

Denise Tomaskovic

From: Pam Schilling
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 7:56 AM
To: Mike Scanlon; Judi Tippetts
Cc: Susan Philp; James Lindt; Denise Tomaskovic; Tom Smith (Office)
Subject: FW: [BASALT CO COMMUNITY PAGE - News, Views & Special Events] Someone asked me today where I stand on...

From: Bennett Bramson [mailto:notification+kjdm3-h-p-ud@facebookmail.com]
Sent: Monday, August 10, 2015 7:58 PM
To: BASALT CO COMMUNITY PAGE - News, Views & Special Events
Subject: [BASALT CO COMMUNITY PAGE - News, Views & Special Events] Someone asked me today where I stand on...

BASALT CO COMMUNITY PAGE - News, Views & Special Events



Bennett Bramson

August 10 at 7:57pm

Someone asked me today where I stand on 'development' in downtown Basalt. With a Masters in Public Administration, specializing in growth management, I responded that I stand on the side of sane, sound and sensible growth that leads to a vibrant, but manageable community. I stand on the side of decency, respect and communication which provides a fertile ground for discussion, even when we disagree. I stand for the BRAMSON 'C' Plan - Collaboration, Cooperation, Communication, Connectivity, Collegiality and Cohesiveness to Create a Caring Community for the Collective Conscience. I disdain the animosity, blaming, finger pointing, accusations, and vitriol that have begun to engulf our town. As I have stated before, in public venues- on the record, as past President of the Basalt Chamber, past President of the Aspen Board of Realtors and in many other civic roles: We can reach consensus through civility and if you're not part of the solution (in a productive, caring way) then you are the problem. Let's help 'Build a Better Basalt' for ourselves, our children and our posterity. There is ample room for many opinions, hopefully in a respectful manner. But, may I ask that calling people out on this page and monopolizing it to foment angry debate belongs on a political page, which someone can create. Come on folks. If you really care about our town, show it by seeking understanding and a compromise which all parties can at least come to some agreement on. That's my last diatribe on this issue.

 Like  Comment  Share

[View Post](#)

[Edit Email Settings](#)

Denise Tomaskovic

From: Pam Schilling
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 2:41 PM
To: Mike Scanlon; Susan Philp; James Lindt; Denise Tomaskovic; Tom Smith (Office); Judi Tippetts
Subject: FW: Please preserve the small town character of Basalt

From: The Hottest Spot [<mailto:thehottestspot@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 11:10 AM
To: James Lindt
Cc: jacque whitsitt; Bernie Grauer; Gary Tennenbaum; Herschel Ross; Mark Kittle; Rick Stevens; Rob Leavitt; Susan Philp; Pam Schilling
Subject: Please preserve the small town character of Basalt

Dear Town Council and planners,

We urge you to make every effort to preserve the small-town character of Basalt! Large three and four story buildings have no place in our small town. Please consider every alternative to protecting the homey, open feel and views of the river N mountains in town.

Sincerely,

Bel, Emily, Juliana, & Soren Carpenter
Director
The Hottest Spot and Vimana Yoga
Basalt and Carbondale, Colorado

On Jul 8, 2015, at 9:31 PM, Jae Gregory <jaeg1@comcast.net> wrote:

Town Council, Mayor, Town of Basalt, it's time to do what the citizens want with the riverfront park area.

I've watched the original RFCD video, read the results of the original surveys, read all the comments generated when the office was open on Main Street, AND read all the post-meeting comment cards, website comments, and letters to the editor that are on the website for anyone to see.

From the get-go, the majority of citizens had a general consensus. A big park, fountains, walkways for strollers and families, a town square, a large arts and entertainment venue, perhaps a restaurant, perhaps a boutique hotel. The suggestions are compellingly consistent over the years. Virtually no one other than a few vocal and very active folks, mostly in the building and real estate trade – felt that more condos and commercial space were the solution to the empty condos and commercial space in Basalt.

Basalt Council Members, even people without much imagination can look at the modest open space there now and can envision how the with the addition of the RFC building, there will be comparatively little useable open space. We want you to do what the vast majority have been requesting for quite some time and keep the little open space left from being developed into a hotel, or worse, condos.

We gave you our time, our ideas, made personal sacrifices to participate and attend meetings. We trusted you. We don't understand the delays to talk still more development. So few advocated that, why are you pursuing it?

Why not move forward with the suggestion that the CDC and the town financial advisor made several months ago and acquire that property so we are not at the whim of developers – or risk getting a bad rep among developers while you take extra time to mull over options?

Many of us offered to help find private funding to support a much larger park and/or concert/arts venue. This is still an option. I urge you to take action - pick from the top 5 ideas suggested so many times, and make it happen. We are chomping at the bit to stroll in the park, dance at riverside concerts, impress visitors with our accessible riverfront, sit and catch up with friends while watching kids play in a fountain.....

Jae Gregory
411 E Jody Rd
Basalt, CO
970-379-4956
Fax 927-4843
www.artfulgardens.net

Come Like us on Facebook www.facebook.com/ArtfulGardens

~~M.K.~~ 1/2 M.K.

Susan Philp

From: mark kwiecienski <mkwiecienski@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 2:42 PM
To: James Lindt; Susan Philp; Denise Tomaskovic
Subject: Please include this in the packets for tonights town council meeting and also, when you have time, post to the website with its own link Thank you!

Reasons why resolution #34 should be rescinded and why we should not yet be entering into a pre-development agreement with Lowe Enterprises.

