



Land Use

Courthouse Annex • 2045 13th Street • Boulder, Colorado 80302 • Tel: 303.441.3930 • Fax: 303.441.4856
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 471 • Boulder, Colorado 80306 • www.bouldercounty.org

Memorandum

To: Planning Commission

From: Abby Shannon *AS*

Date: April 3, 2013

Re: BCCP-10-0001 Allenspark Regional Comprehensive Plan Summary

These public comments were received after your packet was prepared but before noon on April 3, 2013. Additional written comments received before the Planning Commission meeting tomorrow, April 4, will be hand-delivered to you at the beginning of the meeting.

New comments received beginning on page 16. AS

Re: BCCP-10-0001 Allens Park Regional Comprehensive Plan

These are a few comments of mine in regards to the draft plan summary.

First, kudos to those men and women who so diligently put the community's thoughts and beliefs into a written form. I hope that Boulder County takes into consideration your hard work. As a cynic, I think otherwise. The added phrase, highlighted in yellow, in "Purpose" should serve as a clue. So should what once were the "Community Guiding Principles" which have now been diluted.

I disagree with the proposed deletion on page 3. Our corner of the county is unique. County government does have an effect, not always positive, on socio-economic conditions. It was Boulder County that in the late 1970's or early 1980's down-zoned Business Route 7 within the Townsite. It was Boulder County that proactively involved itself in destroying a business in the area. It's the County that is buying up property on the Bunce and turning it into "Private Open Space." There are the color pallets and children's lemon-ade stands. And subjective architectural standards of what fits in the mountain area, as if the standards for the Mc-Castles in the flat lands somehow do so.

In my opinion, this whole process is a façade. The planning staff has made up its collective mind. It's job security. The Planning Commission will listen and may agree with parts and disagree with others. The Commissioners have been primed in advance. With a "Thank you very much for your valuable input, 747; but we see otherwise", they will adopt whatever staff wants. It goes to Court. The judge finds that the community had "input" and rules in favor of the County. So goes five years of hard work.

I've lived in this "Kuhdorf" Allens Park for over 35 years and mostly without the intervention of the County. Since it's the last area of the County that the bean counters have yet to touch significantly, it will be interesting to see what they come up with to "save us from ourselves." If I were to guess the consensus of the residents of the Allens Park Townsite, it might mirror my sentiments. We really do just fine without you. God forbid if I've been too abrupt!

Gene Smerchek
Skunk Hollow

Shannon, Abigail

From: Teresa Hoffman <tchoffman@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2013 4:24 PM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Subject: Allenspark 747 Community Project

I am a full time resident of Allenspark and just wanted to thank the 747 Project Core Team and Boulder County for trying to come up with a plan that at the very least listens to all sides. I don't attend many of the 747 meetings because there are always a few people there that obviously don't have the best interests of the community in mind, they just seem to be trying to sabotage the whole process. I would not have known about any of these meetings or plans if it had not been for the 747 Project Core Team.

I also don't support the Old Gallery and have not been to any of their functions because I don't want any of the people that run the gallery to know who I am or where I live. I actually fear what they might do or say about me if they knew that I don't agree with them.

I thank you and the members of the 747 Project for being braver than I.

Shannon, Abigail

From: Philip Mary Stern <Phil.Stern@colorado.edu>
Sent: Saturday, March 30, 2013 9:16 AM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Subject: 747 attachment

Abby, Please include this with 747 materials for the Planning Staff meeting on April 4. Thank you.

Mary Stern
303-747-2986

Begin forwarded message:

From: Judee Snell <judeesnell@msn.com>
Date: March 29, 2013, 12:21:02 PM MDT
To: "phil.stern@colorado.edu" <phil.stern@colorado.edu>
Cc: Margie Patterson <scampi162@gmail.com>
Subject: Correction to Mary's Letter

Mary,

I am writing in response to a comment in your recent letter to Abby Shannon. It is public record.

Your statement reads "747 members do not support but refuse to participate in myriad activities and services at the Old Gallery..." To the contrary, I have taken 5 classes to date there (my teacher paid a per student fee each time from my fee), attended Cheryl Pennington's demonstration and purchased a piece for over \$100, which benefited the gallery, attended two of your annual meetings, attended and bought at two community sales and this past year paid a fee and sold my own goods (my spot was across the sidewalk from yours), contributed to the general table and bought goods from Betsy benefiting the musical group. My husband and I attended the musical this past summer and attended the opening artist evening for Joyanne Mathes and Vicki Dyas. As a couple we have also attended an open mic night. Before the purchase of the building my husband was asked by the Pattersons to do a cost estimate for the operation of the building. Later, at Margie's request, Bob did a study to determine if a food coop would be beneficial for the building. Recently Bob met with Bill Dyas concerning the possibility of mounting a ham radio antenna at TOG or the fire station for the benefit of all of us.

This letter is penned by me. I consider myself a member of the 747. As a member of the core team, Bob continues to remain neutral.

We are all welcome to our own opinions, but please be aware that your statement was not factual and it is now public record. I would appreciate a retraction of that

statement.

Judee Snell

Shannon, Abigail

From: Michael Johnston <mjohnsto@us.ibm.com>
Sent: Saturday, March 30, 2013 11:06 AM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Cc: 747 Community Project
Subject: upcoming April 4 study session with the Boulder County Planning Commission - Allenspark Regional Comprehensive Plan Summary proposal

Abby,

Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend this meeting in person, however, please include my comments in the study session.

