

AGENDA

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

Sister Cities Meeting Room, Aspen City Hall

**130 Galena St
Aspen, Colorado**

October 27, 2009

4:30 PM WORKSESSION

1. Review of the Aspen Area Community Plan update
 - a. Review of Managing Growth – Vision & Philosophy
 - b. Review of Managing Growth – Goals & Action Items

7:30 PM ADJOURN WORKSESSION

MEMORANDUM

TO: City of Aspen Planning and Zoning Commission;
Pitkin County Planning and Zoning Commission

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

THRU: Chris Bendon, City Community Development Director
Cindy Houben, County Community Development Director

DATE OF MEMO: October 22, 2009

MEETING DATE: October 27, 2009, 4:30pm in Sister Cities

RE: Managing Growth & Economic Sustainability

SUMMARY: After the Planning and Zoning Commissions revised the Vision Statement on October 13th, the P&Zs agreed that staff would use the new Vision Statement to revise and shorten the Philosophy statement.

The revised Philosophy Statement is attached as Exhibit A, to be reviewed by the P&Zs at the October 27th meeting. Some of Marcella's suggestions have been included in the revision, but not all. Staff will project the statement on a screen so we can make changes as necessary. We will provide hard copies of Marcella's comments for reference at the meeting.

Staff is hoping to avoid overly specific wordsmithing in the interest of moving forward with the process. These statements can be reviewed and revised again once we have an overall draft plan.

Staff has also drafted Policies and Action Items for P&Z review, based on discussion to this point. These have been adjusted somewhat compared to a previous draft, and are also contained in Exhibit A. Ideally, we will begin a review of Policies and Action Items on the 27th. Staff provided a number of exhibits as background information for the October 13th meeting, and it may be helpful for P&Z members to bring those exhibits to the meeting on the 27th.

There was brief discussion on October 13th regarding a new study staff had provided to the P&Zs in August on future Residential Redevelopment in Aspen's residential neighborhoods, and we are again providing that study as Exhibit B.

One item that was raised at the October 13th meeting that has not been addressed in the draft is an overall population cap. While there has been some discussion of this concept throughout the P&Zs conversations on Managing Growth, no clear consensus has been reached. Staff is prepared, if the P&Zs wish, to make a presentation and recommendation on this issue at the October 27th meeting.

ATTACHMENTS:

Exhibit A: Revised Vision + Philosophy Statements; Policies and Action Items

Exhibit B: Potential for Future Residential Redevelopment: City of Aspen

DRAFT VISION

The Aspen Area is committed to returning to sustainable land use practices that:

- Create a vibrant year-round community with an excellent quality of life;
- Preserve the physical scale and historic character of our small town;
- Preserve mountain views;
- Consume the least amount of non-renewable resources and is as “green” as possible;
- Encourage redevelopment that results in affordable lodging, commercial and residential uses, and discourages projects with minimal community benefit and excessive job generation;
- Encourage local-serving businesses and a diverse tourist economy;
- Develop affordable housing to provide for a critical mass of local residents, while limiting the future demand for additional affordable housing;
- Control the pace of growth;
- Recognize the physical limits of the geographic bowl that is the Aspen Area;
- Recognize that uncontrolled residential growth will result in a spiraling need for more affordable housing and more infrastructure, which threatens the small town character of our built environment, scenic mountain views, the natural environment, safe enjoyment of an outdoor lifestyle and the overall quality of life that sustains a healthy year-round community and visitor-based economy.

DRAFT PHILOSOPHY

The architectural, social, economic and cultural character of modern Aspen reflects a Victorian Era western mining town, a scenic Rocky Mountain landscape, the post-war foundations of skiing, summer recreation and unique cultural institutions – and a strong environmental ethic. These are the elements of the Aspen Area that attract people from across the country and around the world and are essential to the long-term sustainability of a vibrant permanent population and diverse tourist economy.

Beginning in the mid-1970s, the Aspen Area has a long history of growth management centered around a desire to preserve the natural environment, the social environment, the unique heritage of a small town community and broader quality of life goals. Growth management has evolved from a system originally designed to keep growth from out-pacing traditional infrastructure and

fiscal capacity, to a system that also directs growth to meet changing community priorities. Both the City of Aspen and Pitkin County have used growth management and other land use tools to preserve open space and rural character, encourage a diverse lodging base and create a critical mass of permanent residents through affordable housing.