- 1) Two weeks ago before passage of Resolution 34, people were told that the town would have a platform to discuss the costs and benefits and projected developer profits of various parts of the proposed development. It was stated that it would be two months before this was complete. Many assumed that it would allow the forgotten community oriented uses to be aired and that the window for preparing proposals and related materials and cost /benefits and projected developer profits or required town subsidies was two months out. Logic would have it that no move toward finalizing zoning would be made before two months. It is my suggestion that the more community based option components that have not been aired because they have less profit appeal to a developer, have a period of three months from a date certain, to allow this to occur. It is also suggested that an invitation be extended to the public for participation.
- 2) Until the town determines the appropriate mix and quantities of buildings to be place on the site, entering into a pre-development agreement is premature. The P&Z had just recommend 75,000 square feet, a nice round number, which is ½ of **the bloated 150,000 originally proposed. The 150,000 has no place in this discussion as it has no connection with verified appropriate need/desire of the town.** The verified need can only come by an analysis of looking at all option components including a cost/benefit and projected developer profit analysis, or in the case of non-profit usage town subsidies required. **It is my opinion that as little as 20,000 to 30,000 square feet or high-end residential entitlements** would provide enough developer value to pay back the town and CDC all monies owed and leave the developer with a return on assets of above 50% which is plenty. **With this reality, it is highly improbable that 75,000 square feet of entitlements on the property are appropriate. Maybe it will, but without going thru the process you cannot know.** Parking for this minimalist free market plan is taken care of right on site so there is no need to involve trading or developing any of the other town parcels in this discussion, or any public parking garage. **I am not suggesting that high-end residential is the best use for that Pan and Fork parcel, especially after having displaced all the residents in the trailers, but, I present this to demonstrate the minimal amount of free market development that the property could be zoned for to make this project stand on its own from a short term financial perspective.** You could put this on a piece of land of about ½ acre down by RMI measuring 180 linear feet on Midland Avenue and 110 feet deep, which only consumes 19,800 square feet of land, and would leave the rest of the CDC parcel park.
- 3) Resolution 34, took away many of the protections for open space of resolution 19, which was called the compromise plan. Resolution 34, due considerably to lobbying of the developer's architects, who at the time of lobbying were "representing" the town, leaves open the option for development in the area of the "polygon" which is 175 linear feet upstream from Midland Spur effectively cutting off about 40% more of the open road frontage area than was suggested by resolution 19. Resolution 19 had suggested everything from the four way stop to Midland Spur be completely open. Although more park space would be better, that suggested by Resolution 19, should be the minimum park space that should be considered. No encroachments of any kind should be allowed in this area including any landscape features that are primarily an adjunct or enhancement to the private development. If the private development wants private landscape features, make them move the buildings back so they have room to do it in their parameters. If you give the developers "options" they will

interpret that to mean entitled too. Strict boundaries of development are needed and solutions will come forward respecting the boundaries.

- 4) Resolution 34 was "snuck" thru the intent to shut down the process of discovery discussed in #1 above. Due to the surprise of this resolution being accelerated by six weeks, as discussed in #1 above, and the short window on Friday evening being posted to the site and voted on Tuesday, the resolution was not reviewed by opponents, and nor did it get appropriate review by all council and the mayor. It contains serious flaws. It Instructed P&Z to finalize entitling the property with 75,000 square feet. That should be rescinded for the reasons stated here and in #1, 2 & 3 above.
- 5) A predevelopment agreement will be based on the assumption by the developer that, 75,000 square feet development rights is to come with this, per resolution 34. We should not be starting off with them assuming 75,000 square feet will be their vested right including development in the "polygon" area as noted above. That is a setup for intense acrimony in the future. No reason to invite that.
- 6) Zoning the property for 75,000 square feet would put Basalt in a precarious situation. Where by the option holder could sue if the town did not grant building rights to their liking.
- 7) The agreement would prevent the town from buying the land and it would prevent the town from restructuring the decision/zoning process with the CDC as it should.
- 8) The agreement had no expiration date.

Thank you. Respectfully submitted by Mark Kwocienski 8/11/15. Please distribute to all counselors and make part of tonight's package.

Denise Tomaskovic

From: Pam Schilling
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 3:07 PM
To: Bernie Grauer; Bernie Grauer; Gary Tennenbaum; Gary Tennenbaum; Gary Tennenbaum; Herschel Ross; Herschel Ross (personal); Jacque Whitsitt; Jacque Whitsitt (Jacquewhitsitt@comcast.net); Mark Kittle; Mark Kittle (Work); Rick Stevens; Rick Stevens; Rob Leavitt
Cc: Susan Philp; James Lindt; Denise Tomaskovic; Mike Scanlon; Judi Tippetts; Tom Smith (Office)
Subject: FW: Pan and Fork Project

From: Tina Sagris [mailto:tina.sagris@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2015 3:05 PM
To: Pam Schilling
Subject: Pan and Fork Project

Hon. Mayor and Town Council:

Please **do not** approve or extend any contract or pre-development agreement with Lowe.

And please **do not hamper future plans for the riverbank property by setting arbitrary zoning requirements now**, before eliciting ideas from other organizations who might offer far more imaginative and desirable uses for the heart of Basalt, far more in tune with what your constituents, outside of the biased circle of developers and real estate agents, have been suggesting to you for months.

It is not too late to ask the voters of Basalt to decide on ownership of this precious property.

Sincerely

Tina Sagris