I have participated in the 747 Planning meetings on occasion as well as reviewed the proposals by the committee, and am in 100% support of the proposals. I feel the committee has done everything possible to include anyone and everyone in the study, solicited community input using several different methods (surveys, email communications, community meetings, etc), and has been extremely transparent in everything they have done.

I realize there will be, as always, minority opposition to these proposals, but I sincerely believe the deliverables produced from the 747 Community Project team with the assistance from yourself, Dale, and other members of the Boulder County planning team represents the desires of the majority of citizens in the Allenspark area. It is also my belief the Allenspark Regional Comprehensive Plan is in line with the Boulder County Comprehensive Plan in principle, and I am confident we can collaborate in such a way to implement the plan to everyone's mutual agreement.

It is unfortunate that a few citizens who made the personal "choice" to not participate are now attempting to discredit the study, which by no means, should invalidate the work of those who did take the time and interest to be involved.

Please accept my comments in support of the Allenspark 747 Regional Comprehensive Plan. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Michael Johnston
PO Box 123
Allenspark, Co 80510

Shannon, Abigail

From: Marilyn Sweangen <mn58@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2013 7:35 AM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Subject: Allenspark 747

Abby - just want to thank you and Boulder County for taking this Community project so seriously. It is something I believe in and as a full time resident up here since 1992 recommend it be adopted in its final form.

Marilynn Sweangen

Shannon, Abigail

From: HEIDI ROTHBERG <hrhmadam@wildblue.net>
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2013 7:57 AM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Subject: 747 Project

Dear Ms. Shannon,

I am writing to ask you to read and support the initiative by the 747 Project for Allenspark, and Raymond-Riverside areas. The people who put this survey together have made a huge effort to be inclusive and have held many meetings where all opinions were heard. Those who are against it have said they were excluded from any input. This is patently not true. The survey was anonymous and anyone who wanted to speak at the meetings were allowed to do so. This project was the most inclusive of anything we've seen in Boulder County and most full-time residents just want to be left alone to make the decisions concerning their property without interference from those outside the area.

Thank you,
Heidi Rothberg
153 Ski Road East
Allenspark, CO 80510

Shannon, Abigail

From: Beverly Berg <beverlyberg@earthlink.net>
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2013 4:02 PM
To: '747 Community Project'
Cc: Shannon, Abigail
Subject: RE: 747 Community Project - Meeting with Boulder County Planning Commission

Thanks to all who have worked so diligently on this project. The changes you have noted in yellow seem warranted.

My primary concerns as a property owner of a small cabin just west of Hill Street (131 County Road 90) are as follows:

- The difficulty to meet building requirements to enlarge/improve my property to my future needs should I want this to become a primary residence upon retirement.
- The status of a city sewer system being implemented as I have received notice from Boulder County to have my septic system inspected and then updated by 2023.
- Having internet access.
- Supporting the business community to encourage growth that enhances the area.

Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend the presentation on Thursday. Please keep me updated on the results from the meeting and any future presentations.

Thank you again for the excellent job you have done on our behalf.

Sincerely,

Bev Berg

From: 747 Community Project [<mailto:747communityproject@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, March 31, 2013 11:51 AM
To: undisclosed-recipients:
Subject: 747 Community Project - Meeting with Boulder County Planning Commission

Shannon, Abigail

From: Stephen Coles <sdcoles@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2013 9:00 PM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Cc: Barb Coles
Subject: RE: BCCP-10-0001: Allenspark Regional Comprehensive Plan; 4/4/13 @ 6 pm

To Abby Shannon, Boulder County Commissioners and Land Use Planning staff:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to the deliberations underway in the matter of the 747 Community Planning Project. My wife Barbara and I are year-around residents of Allenspark, having owned and enjoyed our home and community since 1999. It has been our pleasure to have lived in a community that has cared enough about its present and future to invest the time and energy represented in the 747 Community Plan.

It has been our personal experience and that of many of our community's land owners to endure and observe what can only be described as an onerous and arbitrary permitting process in maintaining properties to aesthetic and functional condition. This opinion is widely shared in the Allenspark Community and is the result of often-conflicting, subjective and undefined land use criteria and regulation language and interpretation such as "minimally visible".

It is because of these experiences that many residents and land owners of the Allenspark area have sought to bring increased rationality to the property development and maintenance process by enabling appropriate flexibility in regulation and application of regulatory authority. The 747 planning process has created an opportunity for this to occur and to prevent unneeded frustration and future animosity. By relying less on one-size-fits-all land use and building regulations and more on carefully-applied reason and a focus on mutually desired outcomes through a plan-supported building process, the 747 Community plan seeks to achieve satisfactory results for ALL stakeholders.

For these reasons Barbara and I urge the Boulder County Commissioners to adopt the 747 Community Plan and incorporate it within the Land Use Comprehensive Plan that will guide future decisions in our community. We recognize that there is at least some local disparity of opinion on the 747 plan, but taken as a viable starting point for final decisions it captures the community's aspirations for its future far more broadly than the few voices that have expressed desire for no change at all. We fear that the fact that it has taken much longer than expected in getting to the point of meaningful, legal discussion of this plan may have some basis in the level of commitment by the county administration in seeking a truly shared approach to community stewardship. Please mitigate this fear by adopting the 747 Community Plan as a viable element of the Boulder County Comprehensive Plan.

