changes to the Commercial and Lodging Design Standards, including new restrictive regulations and a mandate to substantially vary heights. No major development has come forward to put the 2007 design standards into practice.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:18 PM

Comment [16]: Flag. We previously discussed that this kind of language suggests that design standards are the cure for the broken "infill" regulations. The issue is one of design, but it doesn't get at the root of the problem, which is that the development (type AND scale) itself is not appropriate or desirable.

Between 2000 and 2010, most construction activity occurred in the form of more than 270 homes being demolished and replaced with new and larger homes. This reflected more than 800,000 square feet of new residential space.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:19 PM

Comment [17]: Why list the residential square feet when you don't list the new commercial/lodge space?

Since adoption of the 2000 AACP, Pitkin County modified the Land Use Code to limit house size to 5,750 square feet, allowing larger homes up to 15,000 square feet within the UGB only upon purchase of transferable development rights (TDRs) from remote or agricultural properties in the County.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:19 PM

Comment [18]: Fact check.

As the development economy slowed to a near standstill since 2008, the focus has been on public projects, including approval for an expansion of Aspen Valley Hospital and a new Aspen Art Museum. While a new downtown Fire Station was constructed, an effort to build on the vacant lot next to the Wheeler stalled in the public process. Today, preliminary planning continues for a renovated Galena Plaza and expanded Pitkin County Library. In the Aspen Airport Business Center area, the Pitkin County Animal Shelter and Aspen Fire Protection District substation have been built in recent years.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:21 PM

Comment [19]: Flag. Fact check. How is the AAM a public project?

In March 2010, the City Council adopted an Affordable Housing Certificate Program intended to make it more economically viable for the private sector to produce deed-restricted housing – and as a method to provide mitigation in a more timely manner.

What's New in the 2011 AACP

One of the broad themes of the 2011 AACP calls for managing growth so that future development contributes to the viability and stability of a sustainable, diverse tourist-based economy and a strong year-round community. While this is not an entirely new concept, the 2011 AACP places a stronger emphasis on this approach compared to past plans.

Similarly, the concept of limiting residential growth in environmentally sensitive areas and scenic areas is not a new idea. However this plan places a stronger emphasis on this effort compared to the 2000 AACP.

Seeking to replenish the lodging inventory while bringing it back into balance by encouraging the development of economy/moderate lodging is a significant new policy

3.28.2011 Draft AACP

Page 20 of 103

compared to past AACPs. It is a policy that began to evolve with the Economic Sustainability Committee Report of 2003.

Perhaps the most significant change in the 2011 AACP is a call to increase housing mitigation so that all new development provides affordable housing for 100% of the new employees generated. This will require many changes to existing city and county codes and practices. Currently, housing mitigation is exempted or partially waived if various types of community benefits are provided. At the same time, the plan suggests that both the City and County conduct a comprehensive re-evaluation of their housing mitigation strategies to ensure that job generation is being accurately calculated, and that mitigation tools result in occupied, deed-restricted housing.

Finally, unlike the 2000 AACP, this plan does not set a cap on population growth. This decision was not made lightly, but was based on several important conclusions.

The bottom line is that a population cap is simply not legally enforceable. The fact is that every property carries with it certain property and development rights, which cannot legally be eliminated without compensation. In short, we can't simply "close the gate."

Instead, we focused our time and energy on estimating ultimate build-out as part of the State of the Aspen Area Report. And there is more statistical work to do. The 2011 AACP calls for further research on the various impacts that ultimate build-out could have on the Aspen Area, from job generation to traffic congestion. Estimating and understanding these impacts will help the community make important decisions during the 10-year life of this plan.

In addition, establishing a population cap could provide a false sense of control that might distract us from exploring realistic and effective tools that can help shape the future. For example, our zoning regulations can influence where a home might be built along a river. Our mitigation policies can offset the impacts of new development in any number of ways.

While we recognize that there are ultimate physical limitations to development in the form of eventual build-out, we also concluded that a population cap was not an effective tool in shaping our future. Instead, we sought consensus on a shared vision.

Linkages

This plan recognizes that community goals are often inextricably linked: sometimes they complement each other, and at times they come into conflict. We manage growth to ensure different community functions and uses are in balance, and to help reach community goals in the broadest sense. When we discuss the different ways to manage growth, topics include ultimate build-out, job generation, affordable housing needs, environmental impacts, infrastructure expansion, the transportation system, and the viability of our tourist-based economy. We rely on the tools of growth management to encourage the uses needed by the community, and to discourage uses that don't contribute to our vision for the future.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:24 PM

Comment [20]: Flag. Fact check (the County already requires 100%), and also we need to decide whether this is really the most important issue for the entire community.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:23 PM

Comment [21]: Flag. This does not accurately reflect P&Z's position.

