SCCC Minutes Oct. 19, 2021

Zoom, guests of David Chase

Board members present: David Chase, Molly Child, Chris Collins, Judy Frey, Judy Hill, George Johnson, Jill Sabella, Helene Slansky, Glenn Russell, Vicki Treece

Guests: Kathy de Wolfe, John McBride, Gayle Morgan, Jeffrey Woodruff

PUBLIC COMMENTS

David expressed a desire to have the Board meet in December at McCabe Ranch shop for an in-person gathering. Chris suggested the possibility of December 14th.

Molly spoke on the ByLaws on the website and their page layout, and the need to look at the number of Board members allowed.

MINUTES

The Minutes of September 15, 2021 were approved.

TREASURER’S REPORT

Vicki reported a current balance as of September 30, 2021 of $24,599.63 with $15,109.12 in the unrestricted account and $9,599.63 in the restricted Snowmass water work account.

The annual end-of-the-year fundraising letter needs to be written, and there was discussion about the possibly of delivering them by hand to caucus mailboxes. This letter would include the survey results. Chris added that since 2020 there are 29 new land owners.

There was discussion about a “welcoming letter” to all new land owners in the Caucus area to be given out at time of land closing, possibly through the title company. This was a gesture made in years past, but is not being made currently. A committee of Vicki, Jill, Judy Lovins and Judy Frey was assigned to look into a “welcoming letter”. The letter would reference the Caucus website, Master Plan, and possibly maps of trails.

LAND USE

*Goldie Hawn Irrevocable Trust Application*

Chris said the current residence is approximately 2,500 sf, and will expand to 5,570 sf. The only concern of the Land Use committee is that they make sure the new development doesn’t cut into the oak brush which shelters the view from Little Elk Creek Village as the siting from LEC is the only real concern. Other than that, the application is straight forward. There is no TDR request. It will be still a Victorian style, green and white. The dark sky policy was reviewed with their planner.

Chris recommended an approval and made a motion as such, given that the McCabe Ranch HOA approved the application. Helene seconded the motion. Unanimous approval. Motion passed.

Chris added with the new site plan, it will probably be a year out to get the permit and commence building.

MASTER PLAN REVIEW/TDR Discussion

David acknowledged the TDR’s in the Caucus area and George’s effort to pull together a survey of Caucus members and opinions on TDR’s. The survey response indicated a general lack of enthusiasm for TDR’s in the Caucus area. David said last week he had put together a subcommittee to further research TDR usage and qualifications with Chris, Molly, Vicki, Jill and himself. in order to get a broad perspective and also considering the survey results. The group went back to the Master Plan which was approved in 2017, in the Residential Development section and concluded that the existing language is ambiguous. That there is “respect” for

TDR’s, but no qualifications, that in the Master Plan we sent out proposed language to support 5,570 sf, and consider TDR’s, but only under conditions, but which were not articulated/written specific enough. That maybe there need to be 30 acre parcels (RS 30 and AR 10), which would basically stop the conversation unless there was a 30-acre parcel. Also to add significant qualifications like the visual effect, traffic, preserve neighboring communities, concerns for water use, to build less above grade and use sub grade - like berming, to adhere to the County’s lighting code as a “dark site”, and to look at whether we could accommodate a TDR for a parcel over 30 acres.

Vicki brought up that presently our Board is a determinate for the Caucus area in addition to local HOA’s. LEC has an HOA whereas Gateway’s is deactivated. McCabe uses an HOA to vet applications and make sure the applications fall within their parameters. The question is whether the Caucus is taking on more responsibility that it should and leave more to the HOA’s?

George stated that the survey was specific that the Caucus didn’t want TDR’s and that we don’t want to be a rubber stamp to TDR’s, and that we have to listened to Caucus residents and land owners.

Chris said about 230 survey questionnaires were sent out. Since there are 284 parcels in the Caucus area 54 large landowners didn’t get to vote. Chris questioned the accuracy of the survey.

Vicki questioned who gets to vote - for instance, if you have four parcels, do you get four votes?

(The answer was you get one vote correct???)

George moved to deny the right for any TDR’s within the Caucus area.

Helene seconded the motion.

Molly said she’s not yet ready to approve, and that looking at the Maroon Creek TDR policy, there’s a lot we can do.

There followed discussion about “no TDR’s” or not limiting of acreage.

Gayle Morgan asked is a caucus can make a different plan that the County.

George said we (the Caucus Board) recommend, but the County makes the policy.

Molly commented that Maroon Creek and the Frying Pan caucuses made their own unique recommendations to their own valley through their Master Plans, and that the character and geography of each of those caucus valleys influenced their Master Plans.

Steve Child said there are still survey ballots coming in - 3 more just arrived. That LEC and Gateway were more against TDR’s, and those of larger parcels, outside the communities of LEC and Gateway - tended to vote for TDR’s.

Vicki said the survey is to guide us, not give final answers.

Steve commended the it’s worth polling the idea that if we have less than 5750 it would effectively lower property taxes, and could be part of the Caucus’ recommendation. That the house size would be proportionate to the lot size.

Chris commented that the potential for square footage is greater in totality in subdivisions than for a large landowner. As with a one acre parcel now gets 5750 and one 20-acre lot gets 5750, plus 2500.

Glenn commented that if we’re trying to rein-in excessive growth, it may be more in subdivisions than large landowners

John McBride stressed the character of our area and that he doesn’t believe the amount of land should determine the size of a house. He cautioned the need to pay attention to how special this valley is and that it’s not a retreat for large landowners.

Steve said the County doesn’t allow houses bigger than what the Caucus recommends (in it’s Master Plan?). It never overrides a Caucus recommendation. The P & Z decides. (any comments to add? The County doesn’t override the Master Plan?) Also that the average house size in all of Pitkin County is 2,854 sf. That the Caucus Master Plan is advising, and can be overridden by the Commissioners (please clarify -), and that the County respects Caucus recommendations. Also, that we need to tighten up the Master Plan, for instance with a 5750 as absolute, and anything larger is nebulous.

Chris added “if we say over 30 acres” -

Judy Frey spoke on the effect of the lay of the land, and that so many lots are in flat land, and that we received a definite result from the survey and should act on it.

Steve commented a survey is not a public vote.

John added we need an absolute limit, and that more land shouldn’t justify a larger home. We must revere the quality of the valley - hate to loose it

Molly added if there’re are TDR’s they should originate in our own valley, and insure land will be protected by Conservation Easements to protect open space, and that she prefers 40-60 acre minimum for a TDR, and concern for the impact on communities.

Chris commented that presently we’re not even reviewing large houses being built in this valley that are hidden, and that rules aren’t made for some and not for everybody.

David stressed the importance of “getting this right”, that there’s a lot more to be dealt with than just TDR’s, that this discussion will continue.

David called for a vote on George’s motion. Four voted in favor and five voted against.

George moved to table the motion. Jill seconded. David said the motion is tabled.

ELECTIONS

David said nominations will be closed at the next meeting in November. The election is from November (date?) to December 16th. He knows of a number of possibly interested new members. We need to look into how large a board number is allowed in the ByLaws. Currently it’s ten. Under the former combined caucus there were 17 board members.

Molly added the ByLaws can be amended if we decide to change the maximum number.

David said he will not be running for the Board again and that therefore we need to think about the Caucus leadership going forward and that he is confident in the qualities of this current Board.

The meeting was adjourned