

Todd commences meeting at 4:08 P.M. Members present: Behrendt, Cook, Cunningham, DePagter, Erspamer, Kelly, Kirk, Lum, Markalunas, Maple, Myers, Reid, Sanchez, Stirling, Todd, Wilke.

Announcements: Maple asks how to add items to agenda and is concerned with procedure and staying consistent. Kirk states public comment was normally at beginning and questions format.

Minutes: Lum motions to approve, Maple seconds. Discussion: none. All in favor, Aye, February 12, 2009 minutes approved.

Public comment: Andrew Kole received numerous emails and questions regarding scope of task force. Stirling responds by naming and describing committees. Marilyn Marks sees “mission creep” and cites Ordinance 48 language, section 5. She asks if they can get public support for great mission, and how to deal with number of people on “list”. Lindsay Smith: Building around courthouse out to sidewalk should not be done to historic buildings. Courthouse does not need to be a hidden jewel. She would like to see true picture of architectural renderings. Mechanical structures should show. Eliminate “vitality, it is subjective.

Maple recommends adding AACP/HP to future agenda. Erspamer suggests public meeting questions be included. Thumbs Up.

Architecture and Urban Design 101: Sarah Broughton, Rowland Broughton Architects and Sheri Sanzone, BlueGreen – presentation regarding context of mass and scale, urban design, arrangement of buildings and spaces and how they are perceived and managed through design guidelines and zoning codes. Eluded to design art, and success of urban design in built environment is measured through paths, edges, districts, nodes and landmarks. Social design success is measured in how well needs are met – comfort, safety, food, activity, people watching, and accessibility. An urban area is an area with an increased density of human created structures in comparison to the areas surrounding it. Layout of city grid and blocks of Aspen streets in 1904 and 1999 presented for vertical to horizontal relationship, corridors and pedestrian experience. Examples of Main Street and Hunter Street shown. Proportions are 1:1 or 1:2.5 relationship, 1 being vertical and 2.5 being horizontal relationship. Relationship of building to street starts to define view corridors and pedestrian experience. The mind subconsciously seeks out mathematical and geometrical relationships or proportions. Human scale and proportion theories are alive in the old Andre’s Building (now Prada). Rules of thumb principles help define scale and mass of both city and individual buildings: rhythm, proximity, repetition, figure ground relationship and texture (Hotel Jerome).

When done correctly mass and scale creates comfortable streets, buildings and spaces where we want to hang out (Paradise Bakery, Zele Café)

Kirk makes Architecture Committee presentation. Are we losing our historic character and context by encouraging massive modern buildings next to historic buildings in our historic districts? We are changing mass and scale in historic districts. Are we are ruining or contributing to these districts? Buildings presented to depict comparison of height and views. We are getting into incremental massive creep. Are we preserving our historic neighborhoods by encouraging modern urban styles? We are a mountain town.

Historic preservation has philosophy, (*excerpt from individual's public comment regarding 2000 Aspen Area Community Plan*) "to continue to build on what we have by authentically preserving historic structures and creating thoughtful new buildings that encourage the shape and feeling of historic continuity. It's possible to let history inform all levels of development through sensitivity to scale". We are seeing no open space. Are we overlooking context in our neighborhoods by encouraging urban modernist styles in historic districts?

Example shown of Aspen Block building with Bidwell building adjacent. There is correlation of heights in downtown historic district, however, former proposed Bidwell went up 41 feet in a block without setbacks and open space. Galena Street has 26 feet average and Cooper Street mall has 15 foot first level with second level setback to approximately 26 feet, tallest building being Victorian Red Onion. We are changing mass and scale in historic districts.

Example of proposal for Wienerstube building which followed code and guidelines in mass and scale depicts massive modern urban architecture. Is this the character of Aspen? Is this appropriate in our historic districts? We are eliminating our setbacks, yards, sunshine and views. If we can't save existing neighborhoods which haven't changed in 40 years in existing historic districts, and if we can't protect them from inappropriate modern urban buildings, then we have no historic preservation. We need to encourage creativity in design through appropriate scale and stricter standards of height, mass and require setbacks. Change existing codes and standards in the core, eliminate incentives for scrape and replace, and change design guidelines to demonstrate context in keeping with the character of a mountain town.