In addition, both the city and county have adopted a variety of regulations to attempt to control the type, quality, quantity, rate and impacts of growth. Some of this legislation has been effective, yet during three major economic boom periods over the last 30 years, the Aspen Area has been inundated by growth that is inconsistent with the unique heritage of our built environment, the social diversity of the year-round community, the social diversity of visitors and the outdoor lifestyle and pristine views of a small town high in the Rocky Mountains. These three boom periods overshadowed what was primarily a tourist-based economy and made real estate and development the dominant economic force in the 1990s and 2000s.

Today, we recognize that the original pillars of our community character naturally evolved into a visitor-based economy, and these pillars remain the foundation of our high quality of life, and that tourism is the only economy that is consistent with our values and is also sustainable over the long-term. Today, our responsibility is to ensure that growth is managed in a way that avoids damage to the long-term health and stability of our community and its visitor-based economy.

We need to preserve the unique visual experience of a small town high in the Rocky Mountains. Even our most important community goals -- of providing affordable housing, of replenishing the lodging base, of a lively downtown with a healthy balance of unique shops and restaurants -- should remain subservient to a built and natural environment that respects pristine natural beauty along with the modest physical scale and architectural context of our town.

The tools for managing growth are intended to create a healthy balance among a variety of uses, so that one kind of use does not overshadow others. We also manage growth to ensure that it does not outpace the public sector's financial capacity and the provision of necessary infrastructure that maintains both basic public services and a high quality of life.

Our roads and water system are part of infrastructure, as are public trails, affordable housing, a balanced lodging inventory, a lively and interesting downtown, unique restaurants, recycling programs, clean air and water, compelling special events, locally-serving businesses and renewable energy systems.

The Residential Sector

While some potential remains for the development of new dwelling units on existing vacant lots, the primary source of new construction in the future will be in the area of residential redevelopment. The track record in the Urban Growth Boundary shows that

residential redevelopment typically means the demolition of existing homes and replacement with expanded homes that are almost always as large as current code allows.

1. Pace of Construction

Intense periods of construction activity threaten the long-term sustainability of the visitor-based economy. Therefore, amending city and county codes to manage the pace of construction activity is essential. The purpose of pacing construction is to maintain a high quality of life for residents and a high quality experience for visitors by preventing traffic congestion, noise, dust, disturbances and reduction in air quality; creating a safe and enjoyable atmosphere for pedestrians and bicyclists in a community that emphasizes alternate modes of transportation and an outdoor recreational lifestyle; preventing the disruption of the visual and aesthetic character of city and county neighborhoods and the downtown area through the presence of construction trailers, heavy truck parking, construction fences and disrupted landscaping.

2. House Size

The built environment is an important part of what defines a community's character and identity. The size and location of new and redeveloped homes in the Urban Growth Boundary is out of context with the unique architectural heritage of a small town in the Rocky Mountains, and disrupts pristine mountain views.

New limits on house size and stronger regulations governing the location of homes on hillsides will preserve and maintain our quality of life by planning for a built environment that reflects historic heritage, preserves scenic mountain views, limits damage to the natural environment, limits the public financial burden of additional infrastructure and annual local government operations, prevents negative construction impacts such as traffic congestion, maintains the safety and enjoyment of our outdoor lifestyle and limits the unnecessary use of resources and unnecessary future energy use.

The Lodging Sector

During the last 10-15 years, many small- to mid-sized lodges in Aspen have converted to other uses, resulting in the loss of many economy/moderate lodges. At the same time, the market has favored the development of 2nd homes and deluxe, high-end, fractional "lodge" projects. We must replenish our lodging base to ensure a balanced, diverse inventory for visitors in order to support a sustainable visitor-based economy. Moderate lodges are needed to encourage a diversity of visitors, and to support special events attendees and producers.

We should formulate a strategy that prevents the further loss of the small to mid-sized lodges that reflect Aspen's historic character, incentivize small room sizes, limit unnecessary amenities that drive excessive job generation, encourage a mixture of different types of inventory in lodge projects and encourage visitors to recognize the town and surrounding areas as their primary amenity.

