



Community Growth Advisory Committee Meeting #8

Wednesday, November 30, 2022

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Rocky Mountain Institute Innovation Center - White Steyer Conference Room

22830 Two Rivers Road, Basalt, CO 81621

Hybrid Option: <https://gbsm.zoom.us/j/83469118299>

Phone: (312) 626-6799 / Meeting ID: 834 6911 8299

Time	Agenda Item	Topic
4:00 pm	1.	Welcome: Meeting Purpose & Agenda
4:05 pm	2.	What We Heard: Key Takeaways from the House Size Roundtable Discussion and White Paper Group Discussion: Q&A Key Takeaways Summary
4:30 pm	3.	Committee Discussion and Group Exercises: Continuing the Discussion on Impacts, Land Use Levers, and Aligning Values
5:50 pm	4.	Our Path Forward: Selection of Topics for the Next Meeting
5:55 pm	5.	Public Comment: Hearing from Our Community
6:00 pm	6.	Adjourn: Next Meeting - December 14 (Up Valley)

Please note that the agenda and times are approximate and subject to change

Individuals with disabilities needing auxiliary aid(s) may request assistance by contacting Pitkin County: alex.sanchez@pitkincounty.com at least 48 hours in advance of the meeting date so arrangements may be made on the requested auxiliary aid(s).

Meeting Packet Includes:

- Memo with summary themes from discussion
- November 16 Meeting Summary (includes link to meeting recording and presentation)
- Comprehensive list of committee comments

Additional Resources:

- [Community Growth Resource Webpage](#)
- [Updated White Paper](#) - this includes the Buildout Table of Rural Areas that was previously missing. This link is on our website, and please feel free to share among your peers or others as you see fit.
- [Pitkin Maps and More](#) - GIS tool for mapping across the county and to explore the various planning areas, UGB and municipal boundaries.
 - [Maps and More Tutorial](#) on how to use the interactive tool
- [Housing Visualization Story Map](#) (data as of 2019)

Reports referenced in white paper (also linked in the Appendix Page)

- [2022 Buildout Summary](#) - we will work on bringing the full buildout and methodology forward in a future meeting
- [2018 Buildout Study and Core Infrastructure Capacity Analysis](#) - methodology for the remaining square footage to be built out
- [2018 Pitkin County Energy Use - Utility Data Analysis](#) - Report prepared by August Hasz, P.E.
- [Peer Reading Library](#) - Many committee members have shared resources or other case studies. We will continue to update as you share ideas and please continue to send to the project team.

MEMO

TO: Community Growth Advisory Committee

FROM: Pitkin County Staff

DATE: November 22, 2022

RE: Preparation for November 30 Meeting

Dear Committee Members,

On behalf of the planning team, a big thank you for your participation, questions, and extended time at last Wednesday's meeting. Given what we heard from the group discussion and reflections from the white paper, we have summarized your individual comments into themes below. The full list of comments is included in the attachment. We will use this as the starting point for our meeting and discussion.

Listening to each of you, it is clear there are differing opinions on whether house size should be limited and what tools we really should be looking at to address the goals we are trying to achieve. However, we also heard some common areas emerging that open the door for future discussions.

DISCUSSION THEMES:

One Size Does Not Fit All: These are complex and nuanced issues that will require sophisticated and nuanced solutions. There is a desire to look at more nuanced strategies (e.g., GMQS, TDRs, etc.) if we are to address the impacts large homes have on our community values.

Home Size is Not the Only Solution but May Be Part of a Solution: There is a diversity of opinions if house size is the right tool to focus on first, or at all. However, there was agreement that one blunt tool will not solve the issues. If we use a blunt tool, let's make sure it's the right tool, and/or part of a suite of tools that could be used to meet our community goals.

GHG Emissions and Impacts are a Concern, but not the Only Concern: Generally, there is a common understanding that the energy loads of large homes need to be addressed. But also a common perspective, that we can't only focus on the GHG emissions and energy loads. There are additional impacts on our community values that likely will require other levers as well that the committee wants to better understand, such as:

- Water usage
- Renewable energy/carbon offsets
- Traffic/vehicle miles traveled (VMT)
- Infrastructure demands/capacity (e.g., wastewater production)
- Sensitive habitats/wildlife corridors
- Outdoor amenity loads (e.g., gas fire pits, ice melt, patio heaters, hot tubs. etc.)