Kirk presents mass and scale of what can adjoin contextually in neighborhood and feels it should not be in a mountain town. 38 feet is still too high and allowances of standards are too great to truly protect what we have today.

Myers hands out Architecture Committee recommended questions.

Public Comment: Sherry Cutler, architect and urban designer, feels it is absolutely necessary to consider context of community when considering preservation. She can't understand how zoning seems to be on collision course with preservation and with vitality they seek to preserve. Doesn't seem to be consideration for things that give preservation its scale and massing. Setbacks, open space incentives, and consistency of

materials got eliminated. She doesn't see how preservation can be accomplished without addressing land use. The quality of life that exists in this town is done away with when you create canyons in your streets. 42 foot buildings on either side of a street create a canyon, which promotes shade, ice, and doesn't allow sun to come in. Address land use and urban design as a master plan, not just series of legal ordinances. This town is designing by legal ordinances, not urban design concepts or elements. Looks like it was designed by lawyers.

Andrew Kole: hears historic preservation and community preservation being same. Historic preservation was for buildings. Community preservation should not be decided. Less is more and he sees rules all over the place. He questions who pushes their agenda and requests a show of hands as to who wants to be in land code business?

Bob Cook: has been involved in architecture in design since 1965 for preservation, restoration and renovation. Cook is disturbed by Kirk's presentation which sounded more like codes, guidelines and regulations. He heard "no modern buildings" and does not think this committee should legislate style. Kirk agrees and references it all comes down to height, mass and scale.

Myers prefaces committee questions with history of issues being addressed and states historic preservation is about two things:

1. Individual buildings, whether you are going to designate or not; and
2. Doing something about concept of historic character of Aspen.

Myers states committee is deadlocked and decided to present questions for entire task force to vote on.

Behrendt questions historical aspects of committee questions. Myers responds they are practical and anecdotal. Maple is looking for committee's recommendation, guidance and opinions and challenges all committees to bring forward a consensus or conclusion.

Reid states a majority vote of 3 to 1 was achieved for a streamlined report but there was a specific concern that things were being built that were not appropriate for the commercial core. She feels it is perfectly appropriate to express concerns about the changes to character of the community, but that has nothing to do with historic preservation. We have to be careful about message and if we draw conclusions based on speculation, misinformation and misinterpretation of the facts, nothing will be reviewed with seriousness. We confuse the issue, and that is the harm. People don't understand the basis of what we are talking about; a lot of things get thrown into the mix inappropriately.

Kirk presents her minority report: Unfortunately this committee is made up of a task force that is about as diverse as the definition of historic preservation. Historic preservation to some is preserving

styles of architecture around town, others it is providing incentives for developers and to increase density in town known as infill, and for still others it's preserving our historic districts, the neighborhoods, and protecting them. I had attached a petition which was removed from last week's report which represented over a hundred long-time locals and residents who want to protect the character of Aspen by urging Council to readdress the issues of height, mass and scale. While I know that we are in the minority here with this task force, because most of the people on this task force are either on Ordinance 30 or 48, or represent legal firms that have clients designated, or have served on infill boards, or even helped write the design guidelines. I feel this constituency of the hundred or more citizens and residences, long time locals, has not been represented. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like this task force to know that I intend to represent this constituency as a private citizen, not as a task force member. I will go before Council to address the issues which have been raised by this committee and are represented by a larger constituency in this community.

Reid states this does include very specific code related issues and does not see it as something to be discussing at this level of specificity. DePagter asks Reid for her streamlined brief statement and wants to hear philosophical broad attempt from committee.

Stirling asks if task force wants to devote thumbs up /thumbs down on architecture committee questions. Kelly feels questions are valid but beyond scope. Everybody knows there are conflicts between zoning and historic preservation, and City Council needs to look at that.

