

Q1 What comments do you have about Attachment A - the IGA extension option? If the Town and County move in this direction, what would need refinement?

Answered: 5 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	I like the extension concept because this process feels very rushed - the public is being pressured to learn all the issues in a very short time frame. I don't trust the motives of Estes Park's planners - why the big hurry?	9/27/2019 2:33 PM
2	It is just kicking the can down the road. The Boards should have had this all in place, not limp along another year. It should make the Town happy, since it was all about the money for them.	9/24/2019 8:45 AM
3	I am a resident of Larimer County, but I don't reside within the Town of Estes Park. As a result, I am not permitted to vote in any Town of Estes Park elections. Based on the fact that I don't have a say in those elections, the Town of Estes Park should *not* have a say (vote) in matters pertaining to the unincorporated area of Larimer County adjacent to the Town. Otherwise, residents of the unincorporated area should have a say (vote) in electing Town officials. In the absence of such changes, those of use who reside in the unincorporated area will continue to be impacted by the decisions made by the Town of Estes Park even though we don't have a say (vote) regarding representation.	9/23/2019 8:15 AM
4	Option A proposes to extend the current IGA for a year to allow time to work out the required changes. This option is better than Option B in that it doesn't immediately take us down the path of dissolving the Joint Planning Area and allows time to thoroughly discuss the alternatives. Director Hunt has stated that this option is unworkable because budgets are already set based on Option B and there is no good reason to delay this decision. First, if budgets are set they can always be changed, and why are we assuming that a decision to go with Option B has already been made? Second, there are good reasons to delay this decision. To date no reasons have been given for going with Option B vs fixing the existing IGA and keeping the Joint Planning Area, including valley-wide zoning and development code, one Comprehensive Plan for the Estes Valley, and one Planning Commission. This comparison needs to be thoroughly discussed. The pros and cons of each approach need to be discussed. This is a hugely important decision for the Estes Valley. Can this be done at the September 30th meeting along with public input so an informed decision can be made? I don't think so. Thus Option A may be the best alternative if a decision must be made at the September 30 meeting. I actually favor an Option C (see Other Suggestions).	9/20/2019 7:28 AM
5	No comment-	9/19/2019 5:58 PM

Q2 What comments do you have about Attachment B - the new IGA option? If the Town and County move in this direction, what would need refinement?

Answered: 5 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	I don't know if this applies here, but my impression has been that the Estes Valley Comprehensive Plan needs updating - it is unclear how having it in a state of flux will affect or be affected by the cancellation of the IGA. Or is it ever so much better to end the IGA and then the county develop a Comp plan for the county around Estes, and the town develop a separate Comp plan for inside the town limits. But those limits are invisible - people have to look across that imaginary line and live with what they see - traffic has to negotiate the roads the cross those invisible lines. I do think Estes Park needs to annex more areas into the town, and regardless of what else I've said, if ending the IGA will propel this, then go for it. Annex the whole darn Estes Valley, as far as the eye can see. Then the planning and compliance and taxation will be consistent for all in that area that appears to be "Estes Park."	9/27/2019 2:33 PM
2	I oppose dissolution of the IGA. I think the present arrangement worked fine. That said, I would like to see some commitment to a single Comp Plan and a commitment to uniformity between the Town and County LU designations and standards within the Estes Valley.	9/24/2019 8:45 AM
3	As noted above...I am a resident of Larimer County, but I don't reside within the Town of Estes Park. As a result, I am not permitted to vote in any Town of Estes Park elections. Based on the fact that I don't have a say in those elections, the Town of Estes Park should *not* have a say (vote) in matters pertaining to the unincorporated area of Larimer County adjacent to the Town. Otherwise, residents of the unincorporated area should have a say (vote) in electing Town officials. In the absence of such changes, those of use who reside in the unincorporated area will continue to be impacted by the decisions made by the Town of Estes Park even though we don't have a say (vote) regarding representation.	9/23/2019 8:15 AM
4	Option B is taking the wrong direction for the future IGA. The Estes Valley is one community. Decisions on land use within the county affect residents in the town and visa versa. We all share the same roads and trails, the same views of the mountains, the same wildlife, the same utilities infrastructure, the same emergency services, the same schools, the same tourism impact, and the same traffic congestion. If a development is proposed in the unincorporated portion of the valley, residents of the Town will be significantly affected and visa versa. Close coordinated planning is required. Option B states that the Town and County will consult with each other on development plans in their respective jurisdictions. But there is no legal requirement to coordinate planning to ensure that valley-wide concerns are addressed. The Overlay District for zoning and development code in the unincorporated part of the Estes Valley is supposed to maintain the status quo for a period of time, followed by gradual changes. But there is nothing stopping the Town and County from changing their separate zoning and development codes at any time and those changes may cause confusion and dissatisfaction among Town and County residents. Developers will have to take into account different development codes in their projects. As time goes by this will become more and more of a problem and when citizen and developer concerns arise they will have to be addressed by separate Planning Commissions. The idea that there will be two Comprehensive Plans for the Estes Valley is ludicrous. We are one integrated community. The views of residents regarding land use issues do not change when you cross from Town to County territory within the valley. The Town / County boundary itself runs all over the place. Residents on one side of a street can be in the Town and on the other side in the County. A Comprehensive Plan is supposed to represent the shared vision of the community. How can we do this with two Comprehensive Plans? The second Comprehensive Plan is likely to be the County-wide Comprehensive Plan, not a separate one for the unincorporated portion of the Estes Valley. Clearly, the Estes Valley is one community and we need a shared vision in a valley-wide Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the Comprehensive Plan directs the implementation of the Development Code within its jurisdiction. If we truly need a combined Comprehensive Plan then we also need a combined Development Code for the Estes Valley.	9/20/2019 7:28 AM