Stephen and Barbara Coles
482 Ponderosa Lane
Allenspark, CO 80510

From: ashannon@bouldercounty.org
To: ashannon@bouldercounty.org
CC: dcase@bouldercounty.org

Abby Shannon, AICP
Senior Planner, Boulder County Land Use
ashannon@bouldercounty.org

Subject: Summary of proposed Allenspark Regional Comprehensive Plan

Dear Abby,

I am writing in regard to the proposed Allenspark Regional Comprehensive Plan Summary, submitted for consideration by the Boulder County Planning Commission. The Commission is scheduled to consider the Summary on April 4 2013, in conjunction with a public discussion session.

My comments about concerns with the ARCP Summary follow. I will be glad to communicate and to explain further about my comments and concerns if it will be helpful.

I look forward to learning more about this and contributing to the ongoing discussion.

With best regards,
Doug Henderson
Pine Valley landowner

General comments

1. As a landowner in Pine Valley (Allenspark), I want to express support for the Boulder County Comprehensive Land Use Plan (BCCP), as the primary and umbrella policy for guiding land use in the county including the Allenspark area. I appreciate the efforts and capacities of the Planning Commission and Land Use Department in fulfilling the vision and intentions of the BCCP. New expressions of land use policy, such as the proposed Allenspark Regional Comprehensive Plan (ARCP), need to integrate with and support the broad objectives and intent established in the BCCP, and to integrate functionally with the County land use framework. Ambiguities and inconsistencies need to be addressed and resolved sooner rather than later, presumably prior to any formal adoption of new policy.

As part of the greater Allenspark community, I also understand and share the desire by local people for a voice in land use policy and planning especially as it affects the Allenspark area and community. Local people have expressed the desire in a variety of ways, including decades of involvement in land use planning, in the Townsite Planning Initiative, and in the efforts of the 747 Project and other local groups. For its part, the County has recognized and encouraged local voice in its participation processes.

Translating interest by local people in addressing land use faces practical challenges in terms of how regional communication, cooperation, and workable agreements can be achieved. Local participation in land use planning in the Allenspark region is by individuals and interest groups (voluntary associations). No institutional mechanism exists in the Allenspark region that enables "the community" to develop and express a collective voice regarding land use or to address land use issues at a regional level. Efforts under the Townsite Planning Initiative

and the 747 Project provided forums for discussion regarding land use. These efforts are noteworthy and commendable. But their history highlights the widely differing views within the greater Allenspark community regarding land use, the challenges for effective communication and inclusive participation, and the deep divisions that impede achieving genuine agreement about land use among stakeholders in the region.

This history also poses a question about what can be accomplished by local volunteers and volunteer group(s) in addressing highly contentious land use issues – and whether it is realistic to expect volunteers and volunteer group(s) to achieve results that challenge much more robust institutional mechanisms. I think the honest answer to that question is fairly obvious, and hardly surprising. This is not to under-value the importance and contributions of volunteers and volunteer groups; but to recognize that placing unrealistic expectations on volunteers and volunteer group(s) is a recipe for unmet expectations and outcomes with serious shortcomings.

Addressing land use at a regional level, as envisioned in the proposed ARCP (outlined in the Summary), will require a regional mechanism with capacities beyond what a volunteer effort can mobilize, and which is governed in a fashion that ensures broad public participation and accountability to the full community. Such a mechanism would be a regional governmental institution for land use. Is this really what the local community wants? If so, what will be required to establish and operate it?

The Summary provides some suggestions related to the institutional dimensions of regional land use planning and a mechanism that would enable “the community” to express a collective (regional) voice regarding land use. In particular, the section on Community Representation contains some ideas. However, more consideration and specificity is needed regarding the objectives, functions, local governance and accountability, as well as the relationships with Boulder County (and in time, presumably the Forest Service and Park Service) on behalf of the greater Allenspark community. As the saying goes, the devil is in the detail – and a lot more detail and consideration will be needed before localization of land use can be advanced with confidence.

2. The Summary presents the proposed ARCP as “A community-based plan that represents Allenspark area citizens, landowners and resident’s vision for the future of the region and provides guidelines for preserving what the community values and changing what it does not.” The Summary continues in both explicit statements and implications to present the proposed ARCP as reflecting the needs, values, and wishes of “the community”, which is generally defined to include landowners, permanent residents, and part-time seasonal residents within the greater Allenspark region, an area bounded by the Allenspark Fire Protection District in Boulder County. (The local group that prepared the proposed ARCP, the 747 Community Project, is named for the area serviced by the 747 telephone prefix, which suggests another definition for “the community.”) While the intent seems reasonably clear, greater specificity is needed to avoid foreseeable problems from vagueness regarding the exact ‘who and where’ encompassed in the proposed ARCP.

