



Community Growth Advisory Committee Meeting #3

Wednesday, September 21, 2022

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Aspen Police Department - Community Room

540 E Main St, Aspen, CO 81611

Meeting Recording: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OpRdD0iGy_M

Meeting Presentation:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1nXmHuFosf2RcVdAdz8KiSxq2LZWkgqmf/view?usp=sharing>

| Agenda Item | Topic | Summary |
|-------------|--|--|
| 1. | Welcome & Introductions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The meeting was called to order at 4:03 p.m. ● Facilitator Miles Graham welcomed staff, resource team and Committee members to the third Community Growth Advisory Committee meeting. |
| 2. | Meeting Purpose & Agenda Review | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Graham briefly reviewed the meeting agenda and purpose. The meeting purpose is as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Establish a general working understanding of how the growth management system is operating today ○ Reintroduce the vision, goals and values that comprise the purpose of this Committee (7/26: BOCC/P&Z) ○ Advance the process for selecting Committee governance ● Mr. Graham described the four key themes of questions and comments heard to date (below). He explained that the presentation will primarily focus on the first two themes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Defining & measuring development (i.e., growth) ○ Development restrictions & limitations ○ Growth trends ○ Future growth |
| 3. | Current State Presentation & Discussion (with Suzanne Wolff): How the Growth Management Framework is Working Today | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Community Development Interim Director Suzanne Wolff outlined the purpose of Pitkin County's Growth Management Quota System (GMQS), which establishes a formal process to compete for development rights. ● Ms. Wolff shared tables illustrating the annual square footage allotment ceilings, categorized by type of development (i.e., residential, commercial, tourist), and the scoring system used for |

| | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| <p>3.</p> | <p>Current State Presentation & Discussion (with Suzanne Wolff): How the Growth Management Framework is Working Today</p> | <p>evaluating proposed development within the urban growth boundary (UGB) and rural area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Next, Ms. Wolff identified the GMQS exemptions, which were defined as development that is not required to compete in growth management. She highlighted the following exemptions as most relevant to the Committee’s work: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development Utilizing Transferable Development Rights (TDRs) ○ Development of Up to 5,750 sq. ft. of Residential Floor Area on Certain Types of Pre-Existing Lots ○ Remodels and Replacement ● Ms. Wolff further explained the TDR program by defining sending and receiving sites. She stated that the majority of TDRs extinguished to date have come from the rural/remote zoned district. She described the process for obtaining GMQS exemptions for a new development right and additional floor plan. Ms. Wolff shared TDR data as of December 2021. ● Long-Range Planner Ellen Sassano and Ms. Wolff next outlined answers to the following questions, as brought by the Committee in previous meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How and why did the County establish 15,000 sq. ft. as the house size limit? ○ How and why did the County establish 5,750 sq. ft. as the size a home may be built to without competing in growth management? ○ When did the growth management system change from competition for a residential “unit” to competition for floor area? ○ When did the growth management system change to require competition for additional floor area for properties in the rural & UGB areas? ○ Does subgrade space count as floor area when calculating 5,750 sq. ft. growth management exempt sq. footage or towards the 15,000 sq. ft. cap? ○ What is the role of zoning in determining land use patterns, urban & rural boundaries and characteristics? ○ How does the 35-acre subdivision restriction work? What is the intent? ● A summary timeline illustrated the key milestones in growth management from 1970-2006. They are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1970s: First Pitkin County Growth Management Policy Plan ○ 1978: Adoption of the Growth Management Quota System (QMGS) |
|-----------|--|--|

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1980s: Land Use Code quiet years ○ 1993: 15,000 square foot house size cap implemented ○ 1994: Creation of the Rural Remote Zone and TDR system ○ 2000/2006: Permitted house size without GMQS or TDRs established at 5,750 square feet and TDRs allowed to be used for additional floor area <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Graham concluded the presentation by summarizing the questions about growth trends to date and stating that answers will be addressed in forthcoming meetings. |
| 4. | <p style="text-align: center;">Q&A: How the System is Working Today</p> | <p>Questions included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does the 4,000 sq. ft. subgrade count towards the allowed floor area in the UGB? ● Why isn't the 4000 sq. ft. subgrade not exempt in the rural area? ● How does the 4,000 sq. ft. subgrade impact employee generation? ● How does the replacement/remodel exemption work? ● How does the County control or not control the monetary value of TDRs? ● How does the TDR market affect or incentivize development in the UGB? ● Does the increased use of TDRs lead to a less refined system to managing growth? ● How many permits do and don't get approved through GMQS? Is it common to not get approved? ● Is there an annual date by which an applicant must submit to compete in GMQS? Has the County ever seen a situation in which one applicant receives the majority or all of the allotment for one year? ● What are the most common criticisms or questions the County receives from people going through this process? Why is the County analyzing this process now? ● Does the GMQS scoring system account for climate impacts or employee housing? ● Did the 2006 LUC changes impact the caucus limits? ● How does the 3 percent use tax for materials brought in from outside Pitkin County impact public projects and other community benefits? ● What community benefits are most common and impactful, and how are they currently used in GMQS scoring? |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When was the GMQS scoring criteria last updated? Are there any criteria that incentivize the minimization or reduction of impacts (i.e., minimizing FTE or VMT)? |
| 5. | <p>Where The Committee Is Headed: Statement of Purpose, Vision, Goals & Values</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion about the statement of purpose, vision, goals and values was tabled for the October 5 meeting. |
| 5. | <p>Governance Structure: Chair Selection</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Graham described the rationale for the evolution to a co-chair structure to maximize collaboration, flexibility and resiliency. The Committee concurred with this structure. The Committee decided by consensus to postpone voting to the October 5 meeting to allow for more time to review applications and consider nominees. |
| 5. | <p>Public Comment, Next Steps & Homework</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Graham outlined details about the October 4 meeting and accompanying homework. No public comments were brought to the Committee. |
| 8. | <p>Adjourn</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meeting was adjourned at 6:03 p.m. |