

TMV Comp Plan Amendment Process: Coded Public Comments 3.10.22

Meadows Subarea-Specific Comments

1. Parking/Traffic

“It seems like the prudent course of action is to maintain and increase/upgrade the infrastructure for the Mt. Village. Increase parking so that residents and visitors don’t have to park illegally on the roads and find alternative locations for deed restricted housing other than piling everyone into The Meadows. We’re full to the brim already.”

“Even the Peaks extension will cause major problems unless a trans-Meadows summer route is feasible”

“I am concerned about evacuation routes from the meadows which is why I DO NOT support the 100+ new units above Parker Ridge. I would be in favor of less than 40.”

“Much of this has been discussed, but I’d like to reaffirm priorities:

- Chondola improvements, and continuing our free public transportation system
- Create biking/walking lanes the full length on Adams Ranch and Country Club Drive”

2. Open Space

“The vast majority of citizens who wrote previously, requested that Mountain Village prioritize high quality of life, open space, and limiting additional density, particularly in the Meadows. The Meadows and Country Club Drive residents lives truly will be degraded significantly with decreased quality life if you continue to expand into both those areas. The prior survey data was extremely clear that full time and part time residents all want continued growth to be centered around the Mountain Village Center but not in our neighborhoods or reducing or encroaching on our open spaces.”

3. Meadows Density and Infrastructure

“The proposed plan includes excessive density for the Meadows. Having been in the Meadows for 25 years, I can fully appreciate the negative impacts of the huge increase in density for this small area - the traffic, pollution, loss of open spaces, cramped living, etc. The Council should definitely reduce the huge increase in density for the Meadows. The people living there deserve a good standard of living - please don’t ruin that. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.”

“The Meadows deserves as much respect as any other area in Mountain Village. This area is targeted for too much density because it is the path of least resistance. A majority of people that live here are busy with families and jobs and rely on the Town and their community to look out

for their best interests. It is okay to put community housing in the Meadows but ‘not next to me,’ in the vast majority of Mountain Village. Quality of life and property values affect us in the Meadows as much as anywhere in the MV. It is as viable to build in Hood Park or other areas appropriate for development (rezone open space) as it is in the Meadows.”

“The recent revision of the Comprehensive Plan has reduced planned density in the Meadows but it continues to lack clarity as to the potential density that might be reached if the maximum planned housing units are developed. What is the present population of the Meadows? Based on the number of units planned how many more people will it add to this subarea? I have been unable to correlate units described in the CP and the CDC units/people per unit to determine this number.”

“The recent revision of the Comprehensive Plan has reduced planned density in the Meadows but it continues to lack clarity as to the potential density that might be reached if the maximum planned housing units are developed. What is the present population of the Meadows? Based on the number of units planned how many more people will it add to this subarea? I have been unable to correlate units described in the CP and the CDC units/people per unit to determine this number.”

“Commercial development in the Meadows should consider the year round needs of this community. Has there been consideration of a co-op market and restaurant that could offer potential local employment and profit return to the participants?”

“Thank you for all the time and effort put in to this document. My greatest concern is the density proposed for Parcel C Lot 644, and Parcel D lot 651-A. At 53 units a piece, this does not match the current density of any established condominium complexes in the neighborhood. Its almost the equivalent of putting a Village Court or Shandoka in the Meadows. I understand the need for community housing, yet a more appropriate density that matches the rest of the neighborhood should be considered. This is just too big! And once again, it makes the already densest neighborhood in all of Mountain Village, more dense! Realistically, that would be at least 200 more cars coming down Adams Ranch Rd. Please consider lowering the density on those two parcels by 50%.”

“Development of 30 - 70 units on lot 644 does not meet the guiding principle of “development fitting in with the character of the community” All condominium complexes in the Meadows are between 20-25 units or in some cases even less. Lot 644 is 1.6 acres. North Star, for example, is 3+ acres. On a lot that is half of the size of many of the Meadows lots, why would the Town of Mountain Village double or triple density for a condominium development on lot 644?”

