

Susan Philp

From: Patrice Becker <42patrice@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2015 3:23 PM
To: Susan Philp
Subject: MASTER PLAN

Dear Susan:

I ask that you not change the master plan at this time.
My feeling about the whole thing is that it is a plan only for Lowe's proposal.
It does not reflect what many in the community of Basalt want.
They haven't been allowed to make a proposal.
Still moving too fast for such an important decision.
What needs to happen is develop Basalt Center Circle property.
That is where the dense development belongs not on the Pan & Fork.

I don't get the Lions park (2d) Our Town Vitality Area.
There is no description of what a vitality area is. One of the pictures shows a huge 3 story building on it.

Is this what you plan to allow on Lions Park?

I ask that you not develop Lions Park. It is the open space needed to connect the town to the river.
If you take the current buildings off the park please do not replace them with more buildings.
Lions Park is Open Space. Why they were allowed to build on it in the first place was wrong.

Thanks for your time,
Patrice K. Becker

Would you forward my letter to the other P&Z members. Thanks

Susan Philp

From: Lynn Nichols <lynnonichols@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2015 3:47 PM
To: Susan Philp
Subject: Pan and Fork Parcel

For the P&Z, I ask them to consider changing the Masterplan to reflect that the Pan and Fork Parcel be changed from "Our Town Vitality Area" (2d) to Parks (4). This will preserve the Pan and Fork as open space and allow for a community structure to be built while directing development where it belongs-in the commercial core of Basalt. I also find the title "Our Town Vitality Area" to be misleading and not well defined. I also am including a letter that I have sent to the Town of Basalt. Thank you for your time and attention to this discussion,
lynn nichols

Dear Town of Basalt,

The Town of Basalt can take a leadership role, demonstrate the intelligence needed to look at the big picture and resist the "easy solution" by preserving the Pan and Fork parcel as open space. Such action will give developers the opportunity to consider mixed use development where it belongs.

The Clark's Market/Aspenalt Motel area (Basalt Center Circle Property) is at the heart of Basalt's commercial core and it is our job as a community to direct developers to what works best for Basalt now and long into the future. This property is complicated in terms of ownership and the Town of Basalt has the capability and legal tools to steer developers to work towards a solution that answers the community's desire to protect open space wherever possible and to create a more dense, vibrant commercial core. The Pan and Fork as open space will benefit all surrounding development as well as honoring the LAST riverfront parcel in Basalt.

When a developer comes to Basalt, let's tell them where development is appropriate and work with them and property owners to make it happen. This path is not easy but isn't it worth taking the time and effort to plan for a future when there will be no more open spaces to preserve?

Lynn Nichols

Basalt

927.4130

Susan Philp

From: David Clark <dcloral@me.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2015 9:08 PM
To: Susan Philp
Subject: Council vote

Dear Basalt City Council,

As a 30 resident and business owner in Basalt I want to make it clear that I am against amending the Master Plan. The tendency to short sightedness in choosing how to develop the Pan and Fork parcel denies the value that property can bring to every citizen of Basalt. If you step back from this brink of allowing the first developer to alter our town we can work together to create what will be an unrivaled place for visitors and citizens alike. We live here because it is a small town and that is what attracts people to come here. The course being taken will destroy the very thing that makes Basalt special. If we work together and do the research and work we can create a more valuable and long lasting revenue source that benefits the citizens and town.

Please do not amend the Master Plan

Thank you,

David Clark

Susan Philp

From: Gerald Terwilliger <grterwilliger@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 02, 2015 10:04 PM
To: Susan Philp
Subject: our town master plan amendment

To: Susan Philp
Re: Subarea Master Plan

I'm going to start at the end with my comments. First, the typologies are not Basalt. They are extremely busy, frenetic if you will, and more appropriate to an urban environment like Boulder. They are just a group of pictures, most submitted by various members of DAAC, but never assessed or voted on by DAAC. I know some were in the final report, but ask any DAAC member if the group chose which pictures they liked. Most of these typologies should be cast aside and the public should be asked if they like any of them for the Town of Basalt.