Evidence that the ARCP “represents Allenspark area citizens, landowners and resident’s vision” is not detailed in the Summary, but appears to draw from a combination of community meetings organised by the Townsite Planning Initiative and subsequent activities conducted by the 747 Project including surveys, public meetings, and other communications with people

in the greater Allenspark region. A “core group” in the 747 Project provided leadership and ‘staff’ function for the 747 Project, and also communicated with the County land use staff. However, whether the greater Allenspark community was engaged sufficiently in 747 activities and the core group to be accurately and fully represented cannot be assessed from the ARCP Summary. (The full ARCP document provides some information to support statements that the proposed ARCP “represents Allenspark area citizens, landowners and resident’s vision.” However, the ARCP’s representation claim seems exaggerated and perhaps not credible considering the region’s population, based on data in the ARCP. Notably, only 10-15% of the population responded to the survey; of respondents, approximately 90% gave highly similar responses to survey questions, which seems problematic given the diversity in the community; and the survey results do not include standard measures of statistical accuracy that are normal in surveys.)

Additional uncertainty about whether the proposed ARCP genuinely “represents Allenspark area citizens, landowners and resident’s vision” comes from the well-known history of sharp disagreement and acrimony over land use among some members and factions in the greater Allenspark community. While disagreements and acrimony did not begin with the Townsite Planning Initiative, these divisions and conflicts quickly surfaced in the Initiative and escalated sharply in subsequent 747 Project efforts and other community-related endeavors. A portion of the community opted out of the 747 Project’s efforts and refused to participate from disenchantment and as a means of protest. Reported problems related to uncivil and hostile conduct during meetings, selection of leaders, differing accounts of what occurred during meetings (and revision of written records), and failure to address and resolve problems and grievances when they occurred.

The actual strength of community support for the proposed ARCP is uncertain. A significant part of the community – possibly as much as 80%, including those who initially participated but then opted out due to disenchantment – did not participate in efforts that produced the proposed ARCP. It seems likely that the proposed ARCP exaggerates the actual level of community representation. The ARCP represents the vision of some local area citizens, landowners and residents – including those who participated in the 747 Project’s efforts, estimated to be 10-20% of the community – but what portion is fairly represented is not known with accuracy, and the proposed ARCP cannot be considered to represent a shared vision of the Allenspark community at large.

The proposed ARCP should be understood for what it is: a valuable and credible expression of the values and vision of the 747 Project, a local interest group that engaged a portion of the Allenspark community. To treat the proposed ARCP as accurately and fairly representing the full Allenspark community would be inaccurate and misleading; it would continue rather than resolve the divisions and communication problems within the community; and it would not be conducive to improving land use planning in the greater Allenspark region. Treated as a draft for discussion, the proposed ARCP can serve as a useful and practical step toward developing a regional land use plan that truly has broad support by the greater Allenspark community; getting to that outcome will depend on the practical interest in the local community, the inclusiveness of the process, and the mobilization of a regional mechanism that has capacities needed for the task.

3. The Summary provides very limited information regarding the institutional arrangements for the proposed ARCP, as discussed above. The institutional arrangements determine how

stakeholders engage in addressing land use, and thereby condition the results. Options for institutional arrangements need careful and extensive consideration because they are critical to political viability, legal implications, and land use outcomes. It is worthwhile to consider several options. Options need to be considered in terms of utility and feasibility at the local/regional level, for Boulder County, and implications for other regions within the county.

According to the Summary, the regional institutional arrangement for the ARCP would be "community-selected committee(s)" that would be formally recognized to represent the greater Allenspark community and to "interface with government" on land use matters. In combination with enabling provisions for locally-defined land use policies in the proposed ARCP, the "community-selected committee(s)" would presumably be vested with authority for land use planning in the Allenspark region. Will "community-selected committee(s)" really be up to the challenges and tasks? This is a contentious and problematic proposal, loaded with as much opportunity for escalating problems and conflict as for resolving issues and improving land use. Moving forward on such a proposal for regional governance of land use without thorough consideration of the expectations, capacities, and requirements would be to construct Pandora's box without much thought about the consequences.

Vesting responsibility and authority for land use at the regional level, as proposed in the ARCP, would effectively create a new layer/level of government in the the Allenspark region, which will require creating a public body with suitable policies and capacities aligned with the expected tasks. Its operation and conduct will need to meet 'good governance' standards for participation, transparency, accountability, and rules of conduct. It will require legal status and clarification of legal responsibilities and liabilities. It will also need financial resources to operate. As a public body serving the full Allenspark community, presumably the financial resources will be raised primarily from local fees and/or taxes. (And a good argument can be made that local fees and/or taxes are a necessary and strong strong incentive for public scrutiny and accountability.) It seems unlikely to me that residents and landowners in the Allenspark region really favor establishing and paying for such a regional mechanism; however, it an open question that could be answered through a referendum.

A second option would be to establish an advisory body to facilitate communication within the Allenspark community regarding land use and to advise the County, similar to what is proposed in the ARCP but without authority to establish or administer region-specific land use policies or other autonomous authority. The specific mandate and objectives, composition, terms of service, and duration would need to be defined. As with the public body outlined above, an advisory body will require suitable policies and capacities; its operation and conduct will need to meet 'good governance' standards; and it will need financial resources to operate. The body can be composed of elected members, appointed members, or both; the specific mechanisms of elections and/or appointments would need to be worked out adequately to ensure appropriate representation, accountability, and capacities. Advisory bodies can be useful and constructive, however they can also suffer significant problems from excessive expectations, over-reach, significant power struggles and conflict, fatigue, disappointing outcomes, and disenchantment. In light of the history of communication problems and deep divisions over land use in the Allenspark community, the potential problems with an advisory body should be carefully considered and the details sorted out, especially related to composition, leadership, and accountability to the full Allenspark community.