The Retail Sector

The downtown is our “front porch” -- it is the place where we make our first impression on visitors. As reflected in past planning efforts, local residents remain dissatisfied with the sense of identity that is created by our retail sector.

High-profile locations in the downtown have steadily converted from restaurants to retail, high rents have resulted in a continuing shift towards exclusivity and the total number of restaurants and bars has dropped substantially since 2000, contributing to a loss of vitality, diversity and balance. We have also grown concerned that businesses providing basic necessities could be replaced with different uses, as illustrated by the closing of Aspen Drug at the corner of Galena & Hyman.

While recognizing that government involvement in the commercial sector is a complex undertaking, we must identify methods and explore partnerships to retain essential businesses, and restore a healthy diversity of unique stores and restaurants – fostering a stronger sense of vitality for both residents and visitors.

Sustainability for Future Generations

The long-term sustainability of our community and visitor-based economy depends largely on our ability to remain an attractive home and destination for future generations. The foundations of our high quality of life must be solidly in place, including skiing, summer recreation, scenic beauty, outdoor lifestyle, strong and diverse year-round community, compelling special events, a diverse lodging inventory, our genuine architectural heritage, a vital downtown and a wide range of arts & cultural offerings.

Mitigation

The City of Aspen and Pitkin County require a range of mitigation for new development, including park fees, school fees, affordable housing, transportation fees and others. Today, we must renew our focus on the types of development that provide minimal public benefit while generating excessive job generation. We need better information on the amount and types of impact created by residential development and redevelopment, and a strategy to ensure that all impacts are offset.

For example, the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) program has provided some benefit in the form of rental units that are spread out in neighborhoods, but the ratio of ADUs that are occupied by employees is too low. The payment-in-lieu option does not adequately reflect the true cost of providing deed-restricted housing, placing too high a burden on public entities to find locations, design, review and build affordable housing.

The Future of the AABC: This section will be drafted after the P&Z holds discussions on the issues of Transportation and the AABC.

POLICIES AND ACTION ITEMS

The following policies and action items are adopted to address the following critical issues: 1) the Residential Sector, 2) the Lodging Sector, 3) Aspen’s Commercial Core, 4) The AABC Area, 5) the Public Sector, 6) Non-Profit/Institutional, 7) Mitigation, 8) Pace of Construction, 9) The Next Generation.

The action items are arranged alongside the policies, so the purpose of the action item is understood. Each Policy is numbered, while the associated Action Items are lettered. For instance, Action Item “1.a” is associated with Policy “1.”

I. RESIDENTIAL SECTOR POLICIES	I. RESIDENTIAL SECTOR ACTION ITEMS
<p>1) Control the location and size of homes in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protect the natural visual quality of river and stream corridors and the surrounding mountainsides to preserve a scenic Rocky Mountain experience; • protect our small town community character and historical heritage; • reduce environmental degradation and excessive consumption; • limit infrastructure costs and local government operating costs; and • reduce a wide range of short- and long-term job generation impacts, including traffic congestion and demand for affordable housing. 	<p>1.a Amend City’s 8040 Greenline process by 1) Adding emphasis in Purpose section to scenic protection rather than only to mitigate for environmental damage, 2) Strengthen criteria re: visual impacts, 3) Require that applicants provide a 3-D model of proposal, as well as requiring a range of specific views from “below.”</p> <p>1.b Amend City code regarding allowable FAR on slopes with the intent of establishing smaller house size that is more appropriate to sloping, mountainside sites. <i>(City currently reduces allowable square footage by a <u>maximum of 25%</u> to calculate house size, regardless of the steepness of slopes.)</i></p> <p>1.c For parcels on slopes, amend City code to adopt a new site plan review process that locates building envelopes in the portion of the lot with lowest slope and/or smallest visual impact. Also adopt new criteria to avoid environmental degradation and minimize visual impacts on slopes, much like 8040 Greenline review. <i>(Pitkin County currently has similar regulations for sloped sites, regarding the location of homes and engineering requirements.)</i></p>

