From: Nancy Grindlay
To: Elena Scott; Hillary Seminick; Nicholas Kempin
Subject: Comments on Draft Master Plan
Date: Saturday, September 17, 2022 6:43:14 PM

Dear Elena and Hillary:

I recognize that putting together the Draft Mater Plan was gargantuan task and made even more so with the reset this past February. There is definitely a sense of urgency to complete the task given the large development proposals on the horizon. That being said I feel that the rush to put out a document has impacted the level of thoughtfulness given to many aspects of the plan. Specifically, the lack of review/discussion/input by the Stakeholders Advisory Group, Planning Commission and Town Council on the Future Land Use Map, the Economic Plan, the Transit Management Study and the Water Study. These studies were literally presented to the above entities as the Draft was being put out to the public. And since there are no hyperlinks or appendices in the Draft to any of these studies (that the Town paid a lot of money to acquire) the Public will also not be able to evaluate the Draft in context of the studies.

As a member of the Stakeholders Advisory Group (my name clearly listed on page 4 of the Draft) and the Planning Commission, I feel especially blindsided by the Future Land Use Map presented in the Draft, which is dramatically different from the first Draft and from the Town's current zoning designations. I have been approached by a number of residents asking how we (me) could propose such a map. I understand their concern as it is clearly stated that the map will be used for future zoning determinations. In many cases, neighborhoods with single family lots or single family and low-density multi-family lots have been designated medium density residential or high density residential, essentially up-zoned. Most residents I know consciously moved to Mt CB for the quiet, low population, low-density environs. I have no answer to these concerned residents because I don't know why or who had input on this map. This is an awkward position to be put in to say the least. I certainly don't agree with any potential change (up-zoning) to existing zoning and would have said so had I been asked for input.

The community survey results seemed to be heavily skewed towards visitors and residents from outside the community. With less than 50% of the respondents in both surveys actual Mt CB residents how can the results be truly reflective of what Mt CB residents desire? While reading, I found myself wondering if this Draft was really addressing Mt CB or a long established mountain town such as Crested Butte or Telluride with a completely different history and demographic (i.e., majority year-round residents, lots of families). Case in point, in the second survey the number one item of concern for Mt CB residents when taken alone was downtown vibrancy, not community housing. However, the Draft is overwhelmingly community housing centric. For example statements like "A commitment to recreational access also means ensuring access to housing" (pg10, par 5),"Providing opportunities for more residents to live, work and play locally addresses a variety of challenges that our community is facing" (pg10, par9) and "Community members expressed a desire that Mt CB maintain a year-round population and become a full-service community…"(pg22, par1) are simply not

true. Mt CB is a community of 70% second homeowners and has orders of magnitude more STRs than any neighboring community. We only have 12% families. Very few people move here to raise their families, most people either retire here or buy second homes to vacation here. The horse is out of the barn so to speak. We have a small year-round population, and I do not get the sense from the community survey or any resident that I've spoken with that there is a desire to grow that population by a significant amount. Most year-round residents treasure the quiet solitude of the fall and spring off-seasons.

Up-zoning existing areas to provide housing (there's no guarantee it will be affordable) for those that want to move here, will negatively impact those residents that already live here with all the bad things that come with a greater population: increased traffic congestion (a big concern cited by residents in the first survey), pollution, depletion and overuse of already limited resources (water, surrounding forest lands) and infrastructure (schools, roads-Gothic specifically, etc.). Lack of community housing is a North Valley problem, not just a Mt CB problem. Mt CB represents a small fraction of the North Valley population and a small fraction of the businesses and employees, so why should we contribute an outsize portion of community housing as proposed by the Draft. Given Mt CB's lack of useable land and limited resources there are far better land use options to address the problem a few miles down valley (e.g., Brush Creek, Whetstone, Sixth and Butte). We cannot build our way out of this problem and still maintain the quality of life that current residents enjoy. Mt CB should continue to pursue options to buy existing units in multi-family complexes and encourage high-density development in the CC to provide affordable housing for Town employees, and for local educators, EMS, Fire District, and health care providers. With two major PUDs coming before the town, and with any other future large development, it should be required that the developer provide/build affordable housing, not cash in lieu.

In light of the traffic congestion we are already experiencing on Gothic during holidays and the summer, I was disappointed by the section on Transportation and the lack of specific policies therein. There are some really good short and long-term suggestions in the transportation management study, but the public doesn't know about them because that study is not included or linked with the Draft. The short-term suggestions from the study should be listed straight out as action items.

Where are the complete neighborhoods advocated for in the Draft? Is commercial to be placed in Pitchfork, Overlook, Summit, Prospect, CVA3, and Paradise? How will that commercial work during the off-season? I think of all of Mt CB including the CC as a complete neighborhood.

Moving forward, I would like the Stakeholders Advisory Committee, Planning Commission and Town Council to have adequate time to discuss and give input on the Draft Master Plan taking into account the Core Economic, Transportation (both Gothic Capacity and Management) and Water studies. This will not happen in one or two work sessions, it will require several. We should not the rush process to meet some artificial deadline to the

detriment of Mt CB residents. This document will guide the Town's future for the next 10-15 years, so we need to devote the time to get it right.

Sincerely,

Nancy