A third option would be to establish one or more task forces, to focus on narrowly defined objectives, often with a limited timeframe for conducting activities and reaching the expected result(s). The considerations are the same as for an advisory body, but with more limited objectives and timeframe, the potential for achieving success is higher, the experiences & learning by one task force can inform and help another task force, and the potential costs from non-success are lower.

A fourth option would be to continue with the current arrangement, wherein individuals and interest groups within the Allenspark community interact and associate with each other on a voluntary basis, and represent their views as individuals and interest groups, without a defined institutional mechanism at the regional level. While this option misses the advantages of a regional mechanism, it may be the most feasible especially considering the requirements, challenges, and resources needed to establish and support for a viable regional mechanism.

Shannon, Abigail

From: susan@susancarrell.com
Sent: Wednesday, April 03, 2013 1:22 PM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Subject: Response to 747 Plan

My husband and I live in Allenspark year-round. We are fairly recent residents and don't carry the weight of those who have called this area home for 30 plus years. However, reasonable growth with reasonable control makes sense to us. We are in favor of the recommendations in the Allenspark Regional Comprehensive Plan as submitted because they seem reasonable.

Here are some of the questions we have in response to all the panic about residents of the community making their own decisions:

1. Isn't it commonplace (and more effective/efficient) in American politics for small groups of people to organize and communicate their wishes to government officials?
2. When a community-wide vote occurs and the ballots are available to all, don't those voters who respond decide the outcome?
3. What's so wrong when local people sharing local concerns make decisions about their community, especially when the Boulder County Commission encouraged and supported the process?
4. Isn't it an abdication of civic responsibility when people chose not to participate in a forum designed to elicit all points of view (such as community meetings and surveys)? Disagreements are part and parcel of the democratic process.
5. If the policy of no growth prevails in our area, who will man our ambulances and fire trucks? Who will plow our private roads and driveways? Who will own and operate the few businesses we all enjoy?

The future of any community is its attraction for young families. Status quo leads quickly to stagnation and decay. This philosophy is already evident in the increased dilapidation and disrepair of buildings in the town proper. It won't be long before Allenspark will look like Ward. But it sure is a scenic drive to get here.

Susan Carrell & Winston Davis

Susan Carrell, R.N., L.P.C.
PO Box 86
Allenspark, CO 80510
303-747-2280 (home)
417-861-6449 (mobile)

Shannon, Abigail

From: Lori <l7hoffman@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 04, 2013 6:14 AM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Subject: Boulder County Comp Plan

Categories: Red Category

Ms Shannon,

I would like to give you a few of my thoughts. I own land in Allenspark, but live in Kansas. I have on occasion been in the state visiting family and was able to attend some of the 747 meetings. Even though I do not live in the community full time, I am very interested in what is going on. I always felt as though I was welcome and my views and opinions were listened to and considered. I find it interesting that a few people have written to express such negative experiences they reportedly had after attending one meeting. I never saw anyone express any ideas or thoughts that were not taken into consideration. It seems to me after reading other comments, they are doing exactly what they are accusing the 747 group of doing, not listening to the community, being closed minded etc. Our communities were founded on the basis of open ideas, open discussion, by the people of those communities. Our government, even county government is structured for the people of the county and is open to all those of that county, and community. I support the 747 group and all the suggestions they have worked so long and hard to put together to submit to the county. I believe everything put forth deserves serious consideration.

Respectfully
Lori Hoffman

Re: BCCP 10-001 Allenspark Regional Comprehensive Plan

Thursday, April 4, 2013

Greetings:

I am submitting this due to the fact that I'm currently out of town and unable to attend the study session. I have participated in the Townsite Planning Initiative (TPI) as the Business lead for almost 5 years.

As you all know, in 2008 the Allenspark area was invited by Boulder County to engage in the TPI. The intent of this invitation was to our understanding, an olive branch by the County in recognition that the Allenspark area is a unique part of the County, unique in its beauty as well as the fiercely independent nature of the stakeholders who live here, recognizing the need for the community to participate in defining the future of our area.

The work has remained transparent, inclusive and demonstrates that the community is not "split" down the middle, as was the initial assertion by Boulder County in 2008. Is there 100% agreement, no, however the numbers are staggeringly in favor of the proposals. Of the handful of folks who do not agree with the proposals, all participated in the surveys as well as the meetings and their voices were heard and represented in the results of our work. However they are the extreme minority, hence the finished proposals do not incorporate everything they oppose.

I am in support of the Allenspark Regional Comprehensive plan as written and proposed by the 747 core group. I disagree with the suggested changes by staff. If those changes are incorporated it negates the work we've done as well as the invitation from the County to engage the community in the Townsite Planning Initiative.

I take exception to Staff objecting to the language in the proposal that suggests that Boulder County regulation has contributed to the decline of the Allenspark area. Simply by not allowing "non-conforming" Businesses to upgrade their properties unless there's a "Health and Safety" risk has resulted in many of the businesses failing to thrive, seriously impacting the economy in the Allenspark area.