Estes Valley Planning and Intergovernmental Agreements

5	1. Uniform language encompassing entire Valley. 2. Balance to include preservation of open space, wildlife. 3. Cap or reduce number of vacation rentals to where they stand now. No further increase in numbers. 4. Enforcement and oversight of IGA language. 5. Transparency and ease of understanding legal language. [Shouldn't take a law degree to interpret functionality]. 5. Protections/ enforcement built in against special interest groups seeking to circumvent code by quid pro quo "deals" with any elected/ appointed officials. Permitting process is a dog and pony show. Consistency is a must. Include a data base of rogue providers so those new to the valley, elders et al are not left to fall prey to shoddy work product which no one will expose!	9/19/2019 5:58 PM
---	--	-------------------

Q3 What comments do you have about transitional duties for the Estes Valley Planning Commission and Board of Adjustment and their future role(s) (see Attachment 5A) ?

Answered: 5 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	It is good to have some sort of guideline or plan instead of winging it and hoping for the best. Appears to be more language to be added (placeholders). Probably keeping it as short and concise as possible would be a good idea.	9/27/2019 2:33 PM
2	The EVPC should cease to exist unless it has the responsibility to prepare a single Comp Plan for the EV. I'm not sure what to do with the B of A.	9/24/2019 8:45 AM
3	None	9/23/2019 8:15 AM
4	I favor the retention of the joint Planning Commission and Board of Adjustment for the Estes Valley. This would be in line with my view that Joint Planning Area for the Estes Valley should be retained. These bodies are much better equipped to address land use planning issues in the Estes Valley than the alternatives, including the Larimer County Planning Commission and the Town's proposed Planning Commission. With regard to the Larimer County Planning Commission, their focus is county-wide and in particular on the growing population and associated issues of front range valley communities. They will have much less time and energy to devote to Estes Park and less knowledge of Estes Valley land use issues. With regard to a Town Planning Commission, it will focus on land use planning within the Town. It would have no obligation to consider land use planning issues outside of Town that could affect the Town.	9/20/2019 7:28 AM
5	Transparency. Transparency. Transparency.	9/19/2019 5:58 PM

Q4 What other suggestions do you have about land use planning in the Estes Valley?

Answered: 5 Skipped: 0

#	RESPONSES	DATE
1	Although I favor extending the IGA for some period of time in order to make sure things are well-understood and there is due process/due diligence in defining future county land use planning, it is possible the best thing for Larimer County is to at some point end the IGA and make life so miserable for the county portion of the Estes Valley that the residents/land owners will vote to be annexed to the town (in case they are hesitating). One reason I feel this way is the county part of the Estes Valley looks and feels like 'town' and the residents expect the amenities of town without the extra town oversight or whatever it is that they seem to fear about annexation - maybe they distrust the current Town planning staff as much as I do. Make the Estes Valley all 'town' - like I said: As far as the eye can see, and keep unincorporated county designations for the more rural areas.	9/27/2019 2:33 PM
2	I would like to see some kind of statement about what the Town and County hope to accomplish by this separation except saving the Town money. What is the vision? What are the goals? That remains shamefully absent. There does not seem to be a shared vision by which to evaluate options. This absence seems to me to be an abdication of responsibility.	9/24/2019 8:45 AM
3	Prohibit (remove) the elected officials of the Town of Estes Park from reviewing and voting on matters that are beyond the Town's boundaries (i.e., unincorporated areas).	9/23/2019 8:15 AM
4	There should be an Option C on the table. It would fix the known problems in the current IGA and retain the existing Joint Planning Area, combined Comprehensive Plan, and combined Planning Commission. Many of the known problems and changes that must be made are already spelled out in Option B, so preparation of Option C should not be difficult. Just eliminate the portion that deals with dissolving the Joint Planning area and associated planning functions. We are rushing to a decision on September 30th without a thorough discussion of the alternatives. Given the fact that the current IGA has been in place and working for more than 20 years, those favoring Option B should clearly state compelling reasons for dissolving the Joint Planning Area agreement.	9/20/2019 7:28 AM
5	Hit the pause button as it goes to any further commercial development beyond Town limits. Include language going to Estes Valley Land Trust- so as to preserve [not sell] at a future date- as seen in out of state Nature Conservancy's- should Estes Valley decide to partner with.	9/19/2019 5:58 PM