

**TOWN OF MOUNTAIN VILLAGE
SPECIAL DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING AGENDA
MONDAY JULY 14, 2025, 10:00 AM
MOUNTAIN VILLAGE TOWN HALL
455 MOUNTAIN VILLAGE BLVD, MOUNTAIN VILLAGE, COLORADO
TO BE HELD HYBRID THROUGH ZOOM:**

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/89868667148?pwd=iRJMxGrAneaDACMvjQ7lMCiqjn3Bpg.1>

Meeting ID: 898 6866 7148

Zoom participation in public meetings is being offered as a courtesy, however technical difficulties can happen, and the Town bears no responsibility for issues that could prevent individuals from participating remotely. Physical presence in Council chambers is recommended for those wishing to make public comments or participate in public hearings.

Agenda Item	Time	Min.	Presenter	Type	Item Description
1.	10:00	0	Chair	Chair	Call to Order
2.	10:00	2	Howe	Action	Reading and Approval of Summary of Motions of the July 10, 2025 Design Review Board Meeting
3.	10:02	30	Howe/ Applicant	Quasi-Judicial	Review and Recommendation to Town Council for a Conditional Use Permit for a Spider Jump Activity and Zipline Ground School at Lot OS-3U, pursuant to CDC Section 17.4.14.
4.	10:32	60	Alvarado/ Applicant	Quasi-Judicial	Review and Recommendation to Town Council for a Conditional Use Permit for a Temporary Parking Lot at Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2, pursuant to CDC Section 17.4.14.
5.	11:32	0	Chair	Adjourn	Adjourn

Draft Minutes from the July 10, 2025 Design
Review Board Meeting will be posted after the
meeting on July 10, 2025.



Agenda Item 3
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

455 Mountain Village Blvd.
Mountain Village, CO 81435
(970) 728-1392

TO: Mountain Village Design Review Board

FROM: Erin Howe, Planning Technician

FOR: Design Review Board Public Hearing: July 14, 2025

DATE: June 20, 2025

RE: Staff Memo – Review and Recommendation to Town Council for a Conditional Use Permit for a Spider Jump Activity and Zipline Ground School at Lot OS-3U, pursuant to CDC Section 17.4.14.

APPLICATION OVERVIEW: Conditional Use Permit for Spider Jump Activity and Zipline Ground School on Lot OS-3U

PROJECT GEOGRAPHY

Legal Description: A TRACT OF LAND LYING IN THE NE QUARTER OF SECTION 3 T42N R9W NMPM SAN MIGUEL COUNTY COLORADO DESCRIBED AS FOLLOWS TRACT OS 3U ACTIVE OPEN SPACE TOWN OF MOUNTAIN VILLAGE PLAT BK 1 PG 3325 JULY 14 2004 CONT 4.493 ACRES MOL

Address: OS-3U

Applicant/Agent: Carson Taylor, TSG

Owner: TSG Ski and Golf LLC

Zoning: Open Space (AOS)

Existing Use: AOS

Proposed Use: AOS

Lot Size: 4.48 acres

Adjacent Land Uses:

- **North:** AOS, Village Center
- **South:** AOS
- **East:** AOS, Single Family
- **West:** AOS, Village Center

Figure 1: Vicinity Map



ATTACHMENTS

Exhibit A: Vicinity Map

Exhibit B: Application

Exhibit C: Staff/Public Comment

Case Summary

Carson Taylor of Telluride Ski and Golf has requested a Design Review Board recommendation of approval for a Class 4 Conditional Use Permit for the placement of a Bungee Trampoline Activity (the “Spider Jump”) and the Zipline Ground School to be located on Lot OS-3U near the Heritage Plaza. Due to the nature of this activity, it is generally limited to summer months. It should be noted that the Spider Jump has been in operation since at least 2010 and has received no complaints from any Town Departments or the General Public. The Zipline Ground School was added in 2022 and will be used to practice and develop necessary skills for the canopy tour.

Section 17.3 Zoning and Land Use Regulations

17.3.3 & 17. 3.4 Use Schedule and Specific Zone District Requirements

Staff: Lot OS-3U is Class 3 Active Open Space, which is considered “Full use, ski resort active open space.” According to Table 3-1. Town of Mountain Village Land Use Schedule, “Recreational facilities general, with built structures,” are permitted conditionally on Class 3 Active Open Space.

Section 17.4.14 (E) General Standards for Review

The location of a conditional use shall best serve the proposed use while minimizing potential adverse impacts.

Staff: The proposed location for the Spider Jump and Zipline Ground School minimizes adverse impacts on the Open Space parcel as well as surrounding infrastructure. The activities are only in use for the summer months and do not interrupt any surrounding infrastructure like the gondola operations. Noise impacts from both are minimal.

Section 17.4.14 (D) Criteria for Decision

Table 1

a. The proposed conditional use is in general conformity with the policies of the principles, policies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
<i>Staff Response: The Town of Mountain Village Comprehensive Plan references recreational activities to complement the ski resort area during the summer months.</i>	
b. The proposed conditional use is in harmony and compatible with surrounding land uses and the neighborhood and will not create a substantial adverse impact on adjacent properties or on services and infrastructure.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
<i>Staff Response: The Spider Jump has been a long, ongoing occurrence in the town since at least 2010, and the proposed continuation of this use in alignment with surrounding land uses and should not create any adverse impact.</i>	

c. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not constitute a substantial physical hazard to the neighborhood, public facilities, infrastructure or open space.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
<i>Staff Response: The design of both the Spider Jump and the Zipline Ground School are such that they will not create any physical hazards or significant adverse effects and have minimized environmental and visual impacts with their placement.</i>	
d. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not have significant adverse effect to the surrounding property owners and uses.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
<i>Staff Response: See above. Operations of the Spider Jump and Zipline Ground School will be from June 21, 2025 through September 1, 2025, with a 7-day operational schedule (9am – 5pm). The Zipline Ground School will remain in operation on weekends only through September 28, 2025. Additionally, signage for the two activities meets CDC design standards.</i>	
e. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not have a significant adverse effect on open space or the purposes of the facilities owned by the Town.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
<i>Staff Response: See above responses. Additionally, Lot OS-3U contains wetlands, but the Spider Jump and Zipline Ground School's proposed locations do not come close to them.</i>	
f. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall minimize adverse environmental and visual impacts to the extent possible considering the nature of the proposed conditional use.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
<i>Staff Response: See above responses.</i>	
g. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall provide adequate infrastructure.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
<i>Staff Response: There is adequate infrastructure available for the project. Additionally, the Zipline Ground School has just gained approval to increase the size of the concrete sonotube anchors used to tether the wires to the ground, improving safety.</i>	
h. The proposed conditional use does not potentially damage or contaminate any public, private, residential, or agricultural water supply source.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
<i>Staff Response: The proposed activities do not contaminate any water source. Lot OS-3U contains wetlands, but the Spider Jump and Zipline Ground School's proposed locations do not come close to them.</i>	
i. The proposed conditional use permit meets all applicable Town regulations and standards.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
<i>Staff Response: Overall, it appears that this proposal meets the requirements of the CDC and the Town. Conditional uses are typically permitted for a 3-year period, and therefore, staff would recommend Approval through July 10, 2028.</i>	

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the criteria listed in this staff memo of record, staff recommends the Design Review Board recommend Town Council approve the conditional use permit to allow the

placement of a Spider Jump and Zipline Ground School on OS-3U, with the proposed motion set forth below:

Proposed Motion:

"I move to recommend approval of the resolution for a conditional use permit for the placement of the Spider Jump and Zipline Ground School activities outlined in the application materials for Lot OS-3U with the following conditions:

1. *The Applicant shall secure the structure and other elements that might attract public access when closed.*
2. *The Applicant shall re-vegetate all disturbed areas and provide seating for spectators.*
3. *This Conditional Use Permit shall be valid for a period of three (3) years with an annual review by the Planning Division staff, with the Applicant responding to any valid issues as they arise during the operation or the annual review."*



The following document contains drawings and plan sets that are not accessible to screen readers. For assistance in accessing and interpreting these documents, please email cd@mtnvillage.org or call (970) 728-8000

Carson Taylor
Director | Mountain Sales
Telluride Ski & Golf, LLC

May 28, 2025
Community Development Department
Planning Division
Town of Mountain Village
455 Mountain Village Blvd
Mountain Village, CO 81435

Dear Community Development Department:

During spring, summer and fall seasons the Mountain Sales office offers guests a multitude of easily accessible activities including Kids Camps, Bike Park Guides/Camps/Clinics, Zipline Tours, Bungee Trampoline and a Mining Sluice. Many of these activities have all been operated by the Telluride Ski & Golf Company since 2018.

Our application renewal requests that both the Spider Jump and Zipline Ground School activities remain positioned at their most recent and/or historical locations on lot OS-3U. The Mountain Sales & Zipline Tour Operations are the natural business units within Telluride Ski and Golf to oversee the sales, fulfillment, and operations of the summer activities per our ongoing commitment to the communications, training, customer service and annual state of CO permitting requirements to operate.

We feel it imperative to maintain both the Spider Jump and Zipline Ground School activities during spring and summer dates in order to foster a vibrant atmosphere in TMV's Gondola & Heritage Plazas and further support the family-oriented activity demands of our summer guest demographic. The availability of these activities in line of sight and short walking distance from the Mountain Village Gondola Plaza draws ideal volumes of summer guests to businesses in the core, which in turn increases sales tax revenues for TMV and sales revenues for TMV merchants. We believe that maintaining the recent locations of the Spider Jump and Zipline Tour Ground School activities adjacent to Gondola Plaza on OS-3U promote economic, social, cultural, and entertainment values.

Ground School is used as a training facility for the Zipline Adventure participants to learn and practice the skills necessary for safely navigating the zip line portions of the experience. For the inaugural summer (2021) of the Zipline Adventure, the Ground School was located in the woods off of the Upper Boomerang ski trail. After operating for a few summers and gaining a better understanding of the flow of our Zipline Adventure experience, the better location for this practice area is adjacent to the Mountain Village core. Should weather come in or if a guest goes through Ground School and realizes the experience is not for them, being close to the Mountain Village core is critical for the best experience. Having it near the Mountain Village core would also provide the added benefit of advertising the product for guests that did not know we offer such an immersive experience in the Mountain Village.


In its simplest form, Ground School consists of a zip line cable strung between two posts that is elevated approximately 5-10' of the ground with a slight grade. Once properly attached to the zip cable, guests can then practice the visual and tactile cues necessary in a "real world" setting. They can hang from the cable to feel the harness support them and they can glide slowly along cable to practice the proper speed control and self-assist techniques involved in the main experience of the Zipline Adventure. We've constructed the Ground School in the area just south of the Magic Carpet on OS-3U (highlighted in the accompanied map). The structure consists of two large posts approximately 15' in height, with a zip line cable approximately 45' in length strung between them (pictures of the current Ground School, for visual reference, included). The Ground School on OS-3U is a seasonal, temporary structure that would be installed late-May and removed mid-October each year.

For all activities, we intend to deploy a similar approach to marketing the summer, adventure activities as we do with our winter lift access segments i.e. bi-weekly e-newsletter, geo-targeted social media ad campaigns, direct mail, summer tourism guide (TTB), etc...

Our operational objectives detail a June 21, 2025 opening, with a 7 day operational schedule (9am – 5pm) through September 1, 2025 (Labor Day). After Labor Day, we will begin breaking down the Spider Jump activity and moving it off the respective location for fall/winter storage (off-site). Ground School will remain in operation weekends only through September 28, 2025. Thereafter that activity will be deconstructed and moved off-site for fall/winter storage. Signage for each activity is based from historical standards utilizing existing resources from previous years with all sales stemming from the Mountain Activity Sales office located beneath the Mountain Village Gondola Plaza in what is the winter's lift ticket, pass, and ski school office.

Carson Taylor
Director | Mountain Sales






Revisions

Date:
00-00-0000

SPIDER JUMP
Drawn by: MATT PERRY

SHEET
A2



Revisions




Date:
00-00-0000

SPIDER JUMP

Drawn by: MATT PERRY

SHEET

A1




Revisions	
Date:	
00-00-0000	
SPIDER JUMP	Drawn by: MATT PERRY
SHEET	
A3	









Erin Howe

From: JOHN D BORGIA <borgiaj@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 10:09 AM
To: planning
Subject: renewal conditional use permit application for summer bungee /trampoline activity located adjacent to Gondola Plaza. AND ALSO set up of summer seasonal zip line ground school , skills practice area for customers

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

We object to the permit renewal for the bungee/trampoline activity located at the gondola plaza AND the set up of summer seasonal zipline ground school at Lot OS-3-U Karen&John Borgia , Mountain Village homeowners of 2 properties in the "CORE"

Sent from my iPad



Agenda Item 4
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
455 Mountain Village Blvd.
Mountain Village, CO 81435
(970) 728-1392

TO: Mountain Village Design Review Board

FROM: Daniel Alvarado, Senior Planner

FOR: Design Review Board Public Hearing: July 14, 2025

DATE: July 2, 2025

RE: Staff Memo – Review and Recommendation to Town Council regarding a Conditional Use Permit application for Temporary Parking Lot on Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2, pursuant to CDC Section 17.4.14.

APPLICATION OVERVIEW: CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR TEMPORARY PARKING LOT ON LOTS 122, 123, AND OS-1R2

I) PROJECT GEOGRAPHY

Legal Description: OS1R2: TRACT OF LAND LYING IN THE SW QUARTER OF THE SE QUARTER OF SECTION 34 T43N R9W NMPM SMC CO DESCRIBED ACTIVE OPEN SPACE TRACT OS 1R2 TMV PL BK 1 PG 3869 OCT 12 2007 CONT 0.62 ACRES;

LOT 122: TELLURIDE MOUNTAIN VILLAGE, FILING 1, ACCORDING TO THE REPLAT AND REZONING OF LOT 122 OF TELLURIDE MOUNTAIN VILLAGE FILING 1, RECORDED OCTOBER 7, 1992 IN PLAT BOOK 1 AT PAGE 1367, COUNTY OF SAN MIGUEL, STATE OF COLORADO

LOT 123: TELLURIDE MOUNTAIN VILLAGE, FILING 1, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT RECORDED MARCH 9, 1984 IN PLAT BOOK 1 AT PAGE 476, COUNTY OF SAN MIGUEL, STATE OF COLORADO

Figure 1: Vicinity Map



Address: TBD Country Club Drive
Applicant/Agent: John Miller, TSG
Owner: TSG Ski and Golf LLC
Zoning: Active Open Space (AOS) and Village Center (VC)
Existing Use: Vacant
Proposed Use: Temporary surface parking lot
Lot Size (total) : .867 acres
Adjacent Land Uses:

- **North:** Single-Family
- **South:** Village Center
- **East:** PUD (Lodging)
- **West:** Single-Family

II) EXHIBITS

Exhibit A: Application/Narrative
Exhibit B: Staff/Public Comment

III) CASE SUMMARY

John Miller of Telluride Ski and Golf (TSG) has requested a Design Review Board recommendation of approval for a Class 4 Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for a temporary, 13,050 SF, 33 space gravel parking lot to be located on Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2 adjacent to the Peaks Resort and Spa. The proposed parking lot would be accessed from Country Club Blvd and via an unpaved pedestrian social trail that runs across the lot.