“Hi, I live in the Meadows and am concerned that buildout of deed restricted housing in Parcels C & D would have a negative impact to: density/traffic (there’s only one road in/out of meadows and adding a lot of people to an already dense area seems like a bad idea for noise and traffic), open space ((the hill/path behind outlaws/Parker ridge is one of the few open areas to walk in and losing this piece of nature would be sad), potential valuations (my bldg is not deed restricted and it’s possible that adding more deed restricted units could negatively impact value, wondering if that has been explored). Thank you for the opportunity to comment and considering my concerns .”

“I am in support of the lowering the density in the Meadows. The lack of access by cars or trails in essentially a boxed environment.. We have visitors and homeowners regularly. It would be a nice additive to see duplexes for families to be able to live and sustain a lifestyle here. It would mean less impact on the roads verses a community building. The meadows has always been a home base for the workers in and around Telluride. I would like to see it maintain with real open space for children and gatherings. 106 new units on lots 651 and 644, which are adjacent and directly behind Parker Ridge This will impact the already existing problem with the water pipes under the fragile slope we have. Please heed the water flow when snow making season is on; I would vote no for that 106 units on this site”

“While Council gave verbal support to removing much of the density in the Meadows at the December (or January?) council meeting, inappropriate density still exists in the draft plan, and we ask that you remove the 70 housing units envisioned for the shops area, the 10-20 units for the Meadows Parking Lot, the total of 45 units at Prospect Plaza, and the 15 additional units at Mountain View.”

“Of particular concern to us, is the consideration of 106 new units envisioned on Lots 644 and Lot 651A, which could heavily and negatively impact all of the Meadows. We ask that you honor the public comment letters of Mountain Village Meadows residents who communicated the need for Infrastructure improvements prior to any further development. Meadows residents need and deserve what all Mountain Village residents are asking for: open space, access to trails, sidewalks and safe walkways, improved transportation links, safe and accessible emergency access/evacuation routes, solutions to parking that overflows into fire lanes, internet improvements, and water and sewer systems capable of handling future development.”

“The traffic within The Meadows has increased in the number of vehicles as well as the hours that the people are coming and going. This is at a manageable level now, what will it become with the increase in density? We did not intend to live in an environment the density of the Core. As it is, more and more units are able to short term rent or long term rent rooms or portions of their homes and the density has increased without measurable new structures being built.”

“Please continue to improve The Meadows for yearround residents. Consider a ban/prohibition on short-term rentals to maintain the neighborhood/local resident integrity. There are plenty of other places for short-term visitors to stay, and they do not need to stay in the Meadows.”

“It is important to build housing for locals; the Meadows is a great place to live and offers quick access to so many trails and to the highway. It really is a gem that more local people should be able to experience with the addition of affordable housing units.”

“In my opinion there should be no more additional units built in the meadows area. It is already too densely populated. It is increasingly difficult to find areas to even walk my dog. The traffic increase with just the 30 telluride apartments now being occupied is dramatic. Adding any additional housing to this area is a mistake.”

“Specifically, I support residential development in the meadows at the existing parking lot that develops OWNER OCCUPIED residences. I feel like that is the best way to enhance the existing community, create management level housing, and limit the density, congestion, noise and light pollution created by larger developments.”

“Of particular concern to us is the consideration of 106 new units envisioned on Lots 644 and Lot 651A, which could heavily and negatively impact all of the Meadows and Mountain Village.”

“Given all of these factors, it is frustrating to be told that “Lot 651C-R was “always envisioned as a luxury hotel site”, and “Lot 644 was always envisioned as a large scale deed-restricted housing development”. It was envisioned in 2011, but that does not mean the 644 vision is suitable today. It certainly should not trump community input gained from the MV survey, as well as 100+ public comments submitted in the first revision to the Comprehensive Plan.”

“I was relieved, in the January council meeting, to hear overwhelming support by council for the requests from residents to the Comp Plan revision. I particularly appreciated Mayor Benitez’s remarks that additional Meadows development of lot 640, the Meadows Parking lot, and the shops area for housing, and Big Billie’s for a hotel, should be taken off the table. Unfortunately, with the exception of Big Billie’s, that direction doesn’t seem to be reflected in the current version of the Comp Plan revision, and I ask that you correct the Plan to reflect that direction. Specifically, please remove the 70 housing units envisioned for the shops area, the 10- 20 units for the Meadows Parking Lot, new units at Prospect Plaza, and the 15 additional units at Mountain View, and please reserve the field/park at Mountain View as a park, as it is the only field in Mountain Village and is treasured as such. Meadows Residents deserve certainty in what to expect in the future. Thank you!”