Certainty and Simplification Over Risk and Complexity: A desire exists to simplify the code so property owners and the community can predictably navigate the process, manage risk and know what they are getting. The Code, not a blunt tool, can provide clarity and a clear strategy for the right development in the right areas.

Low-Hanging Fruit: Explore opportunities for near-term/easy-wins to prioritize areas where common ground exists, including:

- Green building requirements
- Energy codes
- Water conservation, etc.

Resilient and Sustainable Economy: Balance community values with economic resiliency to prevent unintended consequences and address the ways in which large homes influence our economy, service workforce (e.g. traffic and housing), and quality of life.

In addition to this big picture list of key takeaways from our roundtable discussion, detailed notes are attached to prepare us for a highly interactive session on Nov. 30. If you feel your opinion from Nov. 16 is not addressed, please send a follow-up/clarifying email to staff at growthcommittee.projectteam@pitkincounty.com.

As you all know, we began our last discussion with house size because it was at the top of the list of questions we all generated on Nov. 2 and has many ripple effects on many of the other questions. For our meeting on the 30th, we are preparing to delve deeper into the community impacts, land use tools, and values in relation to where we are aligned, and not, on these key growth management elements.

We look forward to another robust discussion and rolling up our sleeves on the 30th. **Given the interactive nature of this meeting, please make it a priority to attend in person.** The exercises and conversations will be nuanced and much more successful in our overall process in a group environment. Thank you!

Pitkin County Staff

ATTACHMENTS: [11.16.22 CGAC Member Comment Summary](#)



Community Growth Advisory Committee Meeting #7

Wednesday, November 16, 2022

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Aspen Police Department - Community Room

540 E Main St, Aspen, CO 81611

Discussion: House Size in Relation to Our Values & Goals

CGAC individual comments:

- Large homes don't match our rural character and goals
- We can't do it all and will need to make hard choices. House size is a place to start
- Large homes generate 30x the energy use is hard to wrap your mind around. Need to address large homes.
- Look to tools other communities have used, such as tax rates for 2nd homes (reference: Maui, Vancouver)
- We need to control the existing stock. This will change the character
- The redevelopment of existing homes to what the current maximums allow is a bigger risk threat to the community.
- More confused as we move along in the process. Is capping square feet going to solve problem?
- If we cap square feet, do it because it addresses the issues, not because it seems like what we are supposed to do.
- Is there a way to allow for large homes but make sure it's done in the right ways?
- Can we achieve regulation by utilizing TDRs through the GMQs
- Can't see treating all situations in the same way, unfair to have the same parameters for all properties; there are examples of large lots that went through GMQS and still may not be reflective of what we want versus others that may not have gone through GMQS and meet the character. We aren't treating all properties the same.
- Would like more energy information - what is required to build a large home at net zero?
- Tackle square footage via requirements
- Don't cap house size just to cap house size - clear reasoning behind our decision
- Mitigation ideas: CO2 offsets acquired, County could actively trade offsets, establishing a CO2 bank (create profit)
- Create a revenue stream for the County to subsidize other activities
- Not feel like a rich biased exercise, or penalizing wealthy homeowners; look at all the good wealthy folks bring to our community
- What can we control: technology performance of systems
- Build a bigger home requires a higher standard of offset
- Scoring system: get home performance as low on the energy consumptive scale as possible. Look at what we can control and can't control.
 - Can Control - achieve a higher hurdle for large homes (e.g. scoring)
 - Can't Control - Home Management (direct impact fee)