The parking lot would replace the loss of TSG employee parking currently located on Lots 69R2, 71R and 67 known as the “Pond Lots” due to the construction of the Four Seasons development. TSG is requesting approval for a CUP period of 5 years, however, per CDC section 17.4.3.(N)(2)(b) the Town Council may specify a time period other than 5 years if they choose. TSG has indicated that parking may be used by future development on lots 122 and 123, however no development proposal has been submitted and therefore should not be considered as part of this approval.

It should be noted that Per CDC section 17.3.3, a permanent employee surface parking lot is *not* a permitted primary use in the Village Core Zoning district, however Per CDC 17.5.8(B)(3)(a)(i):

The DRB may approve surface parking lots as an interim use in the Village Center on future development sites that provide an interim use of a site until development.

Under this provision, the temporary parking lot may be approved as a temporary use with a Conditional Use Permit with a defined expiration date.

IV) CHAPTER 17.3: ZONING AND LAND USE REGULATIONS

17.3.3 & 17. 3.4 Use Schedule and Specific Zone District Requirements

Lots 122 and 123 are zoned Village Center (VC), while lot OS-1R2 is zoned Active Open Space. CDC section 17.3.3, Table 3-1: Town of Mountain Village Land Use Schedule identifies “Ski area maintenance facilities and limited employee parking” as a use approval with a Conditional Use permit in Active Open Space zones but is not permissible in the Village Core District. however, Per CDC 17.5.8(B)(3)(a)(i), a temporary parking lot may be considered for approval with a Conditional Use Permit with a defined expiration date.

17.3.14: General Easement Setbacks

Lots 122 and 123 are zoned Village Center and therefore are not burdened by a General Easement Setback. Lot OS-1R2 is also not burdened by a General Easement setback, however because it is outside of the Village Center Zone District the review authority may require the establishment of a setback at the time of review.

Staff: There is a pedestrian walkway easement platted across the subject property which belongs to property owners along Country Club Drive (near the Boomerang Trail) via Reception #397471. TSG cannot be compelled to construct this pedestrian walkway without the easement owner's permission, however they will require permission from the owner's to build within it.

V) CHAPTER 17.5: DESIGN REGULATIONS

17.5.7 Grading and Drainage Design

The applicant proposes to grade the parking lot surface to a 4.96% grade, which is under the 6% limit per the CDC. However, the construction would require significant regrading of the site including disturbance of 30% slopes in all three lots. Typically, if a development were to propose 30% slope disturbance, they must request a Specific Approval and meet certain Criteria for Decision per CDC section 17.6.1(C)(2). However, because of the temporary nature of the approval and the fact that there is no structural development associated with this approval, the disturbance may be approved as part of the CUP approval.

The applicant has not provided details regarding how steep of a slope would be created in the disturbed areas around the parking lot. Any slopes that are steeper than 2:1 shall require a retaining structure such as geogrid or other retaining structures. Any exposed section of disturbed slope shall require restoration with biodegradable netting until vegetation is reestablished.

17.5.8 (C) Parking Area Design Standards

The CDC regulates the design of parking areas including parking space geometry, surface grade, material, snow storage, etc. It does not include specific regulations determining standards for pedestrian access, circulation, or minimum lighting.

The applicant has proposed a 13,050 SF, gravel parking lot with 33 spaces. A gravel surface is not typically permissible under the CDC, however due to the temporary nature of the lot the DRB may approve a gravel surface as part of the CUP. The applicant has not proposed any compact spaces or ADA accessible parking spaces and the lot as designed does not meet any ADA specifications. The applicant has not provided sufficient details regarding the

parking space geometry, therefore the applicant shall be required to provide such details as a condition of approval.

The applicant has proposed that the vehicular access to the property be from Country Club Drive along the south side of the subject property near the rear entrance to the Peaks Resort and Spa. Additionally, the applicant has indicated that pedestrians can access the lot via a steep, unpaved social trail that runs from the north edge of the property to the southern edge. The applicant has not provided any specific details regarding improvements (if any) will be undertaken to this trail and how it will connect to the parking area.

The CDC requires lighting to be installed in parking garages but offers no guidance on lighting of surface lots. No lighting has been proposed as part of this development.

The applicant has proposed snow storage areas totaling 3,270 SF, which is equal or more than the required 25% of the total paved area of 13,050 SF.

Typically, applicants are required to provide a detailed striping and signage plan. The applicant has not provided a striping or signage plan, only a written description of “signage specifying that the parking area is for TSG Employees...proposed as 1’x2’ sign located at the entrance to the parking area with simple lettering and the TSG Logo”.

Staff: The CDC does not adequately address parking lots where they are not developed in conjunction with a commercial or residential structure, however we can make an assertion that similar regulations should apply as it relates to safety issues. Staff has several concerns regarding the safety of the proposed parking lot, most notably, there are no details regarding how employees will safely access nearby sidewalks or trails, especially in winter when the road shoulder will likely be icy or full of snow, and the social trail is not maintained. Additionally, no lighting is proposed to ensure site security or a safe pedestrian connection between the parking lot and the village core. Finally, the vehicular access point itself is a concern in that it is located near the S-turn in Country Club Road and has a limited site distance.

*Ironically, there **is** a pedestrian walkway easement platted across the subject property, however it belongs to property owners along Country Club Drive (near the Boomerang Trail) via Reception #397471. TSG cannot be compelled to construct this pedestrian walkway without the easement owner’s permission; however, they will require permission from the owners to build within it.*

Therefore, if approval is being considered, staff recommends that the review authority determine appropriate Conditions of Approval for parking lot design per 17.4.4(D)(2), including public improvements (such as pedestrian walkways), lighting, signage or other conditions as determined by the Town “to be necessary to ensure that the development is constructed in compliance with applicable Town regulations and standards.”

17.5.9: Landscaping Regulations

The CDC generally requires landscapes to employee permaculture design principles while also meeting the town’s aesthetic and wildfire prevention goals.

The applicant has proposed landscaping around the perimeter of the parking lot depicting the planting of 17 trees including aspen, spruce and dwarf pines. The landscaping would be irrigated by a sprinkler system that would be installed around the perimeter of the parking lot. The applicant has not provided details regarding the trees to be removed as part of the proposed development.

Staff: additional details will be required regarding the origin of the water for the irrigation system, tree removal and other landscaping requirements as determined by the Town Forester. Staff recommends that the applicant is required to enter into a Performance Agreement with the Town to ensure the survival of the landscaping. Additionally, the review authority should determine if a Development Agreement should be executed to ensure the restoration of the site should a future development not take place prior to the expiration of the CUP.

17.5.12: Lighting Regulations

The CDC does not identify specific lighting requirements for parking lots in the town. Generally, the CDC is concerned with limiting the impacts of lighting on adjacent uses, including additional specific regulations for lighting within the Village Center.

The applicant has not proposed any lighting improvements as part of this development.

Staff: While the CDC does not provide lighting requirements for parking lots, The IES (Illuminating Engineering Society) recommends that parking lots be lit to a minimum 2 lux/ft2 for safety. Additionally, any pedestrian connections would likely need some lighting, at a minimum in locations of steps or other grade change. Without details of the social trail improvements being proposed it is difficult to determine any minimum lighting to be required.

VI) CHAPTER 17.6: SUPPLEMENTARY REGULATIONS

17.6.6: Roads and Driveway Standards

The applicant proposes a 22' asphalt paved driveway, including a 2' shoulder on each side and an 18" culvert beneath for drainage along Country Club Dr. This meets the CDC requirements for commercial driveways to be 20' wide with 2' shoulders. The applicant shall be required to provide additional driveway details including shoulder material and grade as a condition of approval.

VII) CHAPTER 17.7: BUILDING REGULATIONS

17.7.20: Construction Mitigation

Applicants are required to submit a Construction Mitigation Plan that is compliant with the CDC's regulations including limits of disturbance, tree protection, fencing, site access, laydown, dumpster location, etc.

The applicant has not provided a Construction Mitigation Plan. There is a delineated wetland between the proposed parking lot and the Peaks Resort, it will be important that the CMP demonstrate best management practices for avoiding any impacts to the adjacent wetland area. The Applicant shall be required to provide a Construction Mitigation Plan as a condition of approval.

VIII) SECTION 17.4.14 (E) GENERAL STANDARDS FOR REVIEW

The location of a conditional use shall best serve the proposed use while minimizing potential adverse impacts.

Staff: The proposed location for the parking lot has significant constraints and the applicant has not provided sufficient details to satisfy all of staff's concerns and the CDC's requirements. The location of the parking lot would be practical if lots 122 and 123 are developed as indicated by TSG, however the Town has no assurance that such a development will be proposed in the foreseeable future. The review authority should consider significant conditions of approval if they choose to approve the proposal in its current form.

IX) SECTION 17.4.14 (D) CRITERIA FOR DECISION

Table 1

a. The proposed conditional use is in general conformity with the policies of the principles, policies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
The proposed use does not directly violate any elements of the Comprehensive Plan and indirectly contributes to the ongoing development of the Village Center, which is the proposed Future Land Use identified for the subject property.	
b. The proposed conditional use is in harmony and compatible with surrounding land uses and the neighborhood and will not create a substantial adverse impact on adjacent properties or on services and infrastructure.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) NO
The proposed conditional use is compatible with adjacent commercial uses, however concerns about safety may limit compatibility with adjacent residential uses. It does not sufficiently identify improvements to infrastructure to negate its potential negative impact to pedestrian and vehicular safety.	
c. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not constitute a substantial physical hazard to the neighborhood, public facilities, infrastructure or open space.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) NO
Without additional details regarding the pedestrian access to the parking lot, staff cannot determine the level of physical hazard the proposed use constitutes to the neighborhood and infrastructure.	
d. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not have significant adverse effect to the surrounding property owners and uses.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
The proposed use does not have a significant adverse effect to the surrounding property owners in terms of their ability to safely and effectively use their property.	
e. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not have a significant adverse effect on open space or the purposes of the facilities owned by the Town.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
Employee parking is an allowed use (with a CUP) in Active Open Space zones, and the construction of the temporary parking lot would not have a significant adverse impact on any active open space so long as the social trail across the property is preserved or improved.	

f. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall minimize adverse environmental and visual impacts to the extent possible considering the nature of the proposed conditional use.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
The applicant has proposed some landscape screening across the property that will minimize the adverse environmental and visual impacts.	
g. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall provide adequate infrastructure.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) NO
The applicant has not provided sufficient details regarding the improvement of pedestrian infrastructure to safely access the site. The applicant has not provided sufficient details regarding the origin of water for the irrigation system.	
h. The proposed conditional use does not potentially damage or contaminate any public, private, residential, or agricultural water supply source.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
The proposed use does not damage or contaminate any water supply. Adequate drainage shall be required in the construction of the proposed parking lot to prevent contamination.	
i. The proposed conditional use permit meets all applicable Town regulations and standards.	Criterion Met: (Yes/No) YES
The CDC allows for temporary parking related to ongoing construction in the Village Center, however it does not provide strong guidance on regulating standalone or temporary surface parking lots.	

X) STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the DRB consider whether this application meets the criteria for approval in its current form, paying particular attention to criterion related to public safety and adequate infrastructure.

Based on the criteria listed in this staff memo of record, staff has provided three proposed motions for the Design Review Board, one to recommend Town Council approval the conditional use permit, one to recommend Town Council deny the approval of the conditional use permit, and one to recommend continuance.

XI) PROPOSED MOTION:

If DRB choses to recommend **continuance** of consideration for approval of the **Conditional Use Permit** then staff suggests the following motion:

I move to continue the consideration of a Conditional Use Permit request for the development of a temporary parking lot at Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2 until (insert date).

If DRB choses to recommend **denial** of the **Conditional Use Permit** then staff suggests the following motion:

I move to recommend denial to Town Council of a Conditional Use Permit request for the development of a temporary parking lot at Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2, based on the evidence provided in the staff memo of record dated July 2nd, 2025, and the findings of this meeting.

Reasons for recommending denial are: (insert primary design criteria or primary CUP criteria that is not being met).

If DRB chooses to recommend **approval** of the **Conditional Use Permit**, then staff suggests the following motion:

I move to recommend approval to Town Council of a Conditional Use Permit request for the development of a temporary parking lot at Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2, based on the evidence provided in the staff memo of record dated July 2nd, 2025, and the findings of this meeting, subject to the following Conditions of Approval:

#	Condition of Approval/Note	Department or Division	Completed By:
1)	Applicant shall provide additional details required regarding the origin of the water for the irrigation system	Planning	Prior to development permit
2)	Applicant shall obtain tree removal permit for any trees to be removed	Forester	Prior to development permit
3)	Applicant shall enter into a performance agreement with the Town to ensure the survival of proposed landscaping	Planning	Prior to development permit
4)	This Conditional Use Permit shall be valid for a period of five (5) years	Planning	N/A
5)	Provide additional details regarding how pedestrians will access the parking lot including improvements to the social trail, maintenance of the road shoulder and other details as determined by town staff	Planning	Prior to development permit
6)	Receive written permission from the pedestrian walkway easement owners (reception #396471) for construction of the proposed development or provide details showing that the easement will not be impacted.	Planning	Prior to development permit
7)	Provide additional driveway details including shoulder material and grade	Planning	Prior to development permit
8)	Provide additional parking lot geometry details including space size and aisle width, etc.	Planning	Prior to development permit
9)	Applicant shall provide a Construction Mitigation Plan with details as determined by town staff	Planning	Prior to development permit
10)	Provide details regarding how steep of a slope would be created in the disturbed areas around the parking lot. Any slopes that	Planning	Prior to development permit

	are steeper than 2:1 shall require a retaining structure such as geogrid or other retaining structures. Any exposed section of disturbed slope shall require restoration with biodegradable netting until vegetation is reestablished.		
--	--	--	--

Conditional Use Permit Narrative – Temporary Parking Lot

Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2

Town of Mountain Village, Colorado

Applicant: John Miller, Telluride Ski & Golf LLC

Property Owner: Telluride Ski & Golf LLC

Date: 5/15/2025

Project Summary

This application is submitted to request a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the establishment of a temporary surface parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2 within the Town of Mountain Village. The purpose of the proposed temporary parking lot is to address the loss of TSG employee parking in the Mountain Village due to the construction of the Four Seasons Development.