Policies

I. MAINTAIN OUR TOURIST-BASED ECONOMY

I.1. Maintain and improve the Aspen Area's tourist-based economy. (Community Goal, Collaborative Initiative)

FOR SOME REASON THE "CLEAN" WORD VERSION IS MISSING 1.a.-j. Both 1.a. and 1.b., which I would flag because we need to be clear about what this group is doing. A marketing plan is fine (though I might disagree that it should be about "branding" which is an unseemly way to describe the town, in my view), but this shouldn't be the impetus for more upzonings in the name of revitalization. Hopefully we have learned from prior mistakes. The new language also deletes the notion about keeping Aspen relevant to the next generation.

II. RESIDENTIAL SECTOR

II.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. (Proposed Amendment)

HERE MY CLEAN DRAFT IS ALSO MISSING 4.a. i-iv

II.2. Preserve and protect environmentally sensitive and scenic areas by controlling the location and size of homes in those areas. (Proposed Amendment)

II.3. Protect the visual quality and character of residential neighborhoods by reducing site coverage. (Proposed Amendment)

II.4. Encourage permanent residents to remain in existing free market homes. (Incentive Program)

II.5. Ensure that the County and City Transferrable Development Rights (TDR) programs continue to effectively preserve backcountry areas/agricultural lands, and historic structures, respectively. (Work Program for Planning, Proposed Code Amendment)

III. LODGING SECTOR

III.1. Prevent the further loss of lodging inventory. (Community Goal, Collaborative Initiative, Proposed Amendment)

III.2. Replenish the declining lodging base with an emphasis on a diverse and balanced inventory. (Community Goal, Proposed Amendment)

III.3. Lodging amenities should be designed to facilitate interaction between visitors and residents. (Community Goal, Proposed Amendment)

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/11/11 10:13 AM

Comment [22]: This section doesn't contain so many of the subsections that I have stopped commenting. It would have been better for me to have worked off the redline draft! I am switching to that draft now, but have already made comments on the next two pages ...

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:29 PM

Comment [23]: Flag. The prior policy extended beyond site coverage and included mass and scale. Also gone are the reasons why ...

III.4. New lodging should be compatible and in harmony with the massing, scale and character of the neighborhood. (Regulatory)

V. COMMERCIAL SECTOR

IV.1. Create a commercial mix that is balanced, diverse, vital, and meets the needs of year-round residents and visitors. (Community Goal, Collaborative Initiative)

IV.2. Ensure the sustainability of retail businesses that provide basic and essential products and services. (Collaborative Initiative, Incentive Program, Work Program for Planning)

IV.3. Ensure that the City code supports innovative development that respects our architectural heritage in terms of site coverage, mass, scale, form and a diversity of heights. (Work Program for Planning, Proposed Amendment)

V. PUBLIC, INSTITUTIONAL, AND NON-PROFIT SECTOR

V.1. Ensure that PUD and COWOP processes result in long-term community benefits and do not degrade the built environment through mass and scale that significantly exceed land use code standards. (Community Goal, Proposed Amendment)

V.2. Preserve and enhance our non-profit and quasi-public facilities and spaces. (see also Aspen Idea Chapter) (Collaborative Initiative)

V.3. New or expanded non-profit facilities in the UGB should be located within the City limits, as their mission allows. (Proposed Amendment)

VI. MANAGING GROWTH

VI.1. Manage development so that it contributes to the long-term viability of a sustainable, diverse tourist-based economy and a strong year-round community. (Community Goal, Work Program for Planning)

VI.2. Restore public confidence in the development process. (Community Goal, Collaborative Initiative)

VI.3. Our public policies should be informed by reliable data on construction statistics, and population segments. (Data Gathering)

VI.4. New development should be compatible and in harmony with the massing, scale and character of the neighborhood. (Regulatory)

VII. PACE OF CONSTRUCTION

VII.1. Explore better methods to manage adverse construction impacts, including a construction pacing system that respects quiet enjoyment of our community and neighborhoods. (Community Goal, Proposed Amendment)

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:38 PM

Comment [24]: Flag. This standard has never worked well before. The new language eliminates the prior language which said "New lodging should be modest in bulk, mass and scale ..." Also eliminated was the list of reasons why these limitations were in place.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:40 PM

Comment [25]: Flag. This is in the eye of the beholder. We should be much more precise.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:43 PM

Comment [26]: Flag. The word "tangible" (which means actual and concrete) was substituted with "long-term."

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:45 PM

Comment [27]: Flag. The prior language read quite differently and changes the meaning of the prior policy.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:46 PM

Comment [28]: Flag. The prior draft said "achieve sustainable growth practices ..." It isn't just an issue of managing growth – the point was that we're not doing it in a sustainable way right now.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:50 PM

Comment [29]: Flag.. This draft deletes our prior language that impacts of development should be understood as well.