- This may be what manages what size homes can be built and where you build
- Objective scoring process can flatten the relationship between smaller and larger homes - look at a direct impact fee or carbon offset fee
- Prescriptive for the home management side: based on home size you have to pay a significant impact fee for your uncontrollable energy impacts
- Avoid vilifying owners of big homes
- Caution in limiting home size: a side effect could be buying two or three houses or STR
- Consider energy retrofits for existing homes - creating local revenue
 - DC example reduce by 56% or 2.6 M fine
- Other communities' house-size caps
 - Mountain Village: none (houses benign built there over 50,000 sq. ft.)
 - San Miguel County: 12,000 sq. ft., 2,500 ADU
 - Jackson, WY: 10,000, 1,500 guest house
- The building/development community is a large part of this community and they want to build the best, efficient building
- We should consider house size, not because of the newspaper or economic impact.
- Given that a majority of the existing housing stock is under 6,000, this is desirable for the community to live in and we should retain
- Data shows that under maximum build-out potential, we couldn't meet our climate goals like GHG or waste
- Prospective homebuyers are buying into our community values and the Aspen experience, not the SQ FT. House size limitation could mitigate the trend of continued exclusivity
- Energy use intensity should also be considered regarding house size. As we work to an energy-efficient grid, requirements for new buildings could be just as complex as house size
- Mitigation keeps driving costs up and continuing exclusiveness of the home market
- House size reduction threat existed for the past 40 years. Consensus is build as big as you can now because Pitkin will reduce it in the future
- Rather than limiting house size, look at TDR and GMQS, which could be a less confessional system to go with, and the possibility of eliminating the free spaces, such as sub-grade and garage space
- More restrictions on property owners is not a preference. No one needs a 15,000 sq ft house but if you are going to get it, you need to mitigate via solar panels, etc.
- A scoring system like GMQS with a climate lens
- Aspen will always be a top destination for outsiders, we need to use that as an opportunity to educate new homeowners
- If we allow it, owners need to mitigate that
- We don't need to put a housing cap across the county; looked at it zone by zone
- House size is part of the mix, not the only mix
- House prices are going up to the point we can't house doctors and nurses
- People will come here regardless of regulation



- Proponent of limiting house size to 5750 sq ft county-wide. The data is compelling and presents us with an imperative to stop the bleeding, and set an example for other areas like ours.
- For existing stock, develop a creative, new revenue stream through an “impact tax” for the disproportionate carbon, waste, and water consumption - the money could go to affordable housing and/or local initiatives.
- Maybe we need to be talking net positive, not just net zero
- We need community engagement efforts to make climate and resilience relevant in addition to re-aligned rules and regs
- House size is a blunt tool, not nuanced enough - doesn’t account for energy use
- Lean into the GMQS scoring system more. A straight cap would account for the nuance of Rural vs Urban development, and the energy impacts of larger homes vs smaller homes
- Water consumption, providing housing should all be looked at
- Employers are moving out of Pitkin and this is critical
- How does house size influence values - GMQS, not blunt cap
- Feels like an either-or conversation. Suggested framework:
 - Use the Building and Energy codes to set performance standards to build 5750 or less? A TDR and GMQS for anyone who wants to build more than 5750. Preserve some land through TDR. GMQS allows the county to score against the impacts we care about. (Affordable housing, etc...)
- Building and Energy code address the small matter
- LUC Look at our zoning to get at the what and where. Transit-oriented development, housing close to work, STR in a single zone district.
 - Let’s look at 5750 and below - Building and Energy standards
 - Above 5750 with TDR and GMQS
 - Zoning - What do we want, where
- A top five issue in our valley is traffic
- A recession helped slow down the impact back in 2008. Net zero in a home won’t reduce the traffic impact from property management
- Use all tools and requirements to keep small house sizes and address traffic
- Keep community resiliency in the front of our minds
- More work and employees are going to be focused down valley
- Were the changes in the county over the last 20 years, brought by external forces or internal management?
- Let the community bring change, not external forces
- Pressures external forces bring to a community are challenging and difficult to balance. Government's formal systems are horribly difficult
- REMP program is a carbon offset. If you wanted to get extra you had to pay and CORE used those funds for projects. The funds are going down but maybe an update to this process?
- Merging TDR and GMQS. Needs to also look at water, carbon impact, and traffic