Although the proposed use is temporary in nature, due to the topography of the site it will necessitate grading to meet parking design requirements. The proposed parking site will be improved to a safe and functional standard using removable materials, with erosion control and dust mitigation measures in place. While TSG understands that this largely impacts TSG employees as it relates to parking, there are also implications for Gondola Parking Garage demand and supply with the loss of the surface parking pond lot. Because of this, TSG is requesting that this Conditional Use Permit be granted for a period of 5 years. It should be noted that Lots 122 and 123 are designated for future hotel development so this parking use would ultimately be temporary given the future development of these sites per the TMV Comprehensive Plan.

Lighting is not proposed for the temporary employee parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2 because the lot will primarily serve employees who are familiar with the area and accustomed to navigating it under varying conditions. While the lot may be used during early morning or evening hours, the low traffic volume, limited duration of use, and temporary nature of the installation do not warrant the visual and environmental impacts associated with installing lighting. In addition, the site is in close proximity to existing light sources along adjacent roadways and buildings, which provide sufficient ambient lighting for basic visibility. Avoiding new lighting also aligns with the Town of Mountain Village's dark-sky goals and helps minimize potential disturbance to surrounding residential areas and open space.

TSG is proposing the installation of a paved apron at the entrance to the temporary parking lot to reduce dust, control sediment runoff, and maintain a clean transition between the lot and the public roadway. However, paving the entire lot is not proposed due to the temporary nature of the use. Full paving would require significant investment and site disturbance for a parking facility that is not intended to be permanent. Instead, the lot will be surfaced with gravel or other pervious, removable materials that provide adequate vehicle access while minimizing environmental impact and allowing for easy restoration of the site once the temporary use concludes.

Pedestrian connectivity between the temporary parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2 and the Mountain Village Core will be provided via an existing hiking trail that leads directly from the site into the core area.

This trail offers a convenient and direct route for employees walking to and from the lot. While the existing trail is functional, minor improvements are proposed to enhance safety and accessibility for regular daily use. These improvements may include selective trail widening, resurfacing with compacted gravel or similar material, and minor grading to ensure a stable and walkable surface in all weather conditions. These enhancements will maintain the natural character of the trail while ensuring that it is suitable for regular commuter use throughout the duration of the parking lot's operation.

Property Description

Lot 122 & Lot 123 are currently vacant and are zoned Village Center. OS-1R2 surrounds Lots 122 & 123 entirely and is designated as Active Open Space. The lots are located along Country Club Drive and slope towards the west. While the proposed parking is more remote than the existing pond lot, it is located adjacent to The Peaks to allow for easy access to the Mountain Village Core via the existing dirt path.

Proposed Use Details

- Duration of Use: TSG is proposing this use be granted approval for 5 years.
 - Parking Capacity: 33 proposed parking spaces for employee vehicles.
 - Surface Treatment: Temporary gravel or matting surface, no permanent paving.
 - Lighting: No lighting is proposed for this parking area.
 - Access: Access is proposed from Country Club Blvd
 - Signage: Signage specifying that the parking area is for TSG Employees only is proposed. Proposed as a 1'x2' sign to be located at the entrance to the parking area with simple lettering and TSG Logo.
-

Compliance with CDC Conditional Use Criteria

In accordance with CDC Section 17.4.14, this proposal meets the following required findings:
Consistency with Comprehensive Plan: The use supports community mobility and seasonal capacity objectives. It aligns with goals to reduce congestion, improve access, and support resort operations.

Compatibility with Surrounding Uses:

The temporary parking lot is adjacent to a mix of residential and resort properties. The proposed use is seasonal, unobtrusive, and mitigated to minimize impacts on neighbors.

Adequate Public Infrastructure:

The site has safe access to the public road network and will not burden utility services. No water or sewer connections are required.

Design Compatibility:

Temporary surface materials and signage will be visually subdued and compatible with surrounding natural and built environments.

Traffic and Pedestrian Safety:

Traffic flow will be managed through site signage and layout. There will be adequate ingress/egress for vehicles, and safe pedestrian access to nearby sidewalks or trails.

Temporary Nature:

The CUP is sought specifically for a limited-term use.

Community Benefits

Helps alleviate GPG and other parking garage congestion during high-demand seasons.

Reduces unauthorized parking.

Preserves long-term land use integrity by avoiding permanent development.

Conclusion

The applicant respectfully requests approval of this Conditional Use Permit to allow for a temporary surface parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2. The proposed use is consistent with the Town of Mountain Village's goals for sustainable, seasonal capacity management and minimizes environmental and community impacts. The applicant is committed to working with Town staff to ensure proper installation, monitoring, and timely restoration of the lots.




The following document contains drawings and plan sets that are not accessible to screen readers. For assistance in accessing and interpreting these documents, please email cd@mtnvillage.org or call (970) 728-8000



LEGEND

WATER VALVE
FIRE HYDRANT
SEWER MANHOLE

FOUND 1-1/2" ALUMINUM CAP ON 5/8" REBAR, L.S. 24966
FOUND 1-1/2" ALUMINUM CAP ON 5/8" REBAR, ILLEGIBLE
FOUND 1-1/2" ALUMINUM CAP ON 5/8" REBAR, L.S. 20632



This Existing Conditions Plan of Lot 122, Lot 123, and Tract OS-1R-2, Town of Mountain Village, was prepared on October 21, 2022 under the direct responsibility, supervision and checking of Jeffrey C. Haskell of Foley Associates, Inc., being a Colorado Licensed Surveyor. It does not constitute a Land Survey Plat or Improvement Survey Plat as defined by section 38-51-102 C.R.S.

P.L.S. NO. 37970 Date

LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

LOT 122, TELLURIDE MOUNTAIN VILLAGE, FILING 1, ACCORDING TO THE REPLAT AND REZONING OF LOT 122 OF TELLURIDE MOUNTAIN VILLAGE, FILING 1, RECORDED OCTOBER 7, 1992 IN PLAT BOOK 1 AT PAGE 1367, COUNTY OF SAN MIGUEL, STATE OF COLORADO.
LOT 123, TELLURIDE MOUNTAIN VILLAGE, FILING 1, ACCORDING TO THE PLAT RECORDED MARCH 9, 1984 IN PLAT BOOK 1 AT PAGE 476, COUNTY OF SAN MIGUEL, STATE OF COLORADO.

NOTES:

- Easement research and legal description from Land Title Guarantee Company, Order No. ABS86013342, dated October 06, 2022 at 5:00 P.M.
- According to FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map 08113C0287-D, dated September 30, 1992, this parcel is within Zone X; Areas determined to be outside 500-year flood plain.
- BASIS OF BEARINGS: Found monuments along the Northern boundary of Lot 123, as shown hereon, assumed to have the record bearing of N 52°00'00" E according to Plat Book 1 at page 476.
- Benchmark: Control Point "CP BASE", also the Southwest corner of Lot 123, as shown hereon, with an elevation of 9449.67 feet.
- Contour interval is two feet.
- All trees shown hereon are Aspen trees labeled with diameter at chest height, unless otherwise noted. Only trees 4" or greater in diameter are shown hereon.
- Slopes 30% or greater are shown hereon.
- Underground utility locates have not been painted at the time of this survey. Utility locates should be performed by respective providers before any construction.
- Foley Associates, Inc. is not aware of any wetland areas located on these lots, but a wetland delineation was not performed as part of this survey.
- Per Exception No. 20 of the TBD Commitment referenced above, "ANY LOSS OR DAMAGE RESULTING FROM A LACK OF ACCESS TO AND FROM SUBJECT PROPERTY AS A RESULT OF TSG SKI & GOLF, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY NO LONGER OWNING BOTH THE SUBJECT PROPERTY AND THE ADJACENT OPEN SPACE TRACT OS-1R-2 ACCESS TO AND FROM SUBJECT PROPERTY IS DEPENDENT UPON COMMON OWNERSHIP OF SUBJECT PROPERTY AND OPEN SPACE TRACT OS-1R-2."
- NOTE: THERE HAVE BEEN NO RECORDED RIGHTS ACROSS TRACT OS-1 OR TRACT OS-1R-2 FROM SUBJECT PROPERTY TO COUNTRY CLUB DRIVE."
- NOTICE: According to Colorado law, you must commence any legal action based upon any defect in this survey within three years after you first discover such defect. In no event may any action based upon any defect in this survey be commenced more than ten years from the date of the certification shown hereon.


EXISTING CONDITIONS PLAN
Lots 122 and 123 and Tract OS-1R-2, Town of Mountain Village,
San Miguel County, Colorado.

Project Mgr:	JH	Rev.		description	date	by
Technician:	MC					
Checked by:	KB					
Start date:	10/21/2022					



970-728-6153 970-728-6050 fax
P.O. BOX 1385
125 W. PACIFIC, SUITE B-1
TELLURIDE, COLORADO 81435

Drawing path: dwg\02021 EC Plan 10-22 (Lots 122 and 123).dwg Sheet 1 of 1 Project #: 02021



Uncompahgre Engineering, LLC

P.O. Box 3945
Telluride, CO 81435
970-729-0683

SUBMISSIONS:

SUBMITTAL 2025-05-14

Lots 122 & 123
Country Club Dr.
Mtn. Village, CO

NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION


CONTRACTOR TO REVIEW AND COMPARE ALL CHAPTERS AND INTERDISCIPLINARY DRAWINGS AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE ARCHITECT PRIOR TO ANY FIELD WORK BEING DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AIA DOCUMENT A201

Parking Plan


18'-24'-18'

33 Spaces

C2.1



Road Templates





Uncompahgre
Engineering, LLC

P.O. Box 3945
Telluride, CO 81435
970-729-0683

SUBMISSIONS:

SUBMITAL 2025-05-25

Irrigation

Lots 122 & 123
Country Club Dr.
Mtn. Village, CO




CONTRACTOR TO REVIEW AND COMPILE ALL
CHAPTERS AND INTERDISCIPLINARY DRAWINGS
AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE
ARCHITECT PRIOR TO ANY FIELD WORK BEING
DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AIA DOCUMENT A201


Site Plan
with
No Trees
Displayed

18'-24'-18'
33 Spaces

C2.1



Road Templates




Final Structural Section shall be determined after the Parking
Lot has been graded. It is expected to be - at a minimum -
4" of Class 5 Road Base on 6" of Class 2 Road Base on 12"
of Scarified and compacted Subgrade. All Compaction shall be
95% Std. Proctor. The Asphalt Mat shall be 4" Thick

Scale: 1" = 20'

2x Vert. Exaggeration

Parking Lot Profile





Uncompahgre
Engineering, LLC

P.O. Box 3945
Telluride, CO 81435
970-729-0683

SUBMISSIONS:

SUBMITTAL 2025-05-25

Planting Plan

Lots 122 & 123
Country Club Dr.
Mtn. Village, CO




CONTRACTOR TO REVIEW AND COMPLY ALL
CHAPTERS AND INTERDISCIPLINARY DRAWINGS
AND REPORT ANY DISCREPANCIES TO THE
ARCHITECT PRIOR TO ANY FIELD WORK BEING
DONE IN ACCORDANCE WITH AIA DOCUMENT A201


Site Plan
with
No Trees
Displayed

18'-24'-18'
33 Spaces

C2.1



Road Templates




Final Structural Section shall be determined after the Parking Lot has been graded. It is expected to be - at a minimum - 4" of Class 6 Road Base on 6" of Class 2 Road base on 12" of Scarified and compacted Subgrade. All Compaction shall be 95% Std. Proctor. The Asphalt Mat shall be 4" Thick

Scale: 1" = 20'

0 10 20 40
2x Vert. Exaggeration

Parking Lot Profile





COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

455 Mountain Village Blvd. Suite A
Mountain Village, CO 81435
970-728-1392
cd@mtnvillage.org

To: Daniel Alvarado, Senior Planner
From: Amy Ward, Community Development Director
Re: Conditional Use permit Application, Temporary Surface Parking, Lots 122 and 123 and OS 1R2
Date: July 1, 2025

Daniel,

I think it is important as the Design Review Board and the Town Council review the application for a Conditional Use Permit for a temporary surface parking lot on Lots 122, 123 and OS 1R2, adjacent to the Peaks Resort and Spa, and to provide some background and context to this application.

The applicant states in their application that the primary reason for the request is to offset employee parking that was lost in the Village Core due to the construction of the Four Seasons development. The temporary lot located primarily on Lots 69R2, 71R and 67, collectively known as the pond lots, is being sold to the Four Seasons by Telski for the future development of the hotel. Telski, as the seller of the property has been aware that this parking is going away for quite some time. Town staff has been in discussions with the development team for the Four Seasons since 2018, and presumably Telski as a potential seller of land was also involved in discussions with the development team at that time. The Four Seasons SPUD was approved in 2022. Telski has had between 3-7 years to plan for the relocation of this staff parking.

I don't disagree that it is clear that Telski needs a solution for parking. I disagree with the idea that moving from one temporary parking lot to another as the resort sells off various pieces of real estate is the solution. Telski need to make a plan to accommodate its employees and guests of the resort with a meaningful and permanent solution. In 2017, Telski went through a master development plan process with the forest service, that plan is linked here:

https://tellurideskiresort.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/tsg_2017_master_development_plan.pdf

In reviewing the plan and looking at existing county standards for parking required for ski resorts, the current requirement appears to be one space per three (3) potential users of the facility at maximum capacity plus one (1) space per every three (3) employees. I'm not aware if the forest service has different requirements for ski resorts. The plan lists the maximum capacity of the ski resort at 8230 guests and estimated number of employees was unclear. Per county guidelines there would be 2743 required parking spaces for guests and estimating ski resort employees at 1500 in the height of the ski season would add an additional 500 parking spaces for employees.