There are also property owners in the area that in lieu of going through the permit process in fear of opening a can of worms, have chosen to let their properties fall into dis-repair instead of doing the work without a permit. Then of course there are those who simply go forward without pulling

permits. There's also those when they do pull permits find themselves under scrutiny as in the example that follows:

Recently I became aware of a property owner who applied for a permit to re-roof his home and guest cabin, which resulted in Boulder County sending a letter to the applicant questioning him about his guest cabin and saying he would be required to pull "as built" permits or a "deconstruction" permit if unable to demonstrate that the cabin was legally built. With my assistance they were able to provide evidence that the cabin had been built in the 1960's, several years prior to the main house being built and many years before building code had been established in unincorporated Boulder County. These good people were willing to adhere to the regulation when they pulled the permits. They were so distraught by the letter that they were ready to walk away from their home and let the bank have it back if they would have been forced to de-construct.

Those are only two examples of how Boulder County regulation has and continues to contribute to the decline of the Allenspark area.

Sincerely,

Tammy Ackerman
79 Big John Rd
Lyons, CO 80540
303.747.1111

Comments received after the Planning Commission meeting on April 4, 2013

Shannon, Abigail

From: Dave Fausset <dfausset@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 04, 2013 3:37 PM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Subject: Re: BCCP-10-0001: Allenspark Regional Comprehensive Plan; 4/4/13 @ 6 pm

Abby,

I have reviewed the report from the Allenspark Area Landowners and the various critical notations the county staff has made. Unfortunately, the comments by the county staff directly contradict the statements made by the staff at the beginning of the process. Why is that? We were told our thoughts would be given serious consideration. The results don't seem to reflect that.

I have made an approximation of the acreage in the area and find we are talking about 26,800 acres. Averaging the individual potential parcels, each property would contain 24.44 acres. This seems to cause the "green eyed monster" in the people of Boulder to press their misguided thoughts on all those not desiring to live on top of one another.

The AAL's report has presented a very positive description of their desires. Shocking as it may seem, almost every person making up the committee has at the least one college degree and many have several.

All the staff does is criticize wording that suggests the county should keep its nose out of the business of a "pleasant small far distance corner of the county". The only time the people from Boulder come to this far corner is to leave their trash and cause damage. Further showing the considerable jealous rage they have for those with enough foresight to live where they can enjoy clean air and clear sky.

County staff suggested at the beginning of the process, the determinations of the committee, would be given serious favorable consideration.

The committee has done considerable work, both on the ground studies and surveys, gathering of true facts (not space photos and imaginary viewing via other internet and on line sources). Thank heaven they didn't waste our money on coming to the area and spend time learning of community values. They only criticize the thought that the people in the area could possibly know better how to handle the problems than the people actually living there.

Go with what has been provided. Trying to gain some autonomy from the strangle of Boulder, without starting a completely separate governmental unit makes no sense. Unless, of course the real plan is to force the need for more political entities.

Thanks

Dave Fausset
16744 Scenic Highway 7
Allenspark, Colorado
303.747.0497
Property Owner since 1975

Shannon, Abigail

From: Judy Brownsberger <jbrownsberger@mac.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 04, 2013 5:49 PM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Subject: Allenspark Area Comprehensive Plan

Categories: Red Category

Abby,

I want to write you a note letting you know that I support the 747 Community Project and the draft of the Allenspark Comprehensive Plan. I planned to attend the meeting at the court house tonight, but unfortunately my daughter has developed a fever.

I have attended some of the 747 meetings and plan to attend more in the future. I think the 747 group did an amazing job of conducting a transparent process and spent a lot of time engaging as many people as possible. The survey clearly indicated areas where citizens felt we needed a supplemental plan to the overall county plan. And the draft was painstakingly written with input from numerous people. I think this new plan will help folks maintain their homes and still preserve the beauty of the area as intended by the County Comprehensive Plan. I think the business plan will allow our treasured businesses to continue to operate as they have in the past preserving our character.

I did read through the letters against the plan and I guess I'm not surprised at their stance. I remember them in early meetings and they always maintained that no additional plan was needed, which is still what they say. And while I can appreciate their point of view, I think this over restrictive stance is leading to decline in our area. We are one of the very few young families in the area (and I have to laugh at that because we aren't that young). It didn't used to be that way but there are fewer and fewer of us. I think the main reason for that is the cost of maintaining a home here is too high. Plus there are fewer and fewer local jobs typically held by young people.

I also want to reply to an accusation in one of the comment letters about AAL. It was something to the effect of AAL being a "right wing" something or other. Being that I'm the secretary of AAL and a Democrat (and proud of it!) I find that silly. There are a good mix of political philosophies in our group. We are simply a group dedicated to spreading information about issues in the county we think folks might want to know about. And we encourage folks to let their voices be heard. A lot of folks work - like myself - and don't have time to keep up with what's going on and don't have time to lobby with the county with their desires.

Thank you for listening. I hope to meet you in the future.

Judy Brownsberger

Sent from my iPhone

Shannon, Abigail

From: Glenn and Margie Patterson <scampi162@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, April 05, 2013 9:15 AM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Subject: last night's hearing and another comment

Categories: Red Category

Hi Abby,

Glenn and I are somewhat confused about your perspective on the hearing last night. Bill Ellis made it quite clear during his presentation that the 747 Core Team disagreed with EVERY staff comment, strike out, etc. And yet when asked by the Commissioners about the differences between the two versions you said (more than once) that staff and 747 weren't that far apart - - it was only a question of wording. ? That's certainly not what we heard 747 say! They disagree on principle with Staff's changes - - it's not a question of 'just wording.' Or are we missing something? Is staff covering up its real intent?