	<p>1.d Explore legality of prohibiting any building on slopes of 30% or greater, regarding takings law. <i>(Neither the City nor County currently have an outright prohibition regarding building on slopes.)</i></p> <p>1.e Amend County code to reduce allowable FAR on slopes. <i>(County code currently reduces the number of dwelling units allowable based on slopes, but does not address FAR.)</i></p> <p>1.f Amend County code to reduce maximum “hard cap” for house sizes within Urban Growth Boundary from 15,000 s.f. to 7,500 s.f. <i>(County philosophy has been to allow large homes near urban area, where services are available. A reduction of house size in the UGB may place pressure on other areas of County where house size limits would remain higher than 7,500, and would likely require the County to look at a countywide house size reduction.)</i></p> <p>1.g Ensure that the County TDR market remains stable and healthy if changes are made to the hard cap on house sizes in the County. Scope of work would include: a) Estimate future TDR supply, b) Review potential adjustments to ensure adequate demand, such as reducing the FAR awarded for a TDR, c) Explore a sliding FAR scale for TDRs based on scenic or other value related to sending site, d) Explore potential for inter-jurisdictional TDR exchange between County and City, e) Explore other possible “awards” for receiving sites (aside from FAR).</p> <p>1.h Amend city and county codes to address proper solar orientation of homes, and the accommodation of renewable energy structures.</p> <p>1.i. Amend city and county codes with regard to development in riparian area, with the intent to strengthen regulations and establish consistency as appropriate.</p>
--	---

<p>II. LODGING SECTOR POLICIES</p> <p>1) Lodging development or redevelopment should emphasize the town and surrounding area as the primary amenity rather than including extensive amenity space on-site, thereby encouraging the integration of visitors with residents, promoting the use and enjoyment of local businesses and recreational opportunities, reducing the need for bulk and mass to accommodate extensive on-site amenities and limiting unnecessary job generation.</p> <p>2) Encourage the development or redevelopment of moderate/economy lodging to maintain a balanced lodging inventory and to reduce employment generation.</p> <p>3) Prevent the further loss of lodging inventory in the Lodge Zone District.</p> <p>4) Different types of lodging inventory (deluxe, moderate, economy) should be mixed on-site and throughout the area rather than segregated geographically.</p>	<p>II. LODGING SECTOR ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>1.a Amend city <u>and</u> county codes to implement policy.</p> <p>2.a Explore the potential for city fee abatements and limited public financing with regard to the development/redevelopment of moderate/economy lodging.</p> <p>3.a Amend City code to eliminate provision for new multi-family free market residential use in Lodge Zone District.</p> <p>4.a Amend city code to accommodate and incentivize a mixture of types of lodging inventory on-site.</p>
<p>III. ASPEN COMMERCIAL CORE POLICIES</p> <p>1) Ensure that new Commercial Design Standards and Historic Preservation Guidelines will result in development that reflects the context of architectural heritage in terms of site coverage, mass, scale and form and will maintain a diversity of heights.</p> <p>2) Ensure that stores providing basic products and necessities are maintained in the long-term.</p>	<p>III. ASPEN COMMERCIAL CORE ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>1.a Use City’s new 3-D model of downtown area to test Commercial Design Guidelines and Historic Preservation Guidelines. (<i>Commercial Design Guidelines were adopted in 2007, but have never been applied to an actual development proposal.</i>)</p> <p>2.a Establish working group including representatives of City, ACRA, Aspen Retail Association to conduct outreach with property/business owners providing essential products in an effort to explore succession</p>

<p>3) Encourage a downtown commercial mix that is balanced, diverse, unique and vital.</p>	<p>planning.</p> <p>2.b Explore potential for adopting criteria to identify an “Essential Public Service” with regard to private sector retail.</p> <p>3.a Explore Growth Management incentives for non-prime commercial space including basements and alleys.</p>
<p>IV. AABC AREA POLICIES</p> <p>1) Ensure that comprehensive transportation services are in place as part of any substantial new development in the West of Aspen Corridor.</p>	<p>IV. AABC AREA ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>1.a Establish Master Plan for West of Aspen Corridor, from Maroon Creek Bridge to end of airport runway. <i>(This is anticipated to be completed as part of the AACP update.)</i></p>
<p>V. PUBLIC SECTOR POLICIES</p>	<p>V. PUBLIC SECTOR ACTION ITEMS</p>
<p>VI. NON-PROFIT/INSTITUTIONAL POLICIES</p>	<p>VI. NON-PROFIT/INSTITUTIONAL ACTION ITEMS</p>
<p>VII. MITIGATION POLICIES</p> <p>1) Ensure that new residential development and residential redevelopment fully mitigates for its range of impacts.</p>	<p>VII. MITIGATION ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>1.a Conduct a comprehensive review of all mitigation options. The action items below reflect a range of studies needed for this review.</p> <p>1.b Conduct updated study on job generation impacts of residential development and redevelopment.</p> <p>1.c Recalculate cash-in-lieu payment amount to reflect the job generation study, as well as the actual cost of providing off-site affordable housing, including the “soft” costs of locating developable property, design, planning, public process, identifying buy-down properties etc.</p> <p>1.d Review potential for establishing a “mitigation menu” of deed-restricted housing projects and potential buy-down properties.</p>