“My neighbors and I were shocked to see, after the 2011 Comp Plan was adopted, that the density on lots 644/651A was changed, from 59 to 108 units. (41 units on 644 and 17 units on 651A.) This change was made sometime after the public sessions ended but appeared in the final Comprehensive Plan.”

“106 new units on Lots 644 and Lot 651A is way too much density vs the surrounding Meadows community. Impacts will be severe and negative for nearby residents and trails. It makes more sense for workforce housing to be part of new hotels vs forced into existing neighborhoods”

“Meadows is already a very dense area if one looks at the number of units. Adding more units to this area will be deleterious to their quality of life. Adding very large and dense units to this area is totally wrong if we are going to maintain the tranquility and views of the Meadows. Lots 644/651C are immediately adjacent to Country Club Dr. which is a neighborhood of single-family homes (and 2 duplexes) and it needs to be consistent with that neighborhood. Lot 126 lies in a single-family neighborhood and a mixed-use commercial development on Lot 126 does not respect or preserve this single-family well-established neighborhood. The survey data is clear that full time and part time residents all want continued growth to be centered around the Mountain Village Center but not in our neighborhoods or reducing or encroaching on our open spaces.”

“The comp draft plan still shows bigger density amounts in the Meadows area than seems reasonable. When Meadows residents mentioned that the proposed density is the equivalent of five Parker Ridges, that is alarming. That is a lot of cars, noise, dogs, kids and the whole charcuterie of a bunch of people/families crammed into a relatively small area. It would be a bit more palatable if there was a deliberate requirement for significantly increased cable car transportation there. Even then, less density is appropriate. While Council gave verbal support to removing much of the density in the Meadows at the December council meeting, inappropriate density still exists in the draft plan. Please remove or seriously reduce the following from the Comp Plan: 70 housing units envisioned for the shops area, 10- 20 units for the Meadows Parking Lot, a total of 45 units at Prospect Plaza, 15 additional units at Mountain View.”

“However, I feel like the input from the Meadows residents has not been heard. Why is all of the affordable housing being put into the Meadows? The Meadows is already dense and border line overpopulated. When the Chondola is not running the bus is beyond capacity. There is not enough parking as is. There are already a ton of dogs. While there has been some reduction in planned housing, there are still way to many units proposed. What about the existing quality of life in the Meadows? When the additional units at the Telski apartments came online that was a palpable change in the dynamics of the Meadows.”

“Where are the improvements for the current residents? The proposed relocation of the Chondola

to Chair 10 is a great idea but does very little to improve the actual living standards. Regardless of any expansion in the Meadows, this year road Chondola should be installed.”

4. Emergency Access

“EMERGENCY ACCESS AND EVACUATION; Fire season is now a year round risk in Colorado. The recent Marshall Fire has demonstrated the risk of conflagration within high density communities such as the Meadows. Both the Meadows and Village Core have only one paved access at this time! In the event of a wildfire blocking Adams Ranch Road before Double Eagle there is no alternative evacuation route or access for emergency vehicles. Likewise for the Village Core and other areas if Mountain Village Road is blocked. This is another justification for a paved connection between Adams Ranch and Country Club Drive. Is the Town not possibly liable for loss of life and property for not addressing this issue? My residence is at risk for this.”

“● The Meadows is a dense population center. Besides Adams Ranch Road, the Meadows needs an alternate egress route. The egress route I suggest is up the Golf maintenance road, and then connect with Russel drive. It is close to our major population center, and it provides an easy connection to MV Boulevard.

● The Emergency Plan should address ways that immediate evacuation is communicated to all residents, and which roads fire trucks will be using to access the Meadows neighborhood. Is there a way to widen Adams to provide 2 right lanes, if needed, during an emergency?

● Overall there is not enough parking in the Meadows, so many residents have to park in the fire lanes. Parking was not prioritized in previous plans/developments. On busy weekends I see visitor’s vehicles spill out of our parking lot, and park up the fire lane up Adams Ranch. We need to figure out additional parking solutions.”