MARCELLA LARSEN 4/10/11 9:51 PM

Comment [30]: Flag. This substantially changes the position of the P&Z. If there was prior inappropriate development, that means it will continue. We need to say what we mean.

VIII. MITIGATING IMPACTS ON COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE

VIII.1. Ensure that new residential development and redevelopment mitigates all reasonable, directly-related housing impacts. (See Colorado Revised Statutes 29-20-104.5) (Work Program for Planning & APCHA, Proposed Amendment)

VIII.2. Ensure that impact fees fully offset the associated costs of development on the community. (Work Program for Planning & Attorney's Office, Proposed Amendment)

VIII.3 All development should provide housing to accommodate 100% of the employees it generates. (Work Program for Planning & APCHA, Proposed Amendment)

VIII.4. On-site housing mitigation is preferred. (Work Program for Planning & APCHA, Proposed Amendment)

Page 1: [1] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

The community goals we seek to achieve in this chapter include (in no particular order):
Providing

Page 1: [2] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

Managing the impacts of development to maintain a high quality of life.
Preserving mountain views and the natural ecosystems, including riparian areas.
Maintaining a high quality of life and resort experience.
Planning for a tourism economy that is supported by

Page 1: [3] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

Facilitating a diverse, unique and vital downtown area.
Supporting a vibrant non-profit sector, including arts and cultural organizations.
Preserving

Page 1: [4] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

to future generations.
Replenishing the lodging base with a focus on diversifying the lodging inventory.
Encouraging a local business sector that provides basic products and services for everyone, and encouraging an appropriate level of local-serving business

Page 1: [5] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

This community plan recognizes that managing growth and economic sustainability are closely inter-related, and have therefore been combined into one chapter for the first time in order to identify how they work together.

The City and County growth management systems are effective tools that can help the community reach desired goals. The management of development through growth management and other land use tools influences our three intertwining economies:
Resort tourism
Development/Real estate
Year-round Community

None of these economies stands discrete and alone; they are inextricably connected at a number of levels. The economic impact of growth management and other land use tools have been debated for many years, and should continue to be a focus of discussion, study, and visual and economic modeling.

For example, preserving scenic views, riparian areas and a pristine natural environment are important aesthetic and philosophical values held closely by local residents, but these efforts have also contributed to a highly attractive resort, and resulted in substantial economic benefits across the board. Studies have repeatedly shown that open space and opportunities for recreation reflect a kind of natural capital that enhances the economic well-being of the entire community.

As the resort matured in the 1980s, additional venues for arts and cultural groups complemented the already outstanding recreational opportunities and scenic views, and the development economy began growing dramatically. A 2008 economic study commissioned by the City of Aspen found that by 2000 – for the first time – the economic

activity related to the development industry eclipsed and surpassed the economic activity related to the tourism industry.

While the development industry has been hit hard by the current recession, to assume that it will not make a rebound during the 10-year life of this plan would be irresponsible. Therefore, one of the broad themes of this plan is to manage future development so that it contributes to the long-term viability of a sustainable, diverse tourist-based economy and a strong year-round community.

Ensuring a Sustainable Tourist-Based Economy

Our long-term sustainability as a visitor-based economy depends largely on our ability to remain an attractive, welcoming and accessible place for future generations. Aspen has a long history of loyal visitors who return at a rate of about 70% -- far higher than other mountain resorts.

At the same time, we recognize the importance of looking to the future, and considering the interests and needs of the next generation of residents and visitors. As a resort, it's important to ask ourselves: How will Aspen continue be relevant in the next 10-20 years? Some of our local businesses and institutions have anticipated these questions, and adjusted their programming. Aspen has a history of innovation and reinvention, and that creative and groundbreaking spirit should serve us well in the future. We support a working group to generate strategic planning that supports the tourist economy.

There are a set of basic principles that have served the Aspen Area well for decades. These include:

- preserving scenic landscapes,
- protecting the natural environment,
- creating an extensive trail network,
- providing unparalleled winter and summer recreational opportunities,
- maintaining our unique architectural heritage,
- supporting arts and cultural institutions,
- maintaining a safe community,
- facilitating an interesting, vital and walkable downtown, and
- maintaining a sense of place.

This fundamental set of values evolved over the years by responding to changing conditions. The Community Workforce Housing program has provided a service to the resort by providing working residents a place to live, and reducing pressure on our challenged transportation system. Today, we seek to bring the lodging inventory into balance by encouraging economy/moderate lodging. We also strive to improve the everyday quality of life by finding better methods to manage the impacts of development.

Current city and county zoning regulations should be reviewed and amended to better protect and preserve environmentally sensitive and scenic areas through various methods, including allowable house size. Zoning that protects environmentally sensitive and scenic areas has been in place since the mid-1970s, and has been updated from time to time. This plan calls for a renewed focus on these zoning rules. At the same time, this plan also focuses on the neighborhoods on either side of City/County boundaries,

where allowable house size differs dramatically and can result in sudden changes in neighborhood character.