<p>2) Encourage moderate lodging with small rooms and minimal on-site amenities to re-balance lodging inventory, limit job generation and limit mass and scale.</p>	<p>Property owners developing or redeveloping single-family or duplex homes may choose from menu to fulfill mitigation requirements. A payment calculation would still be made based on net new square footage, and would determine from which “mitigation menu” they could choose. <i>(The rational basis for this approach would be the immediate offset of mitigation rather than accumulating cash in lieu payments for future projects.)</i></p> <p>1.e Re-evaluate City and County ADU programs to determine overall effectiveness, including updated database, rate of rental, survey of ADU owners to explore rental incentives, and investigating legal capability of requiring mandatory occupancy.</p> <p>1.f Review existing city and county policies allowing APCHA-eligible homeowners to defer mitigation payments until property purchased by non-APCHA-eligible owner. Amend city and county policies so they are fair and consistent.</p> <p>1.g Revise list of affordable housing mitigation options for residential redevelopment based on the outcome of studies recommended in action items above.</p> <p>2.a Amend County code to implement policy by reducing mitigation for lodge projects with small rooms and limited on-site amenities.</p> <p>2.b Reevaluate City code to implement policy. <i>(Current city code includes a sliding scale that reduces mitigation for development or redevelopment with small average room size and limited on-site amenities.)</i></p>
<p>3)Ensure that fees fully mitigate for impacts.</p>	<p>3.a Review existing impact fees in the city and county with regard to schools, parks, roads, stormwater etc.</p>

<p>VIII. PACE OF CONSTRUCTION POLICIES</p> <p>1) Manage level of construction activity so that it does not degrade quality of life for residents and visitors.</p> <p>2) Reduce the “spike” of construction activity during national economic booms by limiting speculative development practices.</p>	<p>VIII. PACE OF CONSTRUCTION ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>1.a Adopt Building Permit Allocation System in City and County, following a review of other cities and towns using such a system. Establish a “target” year determined to be acceptable in terms of construction activity, to be used as baseline for building permit cap. Examine potential for a Building Permit Allocation System with a “sunset” that is tied to specific infrastructure improvements or other accomplishment that ensures improved quality of life.</p> <p>1.b Identify development to be exempt from pacing system, i.e. explore potential for local residents to “go to the head of the line,” and defer mitigation [see Action Item VII(1.f)].</p> <p>2.a Amend City and County code to implement stricter criteria for the extensions of vested rights after initial three-year term, based on the provision of substantial community benefits. (<i>Vested rights must be granted for three years according to state law.</i>) Conduct research on vested rights policies of other cities and counties.</p> <p>2.b Amend building code to restrict the extensions of building permits unless development includes substantial community benefits.</p>
<p>IX. NEXT GENERATION POLICIES</p> <p>1.) Ensure that Aspen is an attractive place to live, work and play for the “next generation.”</p>	<p>IX. NEXT GENERATION ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>1.a Establish working group with representatives of major non-profit institutions, City, ACRA, APCHA, Aspen Retail Association, CCLC, Wilderness Workshop, other environment groups etc. to generate recommendations for implementing this policy.</p>
<p>X. DATA GATHERING POLICIES</p> <p>1) Track future trends in various population segments for the UGB to inform future public policy discussions.</p>	<p>X. DATA GATHERING ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>1.a Use Population Segment Chart as a starting point to establish reliable, repeatable methodology for tracking UGB population segments. Require yearly updates as part of city and county annual reports.</p>

Potential for Future Residential Redevelopment: City of Aspen

In order to estimate future residential redevelopment in the City of Aspen, Community Development Department staff conducted a sampling study in the summer of 2009, relying on records from the Pitkin County Assessor's Office.