The 2017 plan demonstrates public parking spaces in the Town of Telluride and Town of Mountain Village, hotel parking spaces combined for both towns, condominium parking spaces in Mountain Village and employee housing parking to total 3,594 spaces, none of which is owned by the resort (with the exception of a handful of employee housing parking in housing units owned by the resort and commercial units owned by the resort). Understanding that the users of these units are often ski resort guests as well, we can justify that some of these spaces can be utilized to meet parking requirements, however only the public parking spaces would be available to both day users of the resort and commuting employees of both the resort and all business within the combined towns. The development plan shows a total of 1490 public parking spaces. Looking at that list a little closer, many of the listed spaces cannot be used by day skiers or employees commuting in from other towns as described below:

- Telluride Lot L (Shandoka) 330 spaces, primarily used by Shandoka residents, Shandoka has 134 units, two spaces per dwelling unit requires 268 spaces, **maybe 60 spaces left over for day use skiers and commuters?** Also proposed for redevelopment in the future.
- Telluride Carhenge – 290 spaces, to be redeveloped . Recent proposals could include 60-80 hotel rooms, 220-300 residential units and commercial uses which leaves no additional parking for day skiers or commuters
- Telluride Lot B **80 spaces**, not sure what this is or if development plans exist here, lets assume these will remain usable for the time being
- MV Meadows Parking 110 spaces, is used for meadows residents, inclusive of Big Billies which has no parking for residents, not available for day skiers or commuters.
- Town Hall Plaza 60 spaces. This is one hour parking and not available for skiers or commuters
- **Gondola Parking - 460 spaces**, this is the most available and usable public parking for both day skiers and commuters. It is incredibly expensive to operate and maintain, yet the Town can only charge for parking here with the permission of the ski resort
- North Village 25 spaces, will disappear with approved pending development of Six Senses
- **Heritage Public Parking 106 spaces**
- Blue Mesa 18 spaces, one hour and delivery zone only, not appropriate for day skiers or commuters
- Shirana 11 spaces, will disappear with approved pending development of Six Senses

This is not an exhaustive list of all current parking in the Telluride region, merely a reaction to what the ski area has previously demonstrated to show compliance with a parking requirement. **In summary, it looks like realistically we have around 700 public parking spaces available for day skiers and commuters, with 80% of those owned and operated by the Town of Mountain Village.** I believe the ski resort alone has approximately 1500 employees in the height of the season. This is not a problem that will be solved by one temporary surface parking lot. It seems imperative that the ski resort prioritize understanding their true need for parking/transportation and then go through a real planning process to find solutions that could include building additional parking in Mountain Village, building regional parking and potentially the addition of employee shuttles/transport.

Regards,



Amy Ward
Community Development Director

Erin Howe

From: Ania Aniola <ania@aniastable.com>
Sent: Friday, June 20, 2025 3:36 PM
To: cd
Subject: Telski Emoloyee Parking Lot

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Hello!

I received attached letter regarding proposed parking lot.

There is a beautiful healthy Aspen grove in the area being considered for this parking lot. Lots of birds live in it. How many trees would be cut down for this project?

Telski has plenty of flat land without trees by the golf driving range/tennis courts and they are already using that area for parking. Why not expand that for the employee parking?

Regards,

Ania Aniola

Erin Howe

From: Cynthia <cynthiabarutha19@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, June 23, 2025 10:47 AM
To: planning
Subject: Country Club Proposed Conditional Use Parking Lot

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

To the planning committee:

I am one of the owners of 255 Country Club Dr., Mountain Village.

I have a lot concerns over the proposed Conditional Use Permit for a dirt employee parking lot on the S- Curves of Country Club (CC) Dr.

1st - we all know once money is spent to obtain approval and built, even under conditional approval, there is a high probability it will never be unapproved and it will never be dismantled.

What happens if new owners purchase Telski in the future will this conditional approval be grandfathered to the new owners? How will that be handled?

2nd - We are going to allow trees/native plants to be torn down for a dirt parking lot, then once the conditional waiver ends - and no extension is granted - what is the requirement of the owner for a dusty piece of dirt with zero trees and zero native plants?

3rd - This parking lot does not fit well with CCs single family home. So let me understand this - the request is to plop in the center of CC a dirt parking lot, among single family homes. It makes me think Telski's mindset is, CC is a shit hole, and we don't care what we put there as long as it benefits Telski!
Telski needs to clean up their existing loading dock parking lot, on CC. That place is disgusting!

4th - The beautiful See Forever Community did not purchase these beautiful condos to look down on a sea of cars placed in dirt. Makes no sense.

It's really is a ridiculous request!

I'm requesting the planning department not approve.

Cynthia Barutha
255 Country Club

Sent from my iPhone

Erin Howe

From: Liz Daher <liz@daherinc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 11:01 AM
To: planning
Subject: We are "AGAINST" the parking lot on Country Club - DENY THIS PERMIT REQUEST
Attachments: conditional_use_permit_lots_122-_123-_and_os-1r2.pdf

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

My name is Liz Daher, owner of 267 Country Club, Mountain Village 81435. I just received an email about this proposed parking lot. Us, homeowners on Country Club, pay high real estate costs and taxes to live there. We already had to endure all this development taking away beautiful land for more condos. Now, you want to put in a parking lot. The road is very narrow, it's already a congested with traffic and a safety issue around that curve for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers. This parking lot will be not only unsightly but contribute to problem and safety concerns.

I read the attachment for the permit from John Miller about it only being 5 years, and it not having impact on environment, traffic and all his promises conditions in order to obtain permit. Promises and terms are always put in permits by developers and TSG to get what they want at the expense of the home-owner. TSG has a junk area over by the Peaks loading dock they can't even manage. I'm tired of Teleski trying to enrich themselves at our expense. It is unethical. I am against it 100% and am not negotiable.

Having to write a protest, request denial and attend hearings is harassment and disrespectful to Country Club home-owners. TSG spends a lot time on this type of non-sense, and meetings. The rest of us home-owners have “jobs” and responsibilities, not time for attending hearings. We request, TSG pay all County Club homeowners annual property taxes.

Please deny his request for this permit.

Liz Daher
Belorizonte, LLC
267 Country Club
Mountain Village, Co. 81435



From: Kevin Mellor <k.mellor@knightcommercial.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 8:24 AM
To: planning
Subject: Opposition to Proposed TSG Employee Parking Lot on Country Club Drive (CUP Application)

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Planning Department,

I am writing as a homeowner on Country Club Drive to express my strong opposition to TSG's Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application proposing a 33-space employee-only parking lot within the first elbow of the S-curves, between the See Forever Cabins and the homes of Dr. Alan Safdi and Dr. Harlan Waksal. This proposed parking lot is entirely incompatible with the character and safety of our residential neighborhood. It is not only visually and environmentally disruptive, but it also introduces serious safety concerns on a blind curve that is already hazardous to drivers, pedestrians, cyclists, and hikers—many of whom use this section of Country Club Drive as a connector to the Meadows.

Here are just a few of the reasons I believe this application should be denied:

1. **Inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan:** The plan does not remotely anticipate a surface parking lot in this location. The proposed use is not in general conformity with the policies and principles outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, particularly those emphasizing neighborhood compatibility and quality of life.
2. **Not compatible with surrounding land uses:** This area is surrounded almost entirely by single-family homes. A dusty, noisy, utilitarian parking lot is not “in harmony and compatible” with the existing residential setting, nor does it respect the expectations of current property owners.
3. **Creates traffic and safety hazards:** A parking lot of this scale will significantly increase traffic on a dangerous stretch of steep, winding road with no sidewalk infrastructure. This poses a clear physical hazard to residents and visitors alike.
4. **Environmental and open space impacts:** The plan would disturb approximately 60% of the site's surface area, resulting in total loss of trees and vegetation, extensive grading, and a dirt-surfaced lot—all of which have significant adverse environmental and visual impacts.
5. **Likely permanence:** Although TSG labels this as a “temporary” 5-year use, past experience with similar “temporary” lots—such as the one near the Village pond—suggests this lot could easily remain in place indefinitely.

The Town's Comprehensive Plan explicitly states:

“The relationship between Mountain Village's natural and built environments creates a sense of place and authentic small-town charm... The level of construction in Mountain Village does not reduce the quality of life for residents and visitors.”

Approving this parking lot would undermine that goal.

I urge the Town to deny this Conditional Use Permit and to protect the character, safety, and quality of life in our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Kevin Mellor
267 Country Club Drive
Mountain Village Resident



KNIGHT
COMMERCIAL

Kevin Mellor | Regional Manager | Houston

k.mellor@knightcommercial.com

Mobile: **832.778.8645**

24/7 Emergency Hotline: **877.965.8200**

www.knightcommercial.com

Commercial Restoration | Emergency Disaster Recovery | Commercial Construction | Commercial Roofing | Consulting

EXCELLENCE | INTEGRITY | PERSEVERANCE | SERVANTHOOD

Erin Howe

From: Bill Nictakis <bill.nictakis@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 26, 2025 12:02 PM
To: planning; Michelle Bulson; Paul Wisor
Cc: Bill Nictakis
Subject: Proposed Parking lot Lots 122/123

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Design Review Board and Town council:

I have become aware of the proposed parking lot to be built on Lot 122/123 on Country Club road. As a resident of See Forever Village who spends 5 months per year in our lovely Mountain Village community, I want to express my concerns and opposition to this initiative,

- Mountain village is a beautiful area, surrounded by trees and green space. Having a gravel parking lot diminishes our environment. Trees, grass, and then a gravel, dusty parking lot. I appreciate that TSG does not intend to add parking lot lights, but let's acknowledge that a parking lot does not enhance our community landscaping and natural environment.
-
- Increased traffic poses a danger to residents who walk to Boomerang and Jurassic trails. I hike down Boomerang trail multiple times per week, and am always nervous traversing the winding road from See Forever down to the trail head.....even more so now with the home construction that is occurring. There are multiple blind curves on the "S" shaped winding road, and the increased traffic associated with 33 additional cars driving down the road daily to park poses a safety hazard to our residents. As you know, there is no walkway or path along that road, and I am already concerned for my safety every time I walk down Country Club to the trail head...especially in the winter when the sides of the road are covered with snow and ice. The additional traffic attributed to the parking lot will compound the issue, and we are just asking for a pedestrian accident unless a pedestrian walkway is built.
-
- How temporary is temporary? The request is for 5 years. But once it is built, will the Town really remove the parking lot? Unless a hotel addition is built on that land, strongly suspect that we will have a long term gravel parking lot and the associated safety risk and environment downgrade.

It seems that parking is something that must have been evaluated when approval for Four Seasons and Six Senses development was granted. TSG supported those initiatives, and Town Council approved them, so no one can be surprised at the loss of the parking lots. Approved plans for these development projects did not include building a gravel parking lot on Country Club that increases risk to pedestrians. Given the impact on pedestrian safety, increased traffic, and the loss of trees and green

space, I ask that the Council not allow this parking lot to be built, and work to find an alternative parking solution

Sincerely

Bill Nictakis

117 Sunny Ridge Place
Mountain Village. CO 81435

From: Casey Rosen <caseycrosen@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, June 27, 2025 9:07 AM
To: planning; council
Subject: Conditional use permit for parking on Lots 122, 123 and OS-1R2

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear DRB/Town Council

I am writing to urge you to reject the application for a conditional use permit for parking on Lots 122, 123 and OS-1R2. CDC section 17.4.14 sets out specific criteria for granting a conditional use permit and this application meets none of them:

Column A	Column B
"17.4.14. D. Criteria for Decision.	
a. The proposed conditional use is in general conformity with the policies of the principles, policies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan;	The Comp Plan does not contemplate a parking lot in this location.
b. The proposed conditional use is in harmony and compatible with surrounding land uses and the neighborhood and will not create a substantial adverse impact on adjacent properties or on services and infrastructure;	A parking lot in the middle of a single family neighborhood is the opposite of harmony and compatibility and will definitely adversely impact adjacent neighbors.
c. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not constitute a substantial physical hazard to the neighborhood, public facilities, infrastructure or open space;	The added traffic from a 33 space lot in the middle of the already notorious "S" curve on Country Club Drive makes a dangerous road more hazardous.
d. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not have significant adverse effect to the surrounding property owners and uses;	It is clear that this proposal will have a significant adverse affect on surrounding owners.
e. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not have a significant adverse effect on open space or the purposes of the facilities owned by the Town;	Same as above. Turning a forested open area into a paved parking lot is the definition of having an adverse effect on open space.
f. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall minimize adverse environmental and visual impacts to the extent possible considering the nature of the proposed conditional use;"	See above.

Mountain Village owners rely on you and the CDC to protect their properties from exactly the type of adverse impact that this parking lot will create.

Sincerely

Casey Rosen
253 Country Club Drive

Erin Howe

From: Amy Ward
Sent: Tuesday, July 1, 2025 10:05 AM
To: mvclerk; planning
Subject: FW: Opposition to TSG Parking Lot Proposal

See comment below that seems to have come just to my email address.




Amy Ward


Community Development Director, Town of Mountain Village

Office | [970-369-8248](tel:970-369-8248) | [Mobile | 970-729-2985](tel:970-729-2985)

award@mtnvillage.org

[455 Mountain Village Blvd., Ste. A, Mountain Village, CO 81435](#)



 **Newsletter Subscribe** _Stay connected with Mountain Village

This electronic transmission and any attachments may be considered PROPRIETARY INFORMATION. If you received this transmission in error, please destroy and notify the sender immediately. Sender and receiver should be mindful that all my incoming and outgoing emails may be subject to the Colorado Open Records Act, § 24-72-100.1, et seq.

From: David Koitz <dkoitz@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 1, 2025 9:52 AM
To: Amy Ward <award@mtnvillage.org>
Subject: Opposition to TSG Parking Lot Proposal

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear members of the Mountain Village DRB and Town Council,

We are writing to voice our opposition to TSG's proposal to create a 5 year temporary parking lot adjacent to the Peaks. A dusty and noisy lot certainly appears to "create a substantial adverse impact on" the adjacent single family homeowners and nearby condominium communities. The immediate site is surrounded on three sides by single family homes, the fourth, a wetland on the Peaks lot. It is hard to imagine how an *afterthought* parking lot plopped in the middle of single family homes and the nearby condominiums "is in harmony and compatible with surrounding land uses".

The traffic generated by a 33 space lot will substantially increase the traffic on this blind section of this hairpin curve resulting in "substantial physical hazard to the neighborhood" and to the many hikers, bikers and folks traveling from the Meadows area who use this steep road that has no sidewalk. The opening to two frequented trails are close by (across the road), one providing access to the valley floor and to the town of Telluride.

Moreover, the loss of trees and vegetation, extensive grading and a resulting dirt-surface parking lot will certainly have a significant adverse effect on the already limited open space of the Village proper.