Stirling motions the task force to allow Joe to present recommended questions from architectural committee. Seconded by Markalunas. Discussion: Sanchez clarifies criteria committee conclusions are agreed upon to be important and contribute to historic character and qualities, but to accomplish anything, a distinction needs to be made from things that can be reasonably accomplished and things that should be looked at by City Council and other people. Community preservation and historic preservation are connected and contribute to each other. Stirling states architecture committee has earnestly tried to communicate complexity of issues and consensus was challenging. Issues are viewed and understood in different ways. Stirling motions to address questions: vote yes, no or abstain. Behrendt asks to attach Reid's discrimination between historic and community preservation at beginning of questions. Myers states questions go from general to specific and suggests to vote on question #1 - if no, then don't do #2 - if yes, then vote on #2. If a no vote on #2, then do not go to #3. Stirling suggested forest, not bogged down by trees: Do #1, see result, if #1 passes go to #2, go to #4 and not do #3 at all. Vote on #1 and don't go further if that doesn't pass. If #1

passes go to #2. If #2 passes go to #4. Cook feels like she is being asked to vote on motherhood and apple pie. She feels the real question is whether or not we believe that historic preservation should get involved in land use codes. She is being forced to vote no and is concerned about way it will be misrepresented. Markalunas disagrees with Reid's comments that mass, scale, context and community character have nothing to do with historic preservation. They have everything to do with historic preservation, especially in downtown commercial core. She is disturbed this task force has taken tact that they are going to shelve everything they are not interested in voting on. She wants to give subcommittee courtesy of going through process. Task force should weigh-in. Maple has same problem as Marsha and can see wild interpretations. Cunningham comments questions are leading with an end she may not agree on. Markalunas feels #3 has meat which are specific issues committee was asked to address.

Stirling calls motion: FAVOR = 9 AGAINST = 2 ABSTAIN = 4

QUESTION #1: Do you believe that the scale and diversity of sizes and styles of buildings in Aspen are part of the historic character of Aspen?

FAVOR = 9 AGAINST = 2 ABSTAIN = 4. MOTION PASSES

Discussion: Sanchez could vote yes if there were some reference to historic buildings: *do you believe that the height and mass of new buildings and their impact on identified historic resources are proper matters for consideration in historic preservation.*

Kirk responds that refers to individual structures. Sanchez considers a historic district to be an identified historic resource. Myers responds we are talking about scale and diversity as a part of historic character of Aspen, and the question addresses losing historic character of Aspen, and doesn't want to tie it to its impact on historic buildings. Maple states 50 story buildings permitted in Aspen would have significant impact on historic character. Buildings of mass and scale of Aspen's historic buildings (Hotel Jerome, Elks, Independence Square, Wheeler) are part of historic fabric and other buildings in context are Okay with him. He is concerned a "yes" determination will be interpreted by some as being "you shouldn't tear down any one story buildings". He is quite good with variety.

QUESTION #2: Do you believe that the height and mass of new buildings are proper matters for consideration in historic preservation?

FAVOR= 6 AGAINST = 8 ABSTAIN = 1. MOTION FAILS.

Public Education. Participation committee: Todd updates highlighted changes since last presentation: action plan for disseminating task force report, desire to meet with property owners listed on Ordinance48, educate what has transpired, invite Aspen Meadows back and discuss particulars. Essential to solicit community input particularly those affected by reports of task force. Consciousness raising with respect to tours and tourism can resonate. ACES snowshoe tours on top of Aspen Mountain are up 36% and nighttime presentations are way up this winter. Think of other ways to entertain and reach in to Aspen's uniqueness. This week is "modernism week" in Palm Springs,

California. Be mindful of how economy is changing and how appeal of historic preservation and town's historic character can be marketed. Encourage property owners to be on board with recommendations and figure out ways to encourage them to welcome this type of "recharacterization" or enhancement. Draft outline should be roadmap for proceeding and assembling information.

Kelly adds Aspen Historical Society has walking tours with a pretty good turnout. Cunningham commends progress and mentions we are missing sector of next leaders, ages 20-35. She suggests contacting Terri at Roaring Fork Leadership. Cook agrees and wants to reach out to young design, architectural and engineering professionals. DePagter is happy to see idea of input from those on Ordinance 48, they have a great deal of interest in this outcome, as well as Aspen Meadows, that is key. Cunningham wants to see outreach to neighbors of potential historic property – impacts and/or incentives, educate those affected.

Next meeting: March 19 Historic Districts & Aspen Community Vision

April 2: Economics and Incentives

April 9: Criteria

April 16: Voluntary/Involuntary

April 23: First draft to City Council

Meeting adjourns 6:45 P.M.