The study identified two criteria to determine the existing residential structures that are most likely to be redeveloped and expanded. The two criteria were: the age of the existing structure and the amount of un-built square footage allowed by the current Land Use Code.

Sampling Method & Margin of Error

Due to time constraints, staff was unable to evaluate each existing residential structure in the City of Aspen, and instead relied on a sampling of single family residential parcels in the City of Aspen. The single-family homes in the sampling study came from five zone districts: R-6, R-15, R-15A, R-15B and R-30. (Staff had previously evaluated the build-out potential of residential units in the commercial and lodging zone districts; this separate information can be found in the Managing Growth chapter in the State of the Aspen Area Report.)

Due to time constraints, staff was unable to evaluate each existing single-family home in the City of Aspen, and instead relied on a sampling of approximately fifty-percent (50%). This sampling can be used to extrapolate an accurate estimate for the potential redevelopment of all single family homes in the city with a 3.5% margin of error, according to Venturoni Surveys and Research, based in Dillon, Colo. The study sample was collected using a randomizing function of the Excel computer program.

Potential for Duplexes

With the exception of R-15B, all residential zone districts allow for the redevelopment of single-family homes into duplexes, if the size of the residential lot in question meets eligibility requirements. The tables in this study include redevelopment and expansion potential for single-family lots, as well as the potential for converting and expanding single-family homes into duplexes. When there was potential for an existing single-family structure to redevelop into a larger single family home or a duplex, it was assumed the building would be redeveloped as a duplex. This assumption was made because the allowable floor area for duplexes is larger than single family buildings, and because this has historically been the trend.

Local and Non-Local

In order to provide other relevant information, the study also identifies residential structures according to local or non-local ownership. This distinction was made based on the mailing address of each parcel in the study, as identified in Assessor's Office records. This is not an exact data set, as some local owners may have tax bills mailed to out-of-area accountants, and some non-local owners may have tax bills mailed to in-town accountants. However, this has been used in surveys in the past and has a 5% margin of error, according to Venturoni Surveys and Research.

Analysis by Neighborhood

In order to compare the results with past residential redevelopment trends, the study also identifies the residential structures by neighborhood. The neighborhood boundaries are identical to those identified in the Managing Growth Chapter of the State of the Aspen Area Report, which includes residential redevelopment data on a neighborhood-by-neighborhood basis since 2000.

Historic Properties

The study includes a number of homes that are designated by the City of Aspen as historic, meaning they can't be demolished. However, properties designated historic can obtain approval for additions, and some can split their lots and build a new home. While existing historic structures can't be totally redeveloped, this study calculates the square footage that is available for expansion on-site or in the case of a lot split.

Study Results

The study results begin with a table showing the number of single-family homes with no square footage available for expansion versus the number of single-family homes that do have square footage available for expansion. The total sample size is 326 homes, with over seventy-five percent (75%) with floor area available for redevelopment/expansion.

Availability of additional FAR on all Cases				
	No FAR Left	Single Family and no Duplex Available FAR	Duplex Available FAR	Totals
Total Number	76	118	132	326
Percent of Total	23.31%	36.20%	40.49%	100.00%

In order to identify the single-family homes with the highest potential for future redevelopment and expansion, the subsequent tables show the number of homes that have remaining allowable square footage in the following categories:

- 1,001-1,500 square feet
- 1,501-2000 square feet
- More than 2,001 square feet

This narrowed the number of cases to 151. Just over fifty percent (50%) of these cases have more than 2,000 square feet of available floor area.