Most notable, TSG's application says it is for only 5 years, but once it is in place it is more likely that it will remain so for many more years. TSG's similar lot near the pond in the Village core has existed for two decades or so. If approved, one can assume this parking lot will be around for many more years than proposed. In that light, it has all the makings of being a first step toward erection of a major addition to the Peak's itself, already a long time controversial measure for erosion of the limited open space now available in the Village.

We are opposed.
David and Gretchen Koitz

Sent from my iPad

From: Doug Hynden <DHynden@ANCHOR-PROP.COM>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 8:09 AM
To: planning; Martinique Prohaska; Scott Pearson; Pete Duprey; Harvey Mogenson; Tucker Magid; Huascar (Rick) Gomez; aarguelles@mtnvillage.org
Subject: Proposed parking lot - Country Club

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

As a long-time owner of property on Country Club, I strenuously oppose the proposed Conditional Use Permit that would allow the creation of a surface parking lot in the hairpin turn of Country Club Drive.

Contrary to the applicant's narrative, the proposal does not meet the criteria of CDC Section 17.4.14:

The relevant criteria that DRB and Council must apply when reviewing the application are as follows, a few thoughts appear in Column B:

Column A	Column B
"17.4.14. D. Criteria for Decision.	
1. The following criteria shall be met for the review authority to approve a conditional use permit:	
a. The proposed conditional use is in general conformity with the policies of the principles, policies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan;	1. The Comp Plan does NOT remotely anticipate locating a surface parking lot in this location and, therefore, it appears the proposal is NOT in conformity.
b. The proposed conditional use is in harmony and compatible with surrounding land uses and the neighborhood and will not create a substantial adverse impact on adjacent properties or on services and infrastructure;	2. The site is surrounded on three sides by single family homes, the fourth side is a wetland on the Peaks lot. It is hard to imagine that a dusty and noisy parking lot plopped down in the middle of single family homes "is in harmony and compatible with surrounding land uses". 3. A dusty and noisy parking certainly appears to "create a substantial adverse impact on" the adjacent single family homeowners.
c. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not constitute a substantial physical hazard to the neighborhood, public facilities, infrastructure or open space;	4. The traffic generated by a 33 space parking lot will substantially increase the traffic on this blind section of this hairpin curve resulting in "substantial physical hazard to the neighborhood" and to the many hikers, bikers and folks traveling from the Meadows area who

	use this steep road that has no sidewalk.
d. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not have significant adverse effect to the surrounding property owners and uses;	5. See 1 through 4 above.
e. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not have a significant adverse effect on open space or the purposes of the facilities owned by the Town;	6. Based on TSG's drawings, approximately 60.1% (15,690 SF) of the total area disturbed by the project is located on open space and the balance is located on Lots 122 and 123. The disturbance will be a combination of a total loss of trees and vegetation, extensive grading and a resulting dirt-surface parking lot. The total loss of trees and vegetation, extensive grading and a resulting dirt-surface parking lot certainly appears to have a "significant adverse effect on open space".
f. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall minimize adverse environmental and visual impacts to the extent possible considering the nature of the proposed conditional use;"	7. It does not appear that any type of argument could possibly exist in which the total loss of trees and vegetation, extensive grading and a resulting dirt-surface parking minimizes "adverse environmental and visual impacts".

Thank you for your consideration.

Anchor Mariemont Limited Partnership

Doug Hynden
Anchor Properties
(513) 608-6040

**TRILLIUM MV PARTNERS LLC,
A COLORADO LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY**

July 1, 2025

cd@mtnvillage.org

Town of Mountain Village

Attention: Community Development

Subject: Opposition to Plans/Permit Reviews – TSG Parking Lot Proposal on Country Club Drive

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am the manager/member of Trillium MV Partners LLC, a Colorado limited liability company, the owner of Lot 115, which is located directly across the street (Country Club Drive) from the TSG property upon which the surface parking lot proposed by TSG Ski and Golf, LLC is being reviewed by the Town.

Like many of my neighbors, I am very concerned about the significant impacts that this parking lot that would accommodate TSG employees will cause to our neighborhood in general and my property in particular. I am very much opposed to TSG's request for Town consideration and approval of any plans or permits, including a Conditional Use Permit, seeking approval to construct, use and operate a proposed surface parking lot on Lots 122/123 and adjacent open space, which would be used to serve TSG employees working elsewhere in the Mt Village.

I reviewed the comments offered by my neighbors, which point out various issues and concerns about the use of the surface parking lot proposed by TSG and whether the proposal complies with applicable Town codes. Generally speaking, I am concerned about the following impacts:

- Health/safety issues and concerns relating to the usage of Country Club Drive at its most challenging location (narrow, winding).
- The use of the parking lot would require substantial clearing, grading and tree loss, while having no bearing to a well-designed development plan for buildings and related improvements to be developed on the property after the term of the interim parking lot expires.
- The use would have appreciable impacts relating to noise, dust and visual to our neighborhood that are not readily capable of meaningful mitigation to offset the impacts of the use, nor have any been suggested by TSG.
- The use does not belong in the midst of a well-established, single-family and mixed-use neighborhood.
- The use will have a substantial impact to my use and enjoyment of my lot and a negative impact on my property values.

According to §17.4.14.D of the Municipal Code, a conditional use permit must:

- Be "in general conformity" with the Comprehensive Plan → **It is not.**
- Be "in harmony" with surrounding land uses → **It is not.**
- Not pose a "substantial physical hazard" → **It does.**
- Avoid "significant adverse effect" on adjacent properties → **It fails here.**

- Minimize adverse environmental impacts → **It exacerbates them.**

In addition to these shared objections, I also want to offer some additional comments and concerns, which I have discussed with my land use attorney and real estate advisors. I believe these concerns further support the need for the Town to deny this Conditional Use Permit request:

Incompatible with Community Development Code and Comprehensive Plan

- The Mountain Village, through the Community Development Code (CDC) regulates the uses and activities that may occur and be developed on all property located in the Mountain Village, including Lots 122/123 and the adjoining open space parcel. Under the allowable use table stated in the CDC, the use of these lots/parcels does not appear to be allowed under the Town laws, as such, this presents a threshold level problem for TSG that I believe would bar the Town from even considering this application and the related uses.
 - For property zoned Village Center, such as Lots 122/123, the CDC allows for surface parking “for guests” (presumably the reference to guests is meant to relate to guests or the usage occurring on the lot, not elsewhere). The CDC contemplates that such usage for parking on Lots 122/123 is an “accessory use” of the principal use occurring on Lots 122/123 (an accessory use is a use on a lot that is incidental and exclusive to that of the principal structure or building). Much of the parking lot being proposed by TSG is occurring on Lots 122/123. The CDC does not appear to allow for surface parking accommodating off-site employee usage by right or as a Conditional Use Review application in this zone, rather, the use for employee parking would be proper if incorporated as part of an overall development plan for the site, which is not the case here. The CDC provisions for review of a surface parking lot under the Conditional Use Review process only applies to property zoned as certain active open space (AO-3), which is not the status of Lots 122/123. As such, it would appear that a standalone, surface parking lot for employees, that is not accessory to other uses occurring on Lots 122/123 is not allowed by right or as part of a conditional use permit review.
 - The CDC does allow for surface parking “for guests” in certain active open space zone districts, if approved by the Town as a conditional use permit review application, but the same issue relating to TSG’s intended usage for its employee’s and not guest’s, which pose as a barrier to the Town for even considering the requested Conditional Use Review application. As an aside, it’s not clear what zone district has been applied to the open space parcel adjacent to Lots 122/123 where the parking lot is proposed.
- The Comp Plan makes clear that “all parking areas are constructed, maintained and improved in accordance with the Design Regulations.” If somehow the town finds that some variation of the TSG application can be reviewed and acted upon (which we debate), the CDC (Section 17.5.8) establishes certain parking standards that are to be followed when designing a parking facility, which include the following, which the proposal by TSG fails to meet for the following reasons:
 - The expectation is that parking will be underground, particularly on property located in the Village Center, such as Lots 122/123. Clearly, TSG is not proposing underground parking as contemplated by the CDC.
 - The expectation is that parking will be provided on the lot or property where the need for parking is generated. This is overflow employee parking that is not accommodating any uses occurring on Lots 122/123.

- The CDC allows the Town to consider surface parking for an interim use (for guests) on a case-by-case basis for lots in the Village Center for future development on a site. Again, the CDC does not favor surface parking in the Village Center zone. The proposed usage of a parking lot on Lots 122/123 for TSG employee parking for offsite uses and activities has no bearing or relationship to future development on these lots, as nothing has been submitted or proposed by TSG in terms of any development on these lots. TSG is proposing to disturb a large area of Lots 122/123 and the adjoining open space parcel without having prepared and submitted any design, zoning, subdivision, and density transfer applications for these holdings showing its future usage of these sites and how the future development impacts relate to the parking lot. This approach is committing these lots/parcels to development in these areas in the absence of any plans showing the proposed ultimate usage of the site and how the area being disturbed for the parking lot for this “interim use.” Questions such as is this the final footprint for development of the sites, is this the right site for the development are left open. In essence, TSG is replatting its property by clearing and grading these areas of the site, without going through the subdivision and rezoning process. Clearing and grading Lots 122/123 for remote employee parking does not appear to be what was intended by the CDC, nor should it be interpreted that way.
- Design standards for surface parking indicate that the plan needs to address a number of design issues, such as landscaping, snow storage/removal, drainage facilities inclusive of designs for sand/oil containment and other criteria. These elements are not included in the TSG proposal.


If this is approved, what happens in five years when the “temporary” use expires. The application submitted by TSG suggests that this is a temporary “seasonal” use (which season??), which is what the nature of the use must be to meet the CDC requirements. TSG has not submitted any type of restoration plan for the property showing what happens in five years. Will the site be restored and revegetated, will the large trees be replaced, if so where are the details and where are the assurance that such restoration plan will be implemented by TSG. There is no mention of suitable financial guaranty’s to the town that such restoration work will be done. It’s quite likely that TSG will be back before the Town in 5 years seeking an extension for another five years, and then another five years. Before long, this is a permanent parking lot and no longer an interim parking lot as recognized and required by the CDC. Then what happens.

The proposed use is a bad idea at an inappropriate location and should not be approved by the Town. It’s curious how TSG - given the extensive amounts of land it owns in the Mt Village - is unable to find a location on its holdings to accommodate its employees. The Town should have TSG prepare and present a needs assessment for all of its parking requirements, including its employee parking, and then meet with the Town to develop an appropriate plan to show where and how all of its necessary parking is being handled. A parking needs assessment is clearly contemplated by the Comp Plan and this request by TSG for an interim parking lot on Lots 122/123 underscores why a comprehensive plan, as opposed to an interim, one/off, ill-advised, not particularly well thought out surface parking lot in the heart of a residential neighbor should not be allowed. The Town should have TSG figure out where/why/how it can provide employee parking on sites where they are working, not on a remote large parking lot not readily accessible by its employees and then the Town and TSG can collaborate on a plan to deal with these parking needs. Again, TSG is calling for this to be a “five-year” interim use, so does that mean we have to figure this out again in five years? That does not make sense, lets figure it out now.

In short, this parking lot is an inappropriate use of land in a residential neighborhood, a threat to safety, and a violation of the very planning principles the Town professes to uphold. I urge the Design Review Board and the Town Council to reject this application in full.

Please include this letter in the Town's record for the review of this proposal.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peter Pisters as Manager of
Trillium MV Partners LLC,
a Colorado limited liability company

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Peter Pisters", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Daniel Alvarado, AICP

From: Kevin Mellor <k.mellor@knightcommercial.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 2, 2025 3:02 PM
To: planning
Subject: RE: Opposition to Proposed TSG Employee Parking Lot on Country Club Drive (CUP Application)

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Planning Department,

In addition to the email, I sent on Wednesday, June 25, 2025, I would like to further suggest that parking for TSG be considered in the lot by the market. This location already has rights to build an additional level, which would not only provide more parking capacity for TSG but also benefit the entire town of Mountain Village.

Importantly, this solution would help avoid disruption to our neighborhood and preserve its character, while still addressing the town's growing parking needs.

Thank you for considering this alternative.

Best regards,

Kevin Mellor
267 Country Club Drive
Mountain Village Resident



KNIGHT
COMMERCIAL

Kevin Mellor | Regional Manager | Houston
k.mellor@knightcommercial.com
Mobile: 832.778.8645
24/7 Emergency Hotline: 877.965.8200
www.knightcommercial.com

Commercial Restoration | Emergency Disaster Recovery | Commercial Construction | Commercial Roofing | Consulting

EXCELLENCE | INTEGRITY | PERSEVERANCE | SERVANTHOOD

From: Kevin Mellor
Sent: Wednesday, June 25, 2025 9:24 AM
To: planning@mtnvillage.org
Subject: Opposition to Proposed TSG Employee Parking Lot on Country Club Drive (CUP Application)

Dear Planning Department,

I am writing as a homeowner on Country Club Drive to express my strong opposition to TSG's Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application proposing a 33-space employee-only parking lot within the first elbow of the S-curves, between the See Forever Cabins and the homes of Dr. Alan Safdi and Dr. Harlan Waksal. This proposed parking lot is entirely incompatible with the character and safety of our residential neighborhood. It is not only visually and environmentally disruptive, but it also introduces serious safety

concerns on a blind curve that is already hazardous to drivers, pedestrians, cyclists, and hikers—many of whom use this section of Country Club Drive as a connector to the Meadows.

Here are just a few of the reasons I believe this application should be denied:

1. **Inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan:** The plan does not remotely anticipate a surface parking lot in this location. The proposed use is not in general conformity with the policies and principles outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, particularly those emphasizing neighborhood compatibility and quality of life.
2. **Not compatible with surrounding land uses:** This area is surrounded almost entirely by single-family homes. A dusty, noisy, utilitarian parking lot is not “in harmony and compatible” with the existing residential setting, nor does it respect the expectations of current property owners.
3. **Creates traffic and safety hazards:** A parking lot of this scale will significantly increase traffic on a dangerous stretch of steep, winding road with no sidewalk infrastructure. This poses a clear physical hazard to residents and visitors alike.
4. **Environmental and open space impacts:** The plan would disturb approximately 60% of the site’s surface area, resulting in total loss of trees and vegetation, extensive grading, and a dirt-surfaced lot—all of which have significant adverse environmental and visual impacts.
5. **Likely permanence:** Although TSG labels this as a “temporary” 5-year use, past experience with similar “temporary” lots—such as the one near the Village pond—suggests this lot could easily remain in place indefinitely.

The Town’s Comprehensive Plan explicitly states:

“The relationship between Mountain Village’s natural and built environments creates a sense of place and authentic small-town charm... The level of construction in Mountain Village does not reduce the quality of life for residents and visitors.”