Protecting and preserving environmentally sensitive and scenic areas is an essential part of maintaining a sustainable resort in the long-term.

Page 3: [7] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

an aging lodging infrastructure, shifting expectations of travelers, and high financial returns for alternative uses such as 2nd homes

Page 3: [7] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

an aging lodging infrastructure, shifting expectations of travelers, and high financial returns for alternative uses such as 2nd homes

Page 3: [7] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

an aging lodging infrastructure, shifting expectations of travelers, and high financial returns for alternative uses such as 2nd homes

Page 3: [7] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

an aging lodging infrastructure, shifting expectations of travelers, and high financial returns for alternative uses such as 2nd homes

Page 3: [8] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

The need to accommodate a diverse visitor base is also a well-known fact of our dual season resort – while the winter visitor tends to reflect a higher-end demographic, the summer visitor is more family oriented. Finally, we also recognize that adequate economy/moderate lodging provides a place to stay for those who produce and participate in many of our critically important special events, workshops, and other activities.

We recognize the financial challenges of bringing our lodging inventory into balance by encouraging economy/moderate lodging and the viability of existing small lodges. This plan strongly encourages exploring a wide range of models, including additional zoning incentives and possible public/private partnerships.

Commercial Sector

This plan calls for exploration of the existing balance between local-serving and tourist-serving businesses, and to determine if the level of local-serving business is appropriate to serve year-round residents.

Due to

Page 3: [9] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

land and leasing costs,

Page 3: [9] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

land and leasing costs,

Page 3: [9] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

land and leasing costs,

Page 3: [10] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

Additionally, this plan calls for a unique and vital downtown area that serves a diversity of visitors, addressing the interests of future generations as well as the differing make-up of winter and summer tourists.

Page 3: [10] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

Additionally, this plan calls for a unique and vital downtown area that serves a diversity of visitors, addressing the interests of future generations as well as the differing make-up of winter and summer tourists.

Page 3: [11] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

Active and influential

Page 3: [11] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

Active and influential

Page 3: [11] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

Active and influential

Page 3: [11] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

Active and influential

Page 3: [11] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

Active and influential

Page 3: [12] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

While citizen plans going back to 1976 and various surveys have shown consistent support for some kind of pricing system, specific methods have met with substantial opposition in the past, and none have been implemented. A comprehensive effort to explore pricing models must be deliberate and transparent, including substantial public outreach and feedback.

Mitigating Impacts on Community Infrastructure

Page 3: [13] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

at least partially offset

Page 3: [13] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

at least partially offset

Page 3: [13] Deleted **MARCELLA LARSEN** **4/11/11 9:19 AM**

at least partially offset

Page 3: [13] Deleted	MARCELLA LARSEN	4/11/11 9:19 AM
----------------------	-----------------	-----------------

at least partially offset

Page 3: [13] Deleted	MARCELLA LARSEN	4/11/11 9:19 AM
----------------------	-----------------	-----------------

at least partially offset

Page 3: [13] Deleted	MARCELLA LARSEN	4/11/11 9:19 AM
----------------------	-----------------	-----------------

at least partially offset

Page 3: [13] Deleted	MARCELLA LARSEN	4/11/11 9:19 AM
----------------------	-----------------	-----------------

at least partially offset

Page 3: [13] Deleted	MARCELLA LARSEN	4/11/11 9:19 AM
----------------------	-----------------	-----------------

at least partially offset

Page 3: [13] Deleted	MARCELLA LARSEN	4/11/11 9:19 AM
----------------------	-----------------	-----------------

at least partially offset

Page 3: [14] Deleted	MARCELLA LARSEN	4/11/11 9:19 AM
----------------------	-----------------	-----------------

The continued conversion of locally-owned homes to 2nd homes is just one trend that erodes the amount of workforce housing in the Aspen Area. Other long-term trends include substantial increases in downvalley home prices, limiting options for Aspen Area workers. In addition, the Aspen Area is on the cusp of a long-term trend that will result in more and more local workers retiring in affordable housing. While this is a minor factor at this time, baby boomer demographics clearly show that current Community Workforce Housing will steadily convert to affordable housing for retirees during the next 20 years.

This plan anticipates a continued reduction in the number of both free market and affordable housing units that will be occupied by working residents in the Aspen Area in coming years. These trends will reduce the ability of local businesses to hire local workers to support the tourism economy – and will result in even more profound impacts on our already challenged regional transportation system.

For these compelling reasons, this plan calls for every new development – public or private – to offset its job generation by providing affordable housing for 100% of all new employees. This will require considerable changes to current growth management practices, which currently reduce housing mitigation requirements if certain community benefits are provided.