Second, I want to address the 2d "vitality area". The area across from Gold River, which includes the gas station, liquor store, Habitat store,... should be 2b. This is where the commercial, mixed use belongs. But vitality is such a broad concept that it should be eliminated. Putting "vitality" designation on the CDC parcel is getting ahead of ourselves. It should be 4, Parks. And the Town Center 2b, is not going to be next to RMI. It is a misnomer and in no way is it a 'Town Center', which is right now the area on Midland Avenue from Saxy's to the Basalt Mountain Lodge but should also include Basalt Center Circle. The 2b designation on the west end of the CDC parcel should be scrapped.

Finally, the citizens of Basalt are not ready to develop the CDC parcel and the Town should buy it so that it can be done thoughtfully without pressure from developers. It should not be zoned at all until that happens. In spite of my comments above, I think the "Our Town Master Plan Amendment" should be rejected in its entirety. It is being driven by the desire of a few who want to urbanize Basalt.

Gerry

Susan Philp

From: Mary Jo Hughes <maryjo@bta.bz>
Sent: Thursday, September 03, 2015 9:06 AM
To: Susan Philp
Subject: Pan and Fork Parcel

Good morning Susan,

Please recommend that the town purchase the property and allow the park to remain a park with very little or no development. There are so many other places that are more appropriate for development in this town. The Master Plan should be left as is until further review by not only P and Z but by the public as well. We are reaching out to young families and want their input. After all, they are the future of this town (I would like to say it is people my age but I know better) and they should have the most impact on the decisions being made at this time. They are the ones that will be affected the most by our decisions (schools, parks, vitality, development). Let us take the time to get this one right.

Thank you.

Mary Jo Hughes

Susan Philp

From: mpballou <mpballou@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 03, 2015 9:31 AM
To: Susan Philp
Subject: Basalt P & Z

To whom it may concern:

Dear Basalt P & Z members,

As a 23 year resident of Basalt, I am very pleased with the opportunity we have to preserve the jewel of land on the Roaring Fork River for now and the future. The only question remaining is what and how big will the development be on the parcel next to RMI. To date the discussion seems to be 75,000 sq. ft. Or less. I'm sure I don't need to point out that the RMI building is only 15,000 sq. ft. And the new hotel nearing completion in Willits is enormous at 76,000. I urge you to limit the development and lean toward smaller! " Less is More!" I'm anxious to support business in our town, but there are other parcels which are more appropriate for bigger developments. I'm unclear what the intent is with regard to amending the Master Plan at this time. Please vote no, unless the changes considered will further limit development in Basalt.

Thank you,
Mary Ballou
Box 320/ 2001 Arbor Park Dr.
Basalt, CO 81621

Sent from AOL Mobile Mail

Susan Philp

From: Vicki Johnson <vickibj@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 03, 2015 12:37 PM
To: Susan Philp
Subject: FW: Master Plan

From: Vicki Johnson [<mailto:vickibj@comcast.net>]
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2015 10:49 AM
To: 'susanp@basalt.com' <susanp@basalt.com>
Subject: Master Plan

Hello Susan,

I am still not completely clear on the differences in the Master Plans and should have asked that question at the meeting recently. I was a little lost since I was not aware of all the details of the existing Master plan. What I am sure of is that I would NOT like to see more than 2 stories built on the river parcel. No problem with higher elevations on the Merino or Lions parks parcels. I also would not like to see residential or office space on that river parcel. Only hotel and restaurant but I don't know if falls into the Master Plan or if that is a future issue.

Vicki Johnson
17 yr. Basaltine

Susan Philp

From: Sam Johnson <riversam@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 03, 2015 12:42 PM
To: Susan Philp
Subject: Our Town Vitality Area--Typology Description Sheet 2d

To Town of Basalt Planning Commission

In order to identify Basalt as "The River Town", I believe the majority of the development should be directed to the Basalt Center Circle property with consideration of four stories as currently proposed. However, the mixed use development of the western half of the Pan & Fork frontage should be limited to a maximum height of 2 stores. View corridors between the 2 story buildings will soften the impact of this built environment.