Total # of Cases with Single Family FAR available				
	1001 - 1500 Sq Ft	1501 - 2000 Sq Ft	>2001 Sq Ft	Totals
Total Number	20	20	17	57
Percent of Total	35.09%	35.09%	29.82%	100.00%

Total # of Cases with Duplex FAR available				
	1001 - 1500 Sq Ft	1501 - 2000 Sq Ft	>2001 Sq Ft	Totals
Total Number	14	21	59	94
Percent of Total	14.89%	22.34%	62.77%	100.00%

To further define the single-family homes with the highest potential for future redevelopment and expansion, existing homes with more than 1,001 square feet of allowable expansion were cross-referenced with the “Effective Year Built” of each home in the study. The “Effective Year Built” categories are:

- Pre-1960
- 1961-1970
- 1971-1980
- 1981-1990

This narrowed the cases to 118. Fifty-five percent (55%) of these cases have more than 2,000 square feet of un-built floor area.

Total # of Cases with more than 1000 sq. ft. of Single Family FAR Left Cross-Referenced with Effective Year Built					
	Pre-1960	1961 - 1970	1971 - 1980	1981 - 1990	Total
1001 - 1500 Sq Ft	0	1	6	8	15
1501 - 2000 Sq Ft	1	1	9	8	19
>2001 Sq Ft	0	4	7	5	16
Totals	1	6	22	21	50

Total # of Cases with more than 1000 sq. ft. of Duplex FAR Left Cross-Referenced with Effective Year Built					
	Pre-1960	1961 - 1970	1971 - 1980	1981 - 1990	Total
1001 - 1500 Sq Ft	0	1	1	2	4
1501 - 2000 Sq Ft	1	2	5	7	15
>2001 Sq Ft	2	7	17	23	49
Totals	3	10	23	32	68

“Effective Year Built” is identified by the Assessor’s Office by taking into account the date of the last renovation of the house as well as the general condition of the house, including the age of infrastructure such as foundations, HVAC systems etc.

The study also identified the final 118 cases by ownership (local vs. non-local) and by neighborhood. Approximately forty percent (40%) of the cases list non-local addresses.

Total # of Cases with more than 1000 sq. ft. of Single Family FAR Left and Effective Year Built pre-1991 Cross-Referenced with Local or Non-Local Ownership	
Local	31
Non-Local	19
Total	50

Total # of Cases with more than 1000 sq. ft. of Duplex FAR Left and Effective Year Built pre-1991 Cross-Referenced with Local or Non-Local Ownership	
Local	39
Non-Local	29
Total	68

Cemetery Lane was the neighborhood with the most potential for future redevelopment/expansion, with thirty-two percent (32%) of the cases. The West End was the second highest, with almost twenty-three percent (23%) of the cases.

Total # of Cases with more than 1000 sq. ft. of Single Family FAR Left and Effective Year Built pre-1991 Cross-Referenced with Neighborhood	
Aspen Mountain	5
Cemetery Lane	2
East End	0
Main & Mill	2
Meadowood	0
Midland and Park	9
Mountain Valley	17
Riverside	3
Shadow Mountain	3
West End	9
Total	50

Total # of Cases with more than 1000 sq. ft. of Duplex FAR Left and Effective Year Built pre-1991 Cross-Referenced with Neighborhood	
Aspen Mountain	0
Cemetery Lane	36
East End	0
Main & Mill	0
Meadowood	3
Midland and Park	4
Mountain Valley	0
Riverside	5
Shadow Mountain	2
West End	18
Total	68

Finally, the study contains the total square footage allowable under current zoning. For the final 118 cases, there is 287,810 square feet of un-built floor area.

Total Square Footage Available					
Single Family		Duplex		Both Single Family & Duplex	
R-6	29,367	R-6	37,530	R-6	66,897
R-15	24,542	R-15	119,218	R-15	143,760
R-15A	2,189	R-15A	2,960	R-15A	5,149
R-15B	31,604	R-15B	0	R-15B	31,604
R-30	4,097	R-30	36,303	R-30	40,400
All	91,799	All	196,011	All	287,810

Extrapolating Study Results

The original number of cases in the sample was approximately fifty percent (50%) of existing single family homes in the city. Therefore, the estimate of total square footage available for redevelopment/expansion in single family homes in the five residential zone districts is approximately 575,620. A similar calculation shows the potential for 236 single family homes to be redeveloped and expanded.

For perspective, the city experienced the highest number of residential redevelopment/expansion projects (also known as scrape and replace) in 2005, when 45 homes were replaced and expanded. The conclusion of this sampling study is that there remains a very substantial potential for redevelopment and expansion of single-family homes in the City of Aspen.