The message from Planning Commission seemed very clear - the 747 Summary, even as amended by staff, needs a lot of work and that number 9 should be removed or totally rewritten so the intent is clear. It is clear from the ARCP and from the poorly written #9 comment what the intent of the 747 team is. The formation of a quasi-governmental interface committee (basically the 747 Core Team as Joy Spatz suggested in her final comments) has been one of their major goals since the very beginning. What is staff's intent?

We agreed with the suggestion that the planning areas should be smaller - Allenspark Townsite, Peak to Peak, Raymond/Riverside, Peaceful Valley and that specific problems and vision need to be addressed. It is clear the core team is unable (after four years) to do this. Perhaps it is time for staff to make a real effort at including diverse viewpoints and more rational thinkers in this work (meaning those of us who don't agree with the direction and intent of the 747 core team). Just because 4 years have been spent on this project, doesn't make it 'right' and doesn't justify continuing with the status quo which is clearly not working.

I take great exception to Joy Spatz's final comments and her justification of the need for an interface committee, and that the committee should be made up of core team members because they 'know the community' and could 'help in an emergency,' A community emergency preparedness plan is being developed and that plan will suffice.

Also - - We can't believe you didn't speak up about the surveys and let the Planning Commission know it was not just one vote per person - people could vote multiple times depending on how many lots they owned! Also, that when people with diverse views tried to have input into the survey questions they were shut out. Please contact David Pinkow on this - he signed up to be a member of the survey team and the team never met - or never had a meeting he was told about! JP Brazil took it on himself with help from other Core Team members. The survey is a useless measure as Planning Commission will see when they are able to review the questions.

Please forward our comments to the Planning Commission and thank them for their thoughtful comments and support of the BCCP.

We look forward to talking with you more about this and thank you for your work. We hope staff will not cave to 747 threats and demands (and whining).

Margie and Glenn Patterson

Shannon, Abigail

From: Philip Mary Stern <Phil.Stern@colorado.edu>
Sent: Friday, April 05, 2013 10:06 AM
To: Lanning, Meredith
Cc: Case, Dale; Shannon, Abigail
Subject: Per my ARCP comment:

Categories: Red Category

Planning Commissioners,

My apologies for blurting out information at an improper time in last night's considerations of the Allenspark discussion.

My point concerning the surveys done by "747" besides being skewed was that the tallies did not represent one person, one vote. In fact "747" allowed owners of multiple parcels to vote multiple times for each parcel additionally skewing the results. If you look at page 79 of the supporting materials given to you by "747", you will find Attachment D with the results of the August 2011 survey. It states that parcels represented by 1 or more respondents tallied 240; that the total parcels owned by all respondents tallied 289. However when one tries to calculate the total responses received, 333, from the additional numbers given in Attachment D, I am unable to make the sums.

Regardless, the survey results were inflated by having multiple votes per parcel!

-phil

Shannon, Abigail

From: Shannon, Abigail
Sent: Friday, April 05, 2013 2:13 PM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Cc: Case, Dale
Subject: Allenspark: Planning Commission follow-up

Hi everyone,

A big thanks to those of you who were able to attend last night's Planning Commission meeting. I thought it was a good start to a continuing dialog as we work on the second phase of the 747 Community Project. To those of you who were unable to attend the meeting – there will be more opportunities to come!

I have posted two documents to the Land Use webpage that may be of interest to you: 1) the written comments received after the Planning Commission packet was prepared but prior to the meeting; and 2) the handout of the presentation that the core team provided to the Planning Commission. Both documents can be found on our webpage following the description of last night's Planning Commission meeting:

<http://www.bouldercounty.org/property/build/pages/artrplanning.aspx>

Have a nice weekend,
Abby

Abby Shannon, AICP
Senior Planner, Boulder County Land Use
ashannon@bouldercounty.org
303.441.3930

Stay informed! Sign up for email updates from the Boulder County Land Use Department:
<http://www.bouldercounty.org/gov/media/pages/listserv.aspx>

Shannon, Abigail

From: TOMISABBTT@aol.com
Sent: Friday, April 05, 2013 9:35 PM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Cc: tomisabbtt@aol.com; abbottswest@comcast.net
Subject: Re: Allenspark: Planning Commission follow-up

Hi Abby,

Thank you very much for the forward of the documents related to the current Allenspark effort by the county, and the local 747 Community Project. The inclusion of us grass-roots folks in the document chain is much appreciated.

Our family has owned our cabin in Meeker Park since 1938. At 71, I don't remember a time before the cabin. I also don't remember when there was not friction between Boulder County policies and the local citizenry. So; I am pleased that it seems that Boulder County is this time sincerely trying to work out land use plans actively and in concert with "the locals". I have genetically resisted the incursions of Boulder County into our pleasant Meeker Park lives. But then something like a bright red metal roof would be built on our road; and I would wonder "There should be some kind of regulation about this. Where is that damn Boulder County when we need them?".

I very much support the efforts of the 747 Committee to represent our family's perspectives in these Allenspark regional area land use issues. Including, pretty much, their language as presented to the county, and as defended to the Planning Commission staff. Honestly Abby; I feel that the staff recommendations are dismissive of the intent and insight of the language as submitted by the 747 group. It has been my experience after a long career of managing people and their comings and goings, that more words are almost always beneficial to achieving clarity in a communication; especially when that communication is being subsequently interpreted many years after, by people who were not involved at the origin of the policy. So; I think that staff should "lighten up a little" on the suggested edits to the 747 language as submitted.