Approving this parking lot would undermine that goal.

I urge the Town to deny this Conditional Use Permit and to protect the character, safety, and quality of life in our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Kevin Mellor
267 Country Club Drive
Mountain Village Resident



KNIGHT
COMMERCIAL

Kevin Mellor | Regional Manager | Houston
k.mellor@knightcommercial.com
Mobile: 832.778.8645
24/7 Emergency Hotline: 877.965.8200
www.knightcommercial.com

Commercial Restoration | Emergency Disaster Recovery | Commercial Construction | Commercial Roofing | Consulting

EXCELLENCE | INTEGRITY | PERSEVERANCE | SERVANTHOOD

Erin Howe

From: Czekaj, Andrew <andrew.czekaj@cambridgeus.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 8:05 AM
To: planning; council
Subject: TSG Parking Lot Application - Memo In Opposition
Attachments: 2025-7-1 Lots 122 and 123 and Tract OS-1R2 - Paved Paradise.docx

Importance: High

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

As owner and board member of See Forever II we are resoundly against this new Chuck Horning “reach around”. Your job is to represent the community and NOT Chuck Horning’s special interest. Your vote on this matter will be on the ballot when you run for office. BAD IDEA, NOT WELL CONCEIVED and clearly there to genuflect at the altar of a carpetbagger who has lived off this community for decades!!!

Andrew Czekaj

Co-Chairman

Knowledge

Perseverance

Integrity

Cambridge

8391 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 210
Vienna, Virginia 22182
Direct: 703.925.5215
Cell: 703.608.8600
cambridgeus.com
selfstoragezone.com

Follow Our Progress:

[San Antonio Global](#) | [Cuisine Solutions](#) | [Brooks Industrial](#) | [SSZ Suitland](#) | [SSZ Dumfries](#) | [SSZ Bowie](#)

This e-mail and any attachments may contain confidential information about Cambridge. If you are not the intended recipient of this message, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this e-mail and any attachments is prohibited.

To: Design Review Board
Town Council
Town of Mountain Village
Via email

From:

Date: July 2, 2025

Re: Lots 122 and 123 and Tract OS-1R2

- TSG's Country Club Dr. Parking Lot - "They paved paradise and put up a parking lot" – Joni Mitchell

1. Apparently Joni Mitchell foresaw what Telluride Ski & Golf, LLC ("TSG") is proposing to do in its application for a approve a conditional use permit for the area within the first elbow of the S-curves on Country Club Dr. between the See Forever Cabins and Alan Safdi's and Harlan Waksal's homes. The thought of a dusty and unsightly parking lot and the corresponding traffic from its 33 proposed parking spaces for TSG employee-ONLY vehicles is extremely unsettling to many who live on Country Club Dr. and many others who walk or bike through this area. Lots 122 and 123 are currently zoned as follows:

Lot	Zoning	# of Units
122	CONDO	9.0
122	EMP APT	1.0
123	CONDO	11.0
123	EMP APT	1.0

2. The relevant criteria that DRB and Council must apply when reviewing the application are in Column A, comments appear in Column B:

Column A	Column B
"17.4.14. D. Criteria for Decision.	
1. The following criteria shall be met for the review authority to approve a conditional use permit:	
a. The proposed conditional use is in general conformity with the policies of the principles, policies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan;	<p>1. The Comp Plan does NOT remotely anticipate locating a surface parking lot in this location and, therefore, the proposal is NOT in conformity.</p> <p>1.1 On page 34 of the Mountain Village Comprehensive Plan ("Comp Plan") it states:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">"Preserve the character of existing low-density residential areas."</p> <p>Although the area is currently zoned for 20 Condos and 2 Emp Apt, that use is more compatible with this residential area than a barren, intrusive and utilitarian use such as a gravel parking lot.</p> <p>1.2 On page 22 of the Comp Plan it states:</p>

“Air and water qualities are improved.”

It is hard to conceive of any scenario in which an unpaved and dusty parking lot will improve air and water quality. A “paved apron at the entrance to the temporary parking lot to reduce dust, control sediment runoff” will not improve air and water quality and will have minimal effect in terms of reducing the negative impacts. Dust clouds and dirty runoff don't quite scream "improved", unless we're counting erosion as a feature.

1.3 On page 33 of the Comp Plan it states:

“Land uses envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan are designed to “fit” into the surrounding neighborhood to ensure appropriate scale and context to their surrounding natural and built environments.”

A dirt parking lot was never “envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan” for this location and simply does not “fit” into the surrounding neighborhood”. When the Comp Plan was approved no one stood up and said, “You know what would *really* tie this neighborhood together? A dust-blown gravel lot full of employee vehicles.” A dirt parking lot in this location does not “ensure appropriate scale and context to their surrounding natural and built environments.”

1.4 On page 5 of the Comp Plan it states:

“But the Comprehensive Plan is not just about economics and money. It clearly recognizes the importance of Mountain Village’s exceptional residential neighborhoods and their interconnections with ski runs and golf fairways. It recognizes the importance of the space, tranquility, and extraordinary views that make Mountain Village unique among alpine resort communities, and it seeks to protect them by suggesting more restrictive zoning on the vast majority of land in the town. The Comprehensive Plan also provides the framework for the creation of a true sense of community.”

"But the Comprehensive Plan is not just about economics and money." It is hard to see how locating a parking lot in this location is about anything other than "economics and money."

A single-family residential neighborhood is clearly established on three sides of the proposed site and in its current condition the site provides "space, tranquility, and extraordinary views". A parking lot will destroy the existing "space, tranquility, and extraordinary views".

If Mountain Village truly "seeks to protect" "space, tranquility, and extraordinary views", then now is the time for our Town officials to step forward and do what we say we are going to do.

1.5 On page 9 of the Comp Plan it states:

"Better sustainability can be achieved by:
Protecting residential neighborhoods;"

If Mountain Village is truly committed to "Protecting residential neighborhoods", then, again, now is the time for our Town officials to step forward and do what we say we are going to do.

1.6 On page 32 of the Comp Plan it states:

"Much of the land area in Mountain Village is very stable and not expected to change in the future, particularly single-family neighborhoods."

The owners of the single-family homes that surround three sides of the site recognize that a 22 unit condominium project will eventually be built on the site. However, to impose a dirt parking lot on them for any period of time prior to the construction of the condominium project is contrary to the goal that "the land area in Mountain Village is very stable and not expected to change in the future, particularly single-family neighborhoods." Furthermore, based on studies and many years of experience, it is clear that a 33 unit parking lot will generate considerably more traffic than a 22 unit condominium project.

1.7 On page 16 of the Comp Plan it states:

“The relationship between Mountain Village’s natural and built environments creates a sense of place and authentic small-town charm unique to the region. The level of construction in Mountain Village does not reduce the quality of life for residents and visitors.”

Plopping a dusty and noisy parking lot down in the middle of a single-family neighborhood just makes no sense and is totally contrary to the Comp Plan’s stated goal of protecting the “the quality of life for residents”. If your definition of quality of life includes traffic noise and dust clouds, then you’re in luck if the parking lot is approved.

1.8 On page 18 of the Comp Plan the following UNIVERSAL VISION STATEMENT states:

“UNIVERSAL VISION STATEMENT
Mountain Village is a vibrant, healthy town that provides a high quality of life and experiences for full-time and part-time residents and visitors.”

Again, plopping a dusty and noisy parking lot down in the middle of a single-family neighborhood just makes no sense and is totally contrary to the Universal Vision Statement that Mountain Village “provides a high quality of life”.

1.9 On page 21 of the Comp Plan it states:

“Mountain Village offers an exceptional setting in which to live, work, invest, and visit. Residential neighborhoods are surrounded by scenic alpine landscapes, forested mountain open space, alpine vistas, and wildlife habitat. A system of open space creates attractive buffers between the built and natural environments and gives context to the built environment. Together, open space conservation and recreation contribute to the quality of life and a robust economy in Mountain Village.”

In its current state, Tract OS-1R2 creates an attractive buffer and contributes to the quality of life of the neighborhood. The proposed use will destroy the buffer

	<p>and, along with it, the quality of life of the neighborhood.</p> <p>1.10 Based on the discussion in paragraphs 1.1 through 1.9, it is hard to understand how anyone can conclude that the “proposed conditional use is in general conformity with the policies of the principles, policies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan”. Accordingly, the application should be denied. This application is out of step with the community and should be denied before it kicks up more dust than sense.</p>
<p>b. The proposed conditional use is in harmony and compatible with surrounding land uses and the neighborhood and will not create a substantial adverse impact on adjacent properties or on services and infrastructure;</p>	<p>2. The site is surrounded on three sides by single family homes; the fourth side is a wetland on the Peaks lot. It is hard to imagine that a dusty and noisy parking lot plopped down in the middle of single family homes “is in harmony and compatible with surrounding land uses”.</p> <p>2.1 A dusty and noisy parking certainly appears to “create a substantial adverse impact on” the adjacent single family homeowners.</p> <p>2.3 Based on the discussion in paragraphs 2 and 2.1, it is hard to understand how anyone can conclude that the proposed conditional use meets the requirements of Section 17.4.14. D.1.b. Accordingly, the application should be denied.</p>
<p>c. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not constitute a substantial physical hazard to the neighborhood, public facilities, infrastructure or open space;</p>	<p>3. The traffic generated by a 33 space parking lot will substantially increase the traffic on this blind section of this hairpin curve resulting in “substantial physical hazard to the neighborhood” and to the many hikers, bikers and folks traveling from the Meadows area who use this steep road that has no sidewalk. As noted above, based on studies and many years of experience, it is clear that a 33 unit parking lot will generate considerably more traffic that a 22 unit condominium project.</p> <p>3.1 Based on the discussion in paragraph 3, it is hard to understand how anyone can conclude that the proposed conditional use meets the requirements of Section 17.4.14. D.1.c. Accordingly, the application should be denied.</p>

<p>d. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not have significant adverse effect to the surrounding property owners and uses;</p>	<p>4. See 1 through 3 above which are incorporated herein.</p> <p>4.1 Based on the discussion in paragraphs 1 through 3, it is hard to understand how anyone can conclude that the proposed conditional use meets the requirements of Section 17.4.14. D.1.d. Accordingly, the application should be denied.</p>
<p>e. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall not have a significant adverse effect on open space or the purposes of the facilities owned by the Town;</p>	<p>5. Based on TSG's drawings, approximately 60.1% (15,690 SF) of the total area disturbed by the project is located on open space and the balance is located on Lots 122 and 123. The disturbance will be a combination of a total loss of trees and vegetation, extensive grading and a resulting dirt-surface parking lot. The total loss of trees and vegetation, extensive grading and a resulting dirt-surface parking lot certainly appears to have a "significant adverse effect on open space". When the 22 unit condominium project eventually comes before the DRB, DRB will be charged with minimizing the negative impacts of the development pursuant to the provisions of the land use code. Allowing the clear cutting and grading of the open space for this parking lot will rob the DRB of any opportunity to ensure there is not a "significant adverse effect on open space". But until then? Is it time to gravel paradise and invite the carpool.</p> <p>5.1 Based on the discussion in paragraph 5, it is hard to understand how anyone can conclude that the proposed conditional use meets the requirements of Section 17.4.14. D.1.e. Accordingly, the application should be denied.</p>
<p>f. The design, development and operation of the proposed conditional use shall minimize adverse environmental and visual impacts to the extent possible considering the nature of the proposed conditional use;"</p>	<p>7. It does not appear that any type of argument could possibly exist in which the total loss of trees and vegetation, extensive grading and a resulting dirt-surface parking minimizes "adverse environmental and visual impacts".</p> <p>7.1 Based on the discussion in paragraph 7, it is hard to understand how anyone can conclude that the proposed conditional use meets the requirements of Section 17.4.14. D.1.f. Accordingly, the application should be denied.</p>

3. TSG's application says it is for only 5 years, but once it is place it is likely that it will remain in place for many more years until Lots 122 and 123 are ultimately developed. TSG's similar lot near the pond in the Village Core has existed for 20 years +/- . If approved one can only assume this parking lot will be around for many, many years. Like a government program or a fruitcake at Christmas, it'll be around forever.

4. Mountain Village does have a parking problem—but tossing gravel on open space is not going to solve it. Instead, the problem should be addressed in the location the Comp Plan has designated as the Town's parking facility, the parking structure by Town Hall. Approving a TSG employee-ONLY parking lot will not assist in reaching a comprehensive solution at the parking structure, if fact it may impede it. If we want real solutions, we ought to start where the Plan tells us, not wherever it's easiest to pour gravel.

5. If the DRB and Council decide to treat the Comp Plan and Section 17.4.14.D.1 like last year's New Year's resolutions—ignored and forgotten—then where does that kind of disregard stop? No Active Open Space will be safe, every parcel will be open to parking lot development because if the requirements are ignored for the first open space tract then it is even easier to ignore it for the second and subsequent tracts. Once you bulldoze the first principle, flattening the rest gets easier and easier. And just how will the neighbors feel when *their* slice of paradise is turned into overflow parking for somebody else's payroll? Perhaps portions of the open space tracts outlined in blue below will be the location of some of the Town's next parking lots:



Today it's OS-1R2. Tomorrow it's OS-OMG. Before long, every patch of open space will be fair game for four wheels and a cloud of dust.

Conclusion

On page 6 the Comp Plan states:

“A Comprehensive Plan is a guiding policy document. It provides goals and high level recommendations to help shape growth within a community by envisioning and planning future land use, transportation, infrastructure, utilities, natural resources, open space, and community facilities. It is a document that combines community vision with analysis, research, and best practices.”

Are we as a community going to live up to the goals and vision clearly established in our Comp Plan or are we simply going to pay lip service to them and approve a parking lot that is in no way consistent with any portion of the Comp Plan? Can any Town official look any member of this neighborhood in the eye and provide a legally sound explanation of how this application lives up to the goals and vision of the Comp Plan and meets the requirements of Section 17.4.14. D.1?

On page 29 of the Comp Plan it states:

“The Comprehensive Plan elements also intend to: 1. Provide a policy guide for Town Council, DRB and staff in evaluating certain development proposals.”

Nothing says residential tranquility like 33 dusty vehicles playing bumper cars on a gravel lot. The policy guide is clear; the proposed parking lot is in no way consistent with any portion of the Comp Plan. There appears to be no scenario in which the application meets the requirements of Section 17.4.14. D.1 or “is in general conformity with the policies of the principles, policies and actions set forth in the Comprehensive Plan” and, therefore, it should be denied.

