



Community Growth Advisory Committee Meeting #5

Wednesday, October 19, 2022

4:30 – 6:30 p.m.

Aspen Police Department - Community Room

540 E Main St, Aspen, CO 81611

Meeting Recording: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0yv3j3n_4F0

Meeting Presentation:

https://drive.google.com/file/d/1728sU7CAGJi_R97zcqkjAquANKKMuB-z/view?usp=sharing

Agenda Item	Topic	Summary
1.	Welcome & Introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The meeting was called to order at 4:32 p.m. ● Committee Co-Chair Mona Newton welcomed staff, resource team and Committee members to the fifth Community Growth Advisory Committee meeting. ● Facilitator Miles Graham outlined the meeting purpose and agenda. He acknowledged the meeting was designed to maximize Committee discussion during breakout sessions and focus the Committee’s scope and the problem it is seeking to solve.
2.	<p>What We Heard: Focusing our Scope and the Problems to Solve</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Emma Harrison reviewed the below themes from the October 5 meeting discussion (see the October 5 meeting summary for expanded explanations): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Addressing climate and growth regionally ○ Redefining growth and activity ○ Limits and opportunities of the Land Use Code (LUC) ○ Applying land use levers to desired community outcomes ○ Committee process and scoping ● Cindy Houben revisited the BOCC vision statement and described its components. She stated that the Committee’s scope aligns directly with the BOCC vision: <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Meet our climate action goals by utilizing growth management and the Land Use Code while creating an equitable, sustainable and resilient quality of life and economy for the future.</i></p> ● Ms. Houben outlined the October 14 memo sent to the Committee in advance of the meeting. She emphasized the inherent values

embedded within the Land Use Code (LUC) and described how these values have and will continue to evolve. Ms. Houben then summarized the four problem hypotheses stated in the memo and the six shared values identified to-date. They are as follows:

- Problem hypotheses
 - Growth is no longer defined as density, but also intensity and activity.
 - Many of our homes are no longer acting like the residential use initially intended.
 - The Land Use Code is the most influential tool to shape the land use pattern and activity we want to see.
 - These trends have direct impacts on our climate and environmental values and affect equity, community carrying capacity and economic resiliency.
- Shared values
 - Climate action and environmental sustainability
 - A healthy, resilient and inclusive economy
 - Equity and affordability
 - Quality of life
 - Rural preservation
 - Community carrying capacity

- A brief Committee discussion followed. Questions and comments included:

- How does staff define the phrase: “Many of our homes are no longer acting like residential use initially intended”?
- What is the meaning of community carrying capacity?
- Is the LUC the only lever available to the Committee? Are the Energy and Building Codes also available as levers?
- There is a need to better manage and coordinate public capital improvement projects.
- Zoning is an important tool to manage growth.

- Abby Abel outlined the updated Committee roadmap, including key milestones in each phase. She acknowledged the Committee’s work to-date, its focus during the October 19 meeting and its future trajectory to evaluate options and finalize recommendations.

<p>3.</p>	<p>Breakout Sessions: What We Want to See More and Less Of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Committee members assembled into three breakout groups (one virtual, two in-person) to discuss the following question: <p style="text-align: center;"><i>With land use as the underlying consideration, what do you want to see more of and less of in terms of how the community looks, feels and functions?</i></p> ● Group members listed their answers on a virtual whiteboard. With 20 minutes remaining in the discussion, each group reviewed its list and organized the list by the six value(s). View the complete lists here.
<p>4.</p>	<p>Report Out Discussion: Aligning to Values</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Representatives of each group reported out the key topics discussed. Organized by value, common themes across all groups included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Climate action and environmental sustainability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ More sustainable, energy- and water-efficient construction and retrofitted buildings (residential and commercial) and an incentive structure that encourages emissions reduction and carbon off-sets ■ More climate-intentional, resilient and integrative planning and design that considers density and resource usage ■ More electrification of homes and transit systems, more production and use of renewable energy and less reliance on fossil fuels ■ Less material/water waste from consumption and frequent demolition ○ A healthy, resilient and inclusive economy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ More regional collaboration and planning to mitigate a system that decouples lodging and workforce from transit ■ Less geographical distance between lodging and places of work ■ Less residential-serving jobs that take the workforce away from public-serving businesses and sectors (e.g., schools, restaurants, recreation, retail, etc.) ■ Less residential demolition that intensifies the housing market and decreases access to existing housing stock ○ Equity and affordability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ More affordable and deed-restricted housing that allows the Pitkin County workforce to live closer to their jobs

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fewer GMQS exemptions that favor the wealthy and contribute to larger, more expensive homes and a greater widening of the wealth gap ○ Quality of life <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ More walkable, transit-oriented communities that encourage mixed-use development; smart urban design ■ Less complexity and loopholes within the GMQS system and more alignment to community values and benefits (e.g, prioritizing and incentivizing smaller, more efficient homes) ○ Rural preservation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ More rural/remote-zoned areas and clear geographic boundaries that protect open spaces and rural character ■ More open mindedness to rethinking rural zoning and character ■ Less sprawl in rural areas that contributes to congestion and traffic ■ More prescriptive identification of development areas ○ Community carrying capacity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ More smaller homes (less than 5,750 square feet) and less second homes and short-term rentals that contribute to part-time or seasonal population growth and natural resource depletion ■ More flexibility in the TDR program to align sending and receiving sites with desired development and available resources within an area ■ Less waste and resource use associated with residential construction, retrofitting and demolition, and more reuse, recycling and composting of materials
--	--	---

5.	<p>Evolving Focus Areas: Process and Drafting</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Graham described the process for developing Committee focus areas, illustrated by a diagram on-screen. Components included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Work To-Date <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. History, current state, values and mega trends b. Problems to Solve <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Initial hypotheses ii. Component parts (more of / less of) c. Evolving Focus Areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Values-driven and data-informed ii. Tools within the Land Use Code iii. Focus areas outside the code d. Recommendation Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Evaluating options and tradeoffs ii. Low hanging fruit iii. Common ground recommendations ● One Committee member asked staff to compile research on other communities in the U.S. and Europe in order to
6.	<p>Committee Logistics & Public Comment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Mr. Graham outlined details about the November 2 meeting, which are as follows: <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Community Growth Advisory Committee Meeting #6 Wednesday, November 2, 2022 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Rocky Mountain Institute Innovation Center 22830 Two Rivers Road, Basalt, CO 81621</i></p> ● The Committee confirmed the future schedule for meeting packet distribution as the Friday prior to Wednesday meetings. ● No public comments were shared.
7.	<p>Adjourn</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The meeting was adjourned at 6:32 p.m.