After spending a wonderful youth at Meeker Park, and then a long working career much too absent from the mountains, I hope now to get to spend as much time as possible up there (with what the pine beetle has left us). Thanks again for the inclusion in the document chain; and I wish the best of outcomes for all of you, professional and volunteer, in this very important governmental initiative.

Tom Abbott

(Address unknown as we never had addresses. I'd have to look at my tax statement).

In a message dated 4/5/2013 2:13:03 P.M. Mountain Daylight Time,
ashannon@bouldercounty.org writes:

Hi everyone,

A big thanks to those of you who were able to attend last night's Planning Commission meeting. I thought it was a good start to a continuing dialog as we work on the second phase of the 747 Community Project. To those of you who were unable to attend the meeting – there will be more opportunities to come!

I have posted two documents to the Land Use webpage that may be of interest to you: 1) the written comments received after the Planning Commission packet was prepared but prior to the meeting; and

Shannon, Abigail

From: Glenn and Margie Patterson <scampi162@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, April 06, 2013 6:48 PM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Cc: Case, Dale
Subject: 747 "summary"

Dear Abby,

We just noticed the parenthetical statement below - - "Complete plan incorporated by reference." We hope that is NOT the case and that this wording will be taken out of any future "Summary" that makes it's way before the Planning Commission (along with #9)..

"Abbreviated Summary
(Complete plan incorporated by reference)"

Please pass this on to the Planning Commission.

What is the proposed timetable? What is the proposed plan of action regarding the re-write of the Summary?

Anything less than a month seems premature given the amount of work that seems necessary to meet the stated concerns of Planning Commission members. Something seems odd here - - and contrary to what seemed to be a unanimous sentiment opposing the Summary on the part of Planning Commissioners.

It also would appear that a revised Summary that only includes the input of the 747 Core Team is also unadvisable.

Margie and Glenn Patterson

Shannon, Abigail

From: plattcm@q.com
Sent: Monday, April 08, 2013 9:56 AM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Subject: Re: Allenspark: Planning Commission follow-up

Thanks, Abby. I see that I had this info all the time. I just didn't scroll down far enough in the file.

Reading this batch of letters gives me the same feeling of dread I got when reading the more recent batch. My husband and I are not members of any group in the area, but I've lived through fractious times in three social movements in which I've participated: civil rights, women's and anti-domestic violence. They all began with fellowship and dedication to a noble cause and ended with splinter groups at each others' throats, discounted, marginalized or banished.

Without strong leadership that begins by facilitating each group in establishing norms for discussion, then enforcing those norms, I see future Allenspark meetings heading the same way.

From: "Abigail Shannon" <ashannon@bouldercounty.org>
To: plattcm@q.com
Sent: Monday, April 8, 2013 9:03:08 AM
Subject: RE: Allenspark: Planning Commission follow-up

Hi Connie,

Your letter was included in the Planning Commission packet on page 40 of 73:
<http://www.bouldercounty.org/doc/landuse/bccp100001staffrec20130404.pdf>

Please let me know if you have any questions,

Abby

From: plattcm@q.com [<mailto:plattcm@q.com>]
Sent: Saturday, April 06, 2013 10:38 AM
To: Shannon, Abigail
Subject: Re: Allenspark: Planning Commission follow-up

Abby, do you have a file that includes residents' letters sent to the Commission in preparation for the March meeting that was cancelled? My letter would have been among them and I noticed allusions to letters from Margie Patterson and Mary Stern that I was not able to find.

Thanks...

Connie Platt

Boulder County Planning Commission

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,

I appreciate your review of the County staff's attempt to create a plan for Allenspark. I apologize that I failed to attend the hearing last Thursday evening. Please accept this belated input.

I live at 2645 Briarwood Drive, Boulder. In addition I own a house in Allenspark (17663 Peak-to-Peak Highway) that my wife and I use as an escape. I have not followed in detail the evolution of the 747 process, but I have watched it from afar. I have read some of the recent commentary before your April 4 hearing.

As a political observer for the past few decades, and an admirer of comprehensive planning, my view of the County's attitude toward development in the mountains is that it is discouraged. That makes a great deal of sense because providing urban services in these very lightly populated areas is exceptionally expensive. It serves few of the County's population. I purchased my property with the expectation of minimal development and few, if any, urban services.

I've also observed the arguments that some of those initially consulted about the content of a draft plan treated others rudely, discouraging their future participation. Thus began the long development of distrust in Allenspark. A strong indication is the apparent request that an Allenspark group be allowed to control communications with the County Commissioners. That is contrary to the legislative requirement of the Commissioners that they represent the County population as a whole, the vast majority who don't live in Allenspark. I believe the Planning Commission finds it unacceptable.

With this sad background, I ask you to proceed slowly with an Allenspark Regional Plan. I believe it is important to allow the residents' strong distrust to heal. Please allow six to twelve months before you once again consider the plan. This is give you enough time to allow a complete rewrite of the document, this time with all sides at the same table. I know this is a burden to the staff, and the residents, but documents like this one last a long time. Making the requisite investment of time now will be very worthwhile.

Thank you so much.

Dick Harris

Richard E. Harris
rharris@indra.com
(303) 499-1551