- Net Zero is possible! We need to convert homes throughout the valley
- TDR and SQ FT are blunt and easy tools to try and solve issues. This is a nuanced issue that needs to be looked at holistically. This also shuts out the second homeowners in this conversation
- There are ways to reduce energy efficiency and we should have regulations that promote this
- Create simple, elegant code that addresses core values
- Incentives that would promote affordable housing being built in the County
- This is a complex issue without a single solution. House size limitation isn't the single solution but a great first step. A smaller home doesn't mean second homeowners aren't coming here.
- No ability to go over 5,750. Could this make people live here year-round?
- Because of the outsized impacts that larger homes have, we need to have an outsized solution
- 3,850 should be the goal
- Building & energy codes define operational energy use
- We still need to account for the embodied energy of these homes and water consumption
- Perspective is changing based on the discussion.
- The master list are dials that can be adjusted.
- A max house size cap is necessary but needs to be discussed. Great option to create an artful system to account for all of these items
- Price-distorted and employee-distorted economy



Community Growth Advisory Committee Meeting #7

Wednesday, November 2, 2022

4:00 – 6:00 p.m.

Aspen Police Department - Community Room (2nd Floor)

540 E Main St, Aspen, CO 81611

Meeting Recording: [Community Growth Advisory Committee: Meeting 7, Nov. 16, 2022](#)

Meeting Presentation: [11.16.2022 CGAC Slide Deck.pdf](#)

Agenda Item	Topic	Summary
1.	Welcome: Meeting Purpose, Agenda, Vision & Values	• The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. • Facilitator Miles Graham welcomed staff, resource team and Committee members to the seventh Community Growth Advisory Committee meeting, and he briefly reviewed the meeting purpose and agenda.
2.	Committee Questions: Reviewing the Big Topics for Discussion	• Committee Co-Chairs Michael Miracle and Mona Newton introduced the threshold questions, which were stated in the November 16 memo as follows: ○ Should house size be limited? ■ If so, how and by how much? (Note: Each of these questions will eventually include secondary “if so, how” consideration/s of the available land use levers) ○ Should the TDR and GMQS systems be overhauled? ○ Should we focus on future development and/or what already exists? ○ Should the county’s short-term rental (STR) policies be overhauled? ○ Should the county’s affordable housing policies be overhauled? ○ Should urban growth boundaries be revised? ○ Should growth be limited to areas deemed appropriate for increased density? ○ Should there be concentrated areas of transit-oriented development (TOD)? • Mr. Miracle stated that Committee members can add additional questions by completing this brief survey.

3.	House Size White Paper: Overview of Climate & Community Data	- Kara Silbernagel presented the key takeaways from the white paper titled, “Existing Conditions, Trends and Impacts of House Size in Unincorporated Pitkin County.” Topics included: - Buildout summary and permit data - Historical trends in house size - Surrounding jurisdictions - Environmental and infrastructure impacts (energy, waste and transportation) - Economic impacts (jobs and workforce) - Summary of impacts - Refer to slides 8-41 in the meeting presentation for detailed data presented.
4.	Committee Discussion: House Size in Relation to Our Values & Goals	- Mr. Miracle and Ms. Newton facilitated a Committee discussion in reaction to the white paper presentation and the following prompt questions: - What is the right balance to reflect our values and maintain the community we all love and fight so hard to preserve? - What are the appropriate tools and mechanisms for delivering the outcomes we desire and how might we apply them? What new tools and mechanisms might we need? - Committee members shared varying perspectives on the role of house size and square footage caps to limit, mitigate and offset consequential impacts and achieve the BOCC goals. Members also presented potential solutions outside of square footage caps. - During the discussion, August Hasz, P.E., presented technical insights and considerations related to the impact table that shows metrics such as annual energy use, waste generated in construction, average number of jobs added post-construction and additional daily vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) by various house size thresholds. Some Committee members requested a follow-up presentation from Mr. Hasz. - The Committee agreed to table the continuum exercises for forthcoming discussions.
5.	Our Path Forward: Roadmap of Topics for Upcoming Meetings	Details about the November 30 meeting are as follows: <i>Community Growth Advisory Committee Meeting #8 Wednesday, November 30, 2022 4:00 – 6:00 p.m.</i> <i>Rocky Mountain Institute Innovation Center 22830 Two Rivers Road, Basalt, CO 81621</i>
6.	Public Comment: Hearing from Our Community	No public comments were shared.
7.	Adjourn	The meeting was adjourned at 6:28 p.m.