Thank you for your consideration to imposing this height restriction in the 2d Master Plan Typology.

Best,
Sam Johnson
Basalt

Susan Philp

From: Mark Harvey <markharv@mac.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 03, 2015 6:14 PM
To: Susan Philp
Subject: Master Plan Comments

Dear Susan,

Please enter these comments into the record. Sincerely, Mark Harvey

Basalt Master Plan Comments 9/3/15

No more than 30,000 square feet of improved buildings should be allowed on the CDC parcel and those buildings should all be located between Midland Spur and the RMI Building.

Susan Philp

From: mark kwiecienski <mkwiecienski@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, September 04, 2015 12:04 PM
To: Susan Philp; Mike Scanlon; James Lindt
Subject: Masterplan Comments and Objections appended

Masterplan Comments Appended

September 4, 2015

Dear Susan and Mike, Please append my master plan comments with the following additions:

I protest the improper handling of the square footage issue in the proposed master plan amendment hearings, as a deliberate attempt, via a masterplan amendment, to mislead, disempower and block the citizens' rights, by a citizen ballot initiative to successfully oppose a development application of the significant density that will be ratified on the CDC owned parcel of land that is greater than many citizens feel is appropriate. The next paragraph extracted from the proposed Mater Plan Draft speaks of the importance of the master plan.

The Colorado Revised Statutes provide planning commissions with the authority to make and adopt master plans for the physical development of a municipality. Under the authorizing statutes the master plan is the principal tool by which municipalities may plan for future land uses, roads, utilities and the other infrastructure necessary to support forecast growth and population in accordance with community goals. State enabling legislation governing quasi-judicial actions, such as rezoning and amendments to the Land Use Code, requires that these actions be evaluated for compliance with the adopted master plan. These factors highlight the importance of the master plan as a regulatory tool for municipalities. The Statutes also specify that a master plan is an advisory document for guiding land development decisions. Section 1.3(H) of the Basalt Home Rule Charter also grants the Town Council with the power to adopt and maintain a comprehensive master plan. Therefore, the Our Town Master Plan Amendment has been reviewed and adopted as a formal amendment to the 2007 Town of Basalt Master Plan by both the Basalt Planning and Zoning Commission and the Basalt Town Council.

Chair of the HPC, Dylan Johns, who in the past worked for the proposed developer's architectural firm Cottle, Yaw, and Carr as a project manager, who I have previously objected to due to a conflict of interest, told the audience at the meeting on Monday night, August 31, 2015 at the Basalt Library, that, no discussions of square footage were appropriate when discussing the amendment.

Furthermore on the www.ourtownplanning.org/downtown-planning/ website a notice has been placed to further disempower and dissuade the public that says:

"It's important to know that the Our Town Master Plan Amendment is separate from the work being done to analyze the square footage, building massing, and specific uses that could occur on the Riverfront, Lions Park and Merino Park (former recycle center) parcels, which is ongoing and has resulted in a preferred alternative (Option 3E)"

Option 3E as pulled from the CCY prepared "option" posted on the website has for CDC parcel: Gross Building Area = 75,000 sf Gross Building Area, gsf Hotel + Flats (Approx. 40% Hotel - 60% Residential) Underground Parking. The Mario Center 19,500 sf Gross Building area, and the Lion's Parcel 24,000 sf. for a total of 118,500.

The DAC report as submitted by Paul Anderson, which is part of the proposed masterplan amendment recommends: "Review the CSC Zone District to determine if it could be modified and used to implement some of the findings in this report."

The CSC zone district in Table 1 of the dimensional Requirements of the CSC zone district has maximum floor area ratio of 1.5 times the gross lot area of the master parcel.