We all moved to Mountain Village for the open space, the peace, the air you can actually breathe. Let's not trade that in for a gravel lot that kicks up dust and kicks out common sense.

This application doesn't meet the Plan. Doesn't meet the code. Doesn't meet the expectations of the neighbors. It shouldn't meet approval.

Let's protect our paradise before someone mistakes it for a parking lot.

END OF MEMORANDUM

Erin Howe

From: Dennis Dautel <ddautel@lusagroup.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 7:48 AM
To: planning
Subject: FW: Proposed Parking Lot
Attachments: 2025-7-1 Lots 122 and 123 and Tract OS-1R2 - Paved Paradise.docx


Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.



Dennis W. Dautel

CEO

Landscapes USA

 15123668501

 ddautel@lusagroup.com

 Landscapesusa.com

From: Dennis Dautel
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 8:37 AM
To: planning@mtnvillage.org
Cc: mprohaska@mtnvillage.org; spearson@mtnvillage.org; pduprey@mtnvillage.org; hmogenson@mtnvillage.org; tmagid@mtnvillage.org; hgoomez@mtnvillage.org; aarguelles@mtnvillage.org
Subject: Proposed Parking Lot

As a board member of See Forever and Mountain Village owner. I am in complete agreement with Andrew Czekaj. As he has sent this document too you on July 2.

My whole career has been making thing beautiful in the Landscape. This parking lot does just the opposite.

Additionally, my wife and I, our kids and grandkids use Country Club Drive to get to two major hiking trails. Boomerang and Jurasik. There are no sidewalks from MV core to these trails, yet they are used by many people every day not just my family. I see people all the time from my balcony. The additional traffic on these curves increases the likelihood of someone getting hit. Not to mention most employees of the Tell Skii are transient and are not going to be as careful as a MV homeowner who cares about the community.

There are other options available, maybe at a higher cost or less convenient to Tell Skii, but they do exist.

Please do not approve their application for the proposed parking lot.


Dennis Dautel



Dennis W. Dautel

CEO

Landscapes USA

 15123668501

 ddautel@lusagroup.com

 Landscapesusa.com

From: Anne Safdi <anne.safdi@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 1:50 PM
To: planning; Martinique Prohaska; Scott Pearson; Pete Duprey; Harvey Mogenson; Tucker Magid; Huascar (Rick) Gomez; aarguelles@mtnvillage.org
Subject: Opposition to TSG Parking Lot – From Resident of Country Club Drive

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Members of the Planning and Development Review Board and Town Council,

I'm writing as a homeowner and long-time resident of Country Club Drive to ask you to please **reject** TSG's application for a Conditional Use Permit for their proposed 33-space surface parking lot.

This proposal directly threatens the safety, character, and integrity of our single-family residential street. I want to highlight several critical reasons why this plan should not be approved—each of which shows it violates the intent of our zoning and the Town's own Comprehensive Plan.

1. Incompatible with Zoning and Comprehensive Plan Goals

Our street is specifically zoned for single-family residential use. That zoning isn't just a technicality—it reflects the town's commitment to maintaining a quiet, safe, family-friendly neighborhood with open space and low-density character.

The Town's Comprehensive Plan clearly states that development should **not reduce the quality of life for residents and visitors**, and should **preserve authentic small-town charm**. This proposed parking lot does neither.

Instead, it introduces a commercial-scale facility meant purely for employee parking, fundamentally changing the intended residential use of the area. It is simply not in "general conformity" with the Comprehensive Plan or the purpose of single-family zoning.

2. Safety Hazards on an Already Dangerous Street

Country Club Drive is a narrow, steep, winding road with a blind hairpin curve exactly where this lot is proposed. Crucially, there are **no sidewalks**. Our family—including my husband, children, and grandchildren—walks here regularly, and we have already experienced near-misses with vehicles coming around that curve at speed.

Adding 33 employee cars every day means dozens more trips in and out of a blind driveway, in all seasons, often in icy conditions. This is not hypothetical—it's an obvious recipe for accidents.

The Town's code requires that development **must not pose a substantial physical hazard**. This proposal clearly fails that standard.

3. Environmental and Aesthetic Damage to Residential Land

The plan calls for removing significant mature trees and grading over open space to install a dirt-surface parking lot. This isn't a minimal intervention—it's a transformation of natural, green space into an industrial-looking, dusty, and noisy facility directly in front of our homes.

More than 60% of the proposed disturbance area encroaches on designated open space. This is a direct violation of the intent and impact thresholds in §17.4.14 of the Municipal Code, which specifically says projects must **minimize adverse environmental and visual impacts**.

Turning that hillside into a parking lot will degrade the scenic quality of the neighborhood and permanently harm its natural character.

4. Negative Impact on Home Values and Neighborhood Character

This area was planned and zoned to be a single-family residential street. Paving over open space for a parking lot intended solely for outside employees destroys the quiet, peaceful character we all chose when we moved here.

No family wants to buy a home facing a commercial parking lot. The persistent noise, dust, headlights, and traffic will drive down property values and erode the residential appeal of our street.

The Town's review criteria require that any conditional use **must not have a significant adverse effect on adjacent properties**. This proposal would have an obviously significant negative impact on all surrounding homes.

5. Better Alternatives Already Exist

It's also important to remember this parking lot isn't necessary. There are already **two large parking structures** nearby that can handle employee parking without destroying residential open space.

Using a **shuttle service** from those existing structures would be a safer, smarter, and more sustainable approach. It would allow employees to park in designated commercial zones while protecting the integrity of our residential area.

This is the kind of thoughtful planning solution the Comprehensive Plan envisions—and it's clearly preferable to carving up residential land for an unnecessary parking lot.

Conclusion: Please Uphold Our Zoning and Planning Standards

This proposal is incompatible with single-family zoning. It's unsafe for pedestrians, destructive to open space, damaging to property values, and unnecessary given existing alternatives. It fails multiple

required criteria for a conditional use permit and violates the very planning principles Mountain Village claims to value.

I urge you in the strongest possible terms to protect our neighborhood, respect our zoning codes, and reject this application.

Thank you for your careful consideration of our family's concerns.

Anne Schlezinger

Erin Howe

From: Alan Safdi <alansafdi@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 2:05 PM
To: Martinique Prohaska; Scott Pearson; Pete Duprey; Harvey Mogenson; Tucker Magid; Huascar (Rick) Gomez; aarguelles@mtnvillage.org; planning; cd
Subject: Opposition to TSG's application for a Conditional Use Permit for a proposed 33-space surface parking lot

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Planning and Development Review Board and Town Council,

Thank you very much for taking the time to review public comments on this important issue. I truly appreciate your service and your commitment to protecting our community.

I am writing as a resident of Country Club Drive to formally and respectfully **oppose** TSG's application for a Conditional Use Permit for their proposed 33-space surface parking lot.

First, the proposal is fundamentally incompatible with our zoning and the Comprehensive Plan.

Our street is specifically zoned for single-family residential use, which exists to maintain a quiet, safe, low-density neighborhood character. Introducing a commercial employee parking lot is directly at odds with that intent.

The Town's Comprehensive Plan states that development must be **"in harmony with surrounding land uses"** and **"not reduce the quality of life for residents and visitors."** This project would do the opposite by replacing open space with a high-traffic, industrial-style parking facility right next to family homes.

Second, there are serious, well-documented safety risks that make this proposal unacceptable.

The planned lot would be accessed via a blind, narrow, hairpin curve on Country Club Drive that has **no sidewalks**. This stretch of road is already dangerous, and my wife, our kids, and our grandkids have personally experienced multiple *close calls* with speeding cars while simply walking here.

Adding dozens of daily employee vehicles will only **exacerbate** this danger. It is not hypothetical—it is a predictable and avoidable risk that would directly endanger residents, pedestrians, and cyclists.

The Town's own code for conditional uses (§17.4.14) specifically requires that any project **"must not pose a substantial physical hazard."** Approving this plan in its current form would knowingly violate that requirement.

Third, I want to highlight the legal implications of approving a known hazard.

If the Town grants a permit despite clear evidence of these dangers, it assumes responsibility for the foreseeable consequences. Any future accident involving a pedestrian or cyclist on that blind curve, especially one directly tied to increased traffic from this lot, could expose both the developer and the Town itself to liability.

This is not just a matter of planning policy—it is a question of legal duty of care. Approving a project that predictably creates an unsafe condition risks being seen as negligence.

Fourth, the project would cause significant environmental and aesthetic damage.

It would require removing mature trees, grading over open space, and replacing it with a dusty, noisy dirt lot. This contradicts the Comprehensive Plan’s clear requirement to **“minimize adverse environmental and visual impacts.”**

It would permanently harm the natural beauty and quiet residential atmosphere of our street—qualities the zoning was meant to protect.

Finally, there is a far better, more responsible alternative available.

There is an existing large parking structure nearby that could easily accommodate employee parking, supported by a simple shuttle service. This solution would fully meet employer needs while avoiding the safety hazards, zoning conflicts, environmental damage, and neighborhood disruption of this proposed lot.

Additionally, I want to emphasize that the proposal clearly fails to meet the Town’s own legal criteria for granting a conditional use permit under **§17.4.14.D of the Municipal Code**. That code requires that a conditional use:

- Be **“in general conformity” with the Comprehensive Plan** → *It is not.*
- Be **“in harmony” with surrounding land uses** → *It is not.*
- **Not pose a “substantial physical hazard”** → *It does.*
- **Avoid “significant adverse effect” on adjacent properties** → *It fails here.*
- **Minimize adverse environmental impacts** → *It exacerbates them.*

By these clear standards, this permit simply cannot be justified.

Thank you again for your careful consideration of my concerns and for your commitment to keeping our neighborhood safe, livable, and true to its intended single-family residential character.

Sincerely,

Erin Howe

From: Rhonda Safdi <helpmerhonda@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 2:06 PM
To: planning; Martinique Prohaska; Scott Pearson; Pete Duprey; Harvey Mogenson; Tucker Magid; Huascar (Rick) Gomez; aarguelles@mtnvillage.org
Subject: Please Reject Parking Lot Proposal on Country Club Drive

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Planning and Development Review Board and Town Council,

I'm writing to ask you to reject the proposed 33-space parking lot on Country Club Drive. Our neighborhood is zoned single-family residential for a reason—it's supposed to be a quiet, safe place for families to live.

Building a commercial employee parking lot here completely goes against that intent. It introduces daily traffic into a narrow, blind curve with no sidewalks, putting everyone—especially children and pedestrians—at serious risk. Our family has multiple small children.

This plan also conflicts with the Comprehensive Plan's promise not to reduce residents' quality of life and to keep development in harmony with surrounding land uses. Paving over open space for a dusty, noisy lot right next to homes is the opposite of what that policy is meant to achieve.

There are better, safer alternatives. Two large parking structures already exist nearby, and a shuttle from those locations would avoid damaging our street's character or endangering residents.

Please keep our single-family neighborhood safe and reject this proposal.

Thank you,
Rhonda Barkan

Erin Howe

From: Kathleen Howell <howell.kathleen.e@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 3, 2025 2:06 PM
To: cd
Subject: Opposition to Pending Development Application - OS-1R-2 Temporary TSG Parking Lot

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Council and DRB Members,

I am writing as a full-time resident, local worker, and Mountain Village homeowner to firmly oppose the plan to create a temporary TSG employee parking lot near our residence.

While I understand the challenges presented by the upcoming Four Seasons development and the potential loss of parking, clearing the open space in front of our home to make way for a temporary lot is not a suitable or sustainable solution. This proposal fails to address long-term needs, and instead, creates a short-term fix that causes irreversible harm to the surrounding environment and neighborhood character.

There are existing, viable alternatives for TSG employees to access the Mountain Village core, including the gondola and bus system, which offer more direct access to the core area than this proposed lot. It is only fair and appropriate that TSG staff utilize the same public transit options available to other businesses and residents. Creating an unnecessary temporary development for a small number of vehicles - when existing lots are often underutilized (as I observe daily) - is both inefficient and environmentally damaging.

Furthermore, this development would require the removal of mature trees near our home, degrading the natural beauty and open space that is a shared asset of our community. The visual and environmental impacts of this plan would extend far beyond our property, affecting numerous residents and property owners who value these protected spaces.

We are also deeply concerned about the safety implications. This proposed lot would increase pedestrian and vehicular traffic on a stretch of road that is already hazardous - there are no sidewalks, no ADA-accessible infrastructure, and the road is characterized by sharp turns and frequent speeding. Adding more traffic and access around a blind turn in this area puts both residents and visitors at greater risk.

Additionally, because there are no usable sidewalks, we anticipate a rise in pedestrian cut-through traffic across the See Forever property, which undermines privacy and disrupts the peaceful use of our community.

In summary, while the need for creative parking solutions is understandable, this proposal sets a troubling precedent for temporary development at the cost of our open space, safety, and community integrity. I urge the Council to reject this application and seek alternative solutions that align with long-term planning goals and community values.

Thank you for your service and your careful consideration.

Best,
Kathleen Howell

Erin Howe

From: Tom Keogh <thomas.keogh@corps-solutions.com>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:02 AM
To: cd; planning; Martinique Prohaska; Scott Pearson; Pete Duprey; Harvey Mogenson; Tucker Magid; Huascar (Rick) Gomez; aarguelles@mtnvillage.org
Cc: Jill Keogh
Subject: Opposition Letter to Telluride Ski and Golf LLC Class 4 Conditional Use Permit Request
Attachments: TELSKI Temporary Parking Lot Opposition_Letter_ICO Tom and Jill Keogh.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Members of the Mountain Village Design Review Board and Mountain Village Town Council;

Please find attached a letter from my wife and me opposing the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application submitted by Telluride Ski & Golf LLC for the creation of a temporary parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2.

As residents and homeowners at 184 Country Club Drive—directly across from the proposed site—we are extremely concerned about the significant safety, environmental, and quality-of-life impacts this proposal would have on our family and neighbors.

Our letter outlines five key reasons the CUP should be denied, all of which directly relate to the Mountain Village Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code §17.4.14.D.

Additionally, given the significant impact this conditional use permit will have on our family and property, both my wife Jill and I will be present for both hearings next week.

We appreciate your time and your commitment to preserving the character, safety, and integrity of Mountain Village.

Please don't hesitate to contact us if any further clarification is needed.

Warm regards,

Tom and Jill Keogh

CORPS SOLUTIONS

Thomas.keogh@corps-solutions.com

Cell (540) 623-8598

Fax (703) 891-9570

233 Garrisonville Rd, Ste 202

Stafford, VA 22554

Thomas and Jill Keogh

184 Country Club Drive

Mountain Village, CO 81435

Thomas.keogh@corps-solutions.com | 540-623-8598

Date: July 7, 2025

To:

Design Review Board and Town Council

Town of Mountain Village

Via Email: planning@mtnvillage.org

Subject: Opposition to Conditional Use Permit for Temporary Parking Lot on Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2

Dear Members of the Design Review Board and Town Council,

We are writing as residents and property owners directly across from the proposed temporary parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2. We strongly oppose Telluride Ski & Golf LLC's (TSG) application for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the establishment of a 33-space gravel-surfaced parking lot on these parcels.

While framed as a "temporary" solution to a parking loss, the proposal poses immediate and long-term threats to neighborhood safety, environmental quality, and the integrity of Mountain Village's Comprehensive Plan. I respectfully urge the Board and Council to deny the CUP based on the following five principal objections:

1. Safety and Traffic Hazards

The proposed lot would introduce daily traffic from dozens of vehicles onto a blind hairpin curve on Country Club Drive, a steep, narrow road lacking sidewalks or shoulder space. This route is heavily trafficked by families, cyclists, and hikers, many of whom walk along the road from the Meadows area to the Village Core.

With no traffic mitigation measures, signage plans, or formal pedestrian access routes, this lot would increase the risk of vehicle-pedestrian collisions, particularly during low-light hours in the winter season. The fact that no lighting is proposed further compounds the hazard. The placement of the lot directly across from our driveway raises specific safety concerns for our family and guests.

2. Environmental and Visual Degradation

The plan calls for extensive grading and vegetation removal in both the zoned lots and designated open space (Tract OS-1R2), with over 60% of the disturbed land occurring on open space. Despite claims of minimal impact, the removal of trees, increased dust, and sediment runoff will visibly and physically degrade the area.

The lack of paving—intended to signify the temporary nature—will actually lead to persistent dust clouds, mud, and noise, which will affect nearby homes, air quality, and the ecological integrity of the hillside and adjacent wetlands.

3. Non-Conformity with the Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code

The CUP application fails to meet the required findings under §17.4.14.D of the Mountain Village Municipal Code, specifically:

- Subsection (a): The parking lot is not in general conformity with the Comprehensive Plan.
- Subsection (b): The project is not harmonious with surrounding land uses.
- Subsection (c): The project does pose a substantial hazard.
- Subsection (d): The project will have significant adverse effects on surrounding property values.
- Subsection (e): It will significantly affect protected open space.
- Subsection (f): It does not minimize adverse environmental and visual impacts.

4. Impact on Quality of Life and Property Values

We purchased our home in Mountain Village to enjoy the peace, privacy, and beauty of a quiet residential enclave. The introduction of a utilitarian gravel parking lot across from our home will irreparably harm this character. This lot will be used primarily during ski season when traffic, noise, and dust levels are already elevated.

This project undermines the “high quality of life” promised by the Mountain Village Comprehensive Plan and threatens to lower property values.

5. The Fallacy of “Temporary” Use

TSG’s CUP application requests a 5-year term, but given the precedent of the ‘temporary’ surface lot near the pond that has existed for over 20 years, there is valid concern that this installation will become permanent in practice if not in name.

Approval of this application sets a precedent for further encroachment into Open Space parcels.

Conclusion: Preserve What Makes Mountain Village Unique

The Town's own Comprehensive Plan declares:


"Mountain Village is a vibrant, healthy town that provides a high quality of life and experiences for full-time and part-time residents and visitors."

Jill and I take this vision seriously. We ask our elected and appointed officials to do the same by rejecting this application, which undermines every element of that vision.

Mountain Village must not trade its open space, safety, and quiet charm for convenience or expediency. Please reject the CUP application for the proposed temporary parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2.

Thank you for your consideration and for your service to our community.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom and Jill Keogh". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style. The "T" is large and loops around the "K". The "J" is also large and loops around the "K". The "Keogh" part is written in a more standard cursive script.

Tom and Jill Keogh
Homeowner, 184 Country Club Drive
Mountain Village, CO 81435

Erin Howe

From: Bill Bock <wmgbock@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 9:50 AM
To: planning
Subject: Conditional Use Permit - Temporary Parking Lot

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

I am writing to the Town of Mountain Village to express my opposition to granting Telluride Ski & Golf the Conditional Use Permit they seek to build a temporary parking lot on Country Club Drive. I am William G. Bock. My wife, Cynthia L. Bock, and I own a See Forever Village cabin located at 158 Country Club Drive.

Our property is directly across the street from the proposed parking lot. We presently enjoy a view of Mount Wilson, rising above a grove of aspen. Imagine our reaction to looking out on this parking lot in the future. You are hearing from other neighbors voicing concerns about traffic, safety, loss of open space, and numerous additional objections. All are valid.

But I wish to emphasize one primary reason to reject this Conditional Use Permit. It does not comply with the Criteria for such a permit as required by the governing Comprehensive Plan for Mountain Village. The Town Council and Design Review Board may follow the existing procedures and decline the request on this basis. It is simply sufficient.

Sincerely,
Bill

Erin Howe

From: Aiden Keogh <aiden.s.keogh@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 11:45 AM
To: cd; planning; Martinique Prohaska; Scott Pearson; Pete Duprey; Harvey Mogenson; Tucker Magid; Huascar (Rick) Gomez; aarguelles@mtnvillage.org
Subject: Opposition Letter to Telluride Ski and Golf LLC Class 4 Conditional Use Permit Request
Attachments: Opposition_Letter_Aiden_Keogh.pdf

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Members of the Mountain Village Design Review Board and Town Council:

Attached is a letter I have written to formally oppose the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application submitted by Telluride Ski & Golf LLC for the creation of a temporary parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2.

As someone whose family owns the home directly across from the proposed site, I have serious concerns about the safety, environmental, and long-term community impacts of this proposal. I've outlined these concerns in the attached letter, and I hope you'll take them into account as you review the application.

Thank you for your time and dedication to protecting the character and safety of Mountain Village.

Very Respectfully,

Aiden Keogh

Undergraduate in Computer Science

Virginia Tech Engineering

aiden.s.keogh@gmail.com | aidenk@vt.edu

Aiden Keogh

c/o Keogh Family Residence @ 184 Country Club Drive

Mountain Village, CO 81435

aiden.s.keogh@gmail.com | (540) 604-7837

Date: July 7, 2025

To:

Design Review Board and Town Council

Town of Mountain Village

Via Email: planning@mtnvillage.org

Subject: Opposition to Conditional Use Permit – Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2

Dear Members of the Design Review Board and Town Council,

My name is Aiden Keogh, and I am writing to express my strong opposition to Telluride Ski & Golf LLC's application for a Conditional Use Permit to install a so-called "temporary" parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2.

I'm reaching out with deep concern about how this proposed development would affect my family's home on Country Club Drive. We have been traveling frequently to our house in Mountain Village for about six years now, and we've come to love the community and surrounding areas greatly. It's more than just a destination, but rather something that we look forward to year after year and a space where we've built memories.

The proposed parking lot, located directly across from our driveway, threatens the safety, character, and environmental integrity of the community. I'd like to share my perspective on three areas that are important to me: safety, environmental and wildlife impact, and the preservation of community character.

1. Safety

Country Club Drive is very clearly not designed to support high volumes of traffic. It is narrow and winding, with a lack of sidewalks. In the winter, even with light traffic, it is scary to navigate considering the weather conditions. If the proposal were to pass, this would add dozens of employee vehicles near a very sharp and blind curve, which would make it significantly more dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists, and current community members who drive this road, especially during peak ski season.

Personally, I walk this road almost every time I head to the Village Core. Nine times out of ten, I am making that walk rather than driving. The idea of having to navigate the already dangerous road, with increased traffic, especially with potentially careless employees who

are unfamiliar with the area, genuinely worries me. This change would compromise the safety of not only my family, but also every resident and visitor who would use this road on foot or by car.

2. Environmental and Wildlife Impact

One of my favorite things about our home is looking out the window and seeing deer, birds, rabbits, and the occasional fox in the wooded area across the street in the location of the proposed lot. This area is more than just a patch of trees; it's an active habitat. Paving it over with gravel, even though it is claimed to be temporary, will remove trees and permanently alter the landscape, and discourage the animals from returning.

Beyond that, the grading and clearing would increase dust, runoff, and erosion. As I mentioned before, even though it is labeled as "temporary," this damage would be long-lasting. I know Mountain Village values conservation and stewardship of the land, and I believe this proposal runs counter to those principles. Once that space is disrupted, we can't simply put it back the way it was.

3. Protecting the Character of the Community


We chose Mountain Village because of the way it balances human life and nature, and because of how thoughtful development and conservation exist side by side. Replacing trees with cars in the middle of a quiet residential area doesn't feel thoughtful. It feels like a shortcut, made at the expense of the people who live here and the environment we cherish.

Even if this project is labeled "temporary," its consequences will linger. What worries me just as much as this individual proposal is what it represents. These small decisions, if made incrementally, could shape the future of the village, for the worse. I want to keep returning here in the years ahead and feel the same sense of peace, quiet, and connection to nature. I don't want to watch those values be slowly replaced by noise, traffic, and gravel lots.

I am very grateful for the work that you do in shaping the future of this town, and I don't take that responsibility lightly. I ask you to please consider the safety, environmental, and quality-of-life implications this project brings, not just for my family, but for the broader community, and to vote to deny the conditional use permit.

Thank you for your time and your service to the community.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Aiden Keogh', with a long horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

Aiden Keogh

July 7, 2025

Mountain Village Town Council
455 Mountain Village Blvd.
Mountain Village, CO 81435

Subject: OPPOSITION to Proposed Parking Lot on Lot 122/123

Dear Council Members,

As a homeowner at See Forever Village and a resident of Mountain Village for the past 14 years, I'm writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed construction of a gravel parking lot on Lot 122/123 along Country Club Road.

One of the reasons I chose to live in Mountain Village—and specifically in See Forever—is because of the tranquility, natural beauty, and thoughtful planning that define this community. The introduction of a gravel parking lot directly adjacent to my neighborhood would significantly diminish that environment. Even without lighting, a dusty gravel lot does not align with the values of open space, forest preservation, and scenic mountain character. This is not what I—or others—moved here for.

Mountain Village's unique charm lies in the harmony between carefully considered development and the preservation of nature. The Town's master plan reflects this balance, and it's a major reason why Mountain Village feels so different from other ski towns. Cutting down trees to create a surface parking lot should be held to the highest level of scrutiny. It is the exact opposite of the aesthetic and vision that make Mountain Village special.

Additionally, **the proposed lot will be clearly visible from the Gondola** traveling between the Village Core and the Market. Instead of showcasing trees, trails, or mountain views, this change would introduce an unattractive gravel lot into the landscape experienced by both residents and visitors. That is not the impression we should be creating for anyone arriving or leaving the Village.

I'm also deeply concerned about pedestrian safety. I regularly walk along Country Club Road to access the Boomerang and Jurassic trailheads, and I've long been uneasy about the blind curves, narrow shoulders, and lack of a walkway—especially in winter, when snow and ice make the road even more dangerous. Adding daily traffic from 33 additional cars will only compound these risks. Without a proper pedestrian path, we are simply asking for an accident.

While the proposal calls the parking lot "temporary," it is approved for five years—**and we all know how often "temporary" becomes permanent.** Unless a hotel addition is built on the site, I find it hard to believe that the gravel lot would ever be removed or that the trees and green space would be fully restored.

I also question the need for this lot in the first place. The parking lot currently located where the Four Seasons is set to be built—which this proposal is intended to replace—has rarely had more than a handful of cars in it at any given time. I've walked through that area for many years on my way to the Gondola and have consistently observed it as underutilized. **Creating a new lot to replace a barely-used**

one feels both unnecessary and unjustifiable—especially when the environmental and safety costs are so high.

I understand the importance of the Four Seasons and Six Senses developments to the Town's future, but I urge the Council not to let their progress come at the expense of pedestrian safety, environmental integrity, and the visual identity of Mountain Village. This parking lot was not part of the approved plan, and for good reason.

Please do not approve this permit. I respectfully ask that you consider alternative solutions that maintain the spirit, safety, and beauty of Mountain Village.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "RSC" or similar, with a stylized flourish at the end.

Bob Gutermuth

Homeowner at See Forever Village, Unit GL101
14-Year Resident of Mountain Village
Bob@DialogGroup.com

Erin Howe

From: brianna burckhalter <briannacb1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 3:15 PM
To: cd; planning; Martinique Prohaska; Scott Pearson; Pete Duprey; Harvey Mogenson; Tucker Magid; Huascar (Rick) Gomez; Alline Arguelles
Subject: Opposition Letter to Telluride Ski and Golf LLC Class 4 Conditional Use Permit Request
Attachments: opposition letter.pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Members of the Mountain Village Design Review Board and Mountain Village Town Council;

Please find attached a letter from me opposing the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application submitted by Telluride Ski & Golf LLC for the creation of a temporary parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2.

As residents and homeowners at 184 Country Club Drive—directly across from the proposed site—we are extremely concerned about the significant safety, environmental, and quality-of-life impacts this proposal would have on our family and neighbors.

Our letter outlines three key reasons the CUP should be denied, all of which directly relate to the Mountain Village Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code §17.4.14.D.

We appreciate your time and your commitment to preserving the character, safety, and integrity of Mountain Village.
Brianna Burckhalter

Dear Members of the Design Review Board and Town Council,

My name is Brianna Burckhalter, and I'm writing with sincere respect for the work you do and deep appreciation for the special character of Mountain Village. I'd like to express my concern about Telluride Ski & Golf LLC's application for a Conditional Use Permit to install a "temporary" parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2.

My family owns a home directly across from this proposed site. As someone who frequently returns to Mountain Village to spend time with my family, reconnect with nature, and find peace in this truly unique setting, I feel strongly about protecting the qualities that make this place so meaningful to residents and visitors alike.

1. Safety Should Be a Priority

Country Club Drive is narrow, steep, and without sidewalks. Adding a significant number of vehicles to this stretch—especially near a blind curve—poses a real safety concern for pedestrians, cyclists, and families. My loved ones and I regularly walk this road, and it's difficult to imagine how this proposal wouldn't increase the risk of accidents, particularly during the busy ski season. I hope the town will continue to prioritize safety in all planning decisions.

2. Environmental and Visual Impacts

The natural landscape in this area is beautiful, and it contributes so much to the peaceful atmosphere we all treasure. Removing trees, grading the land, and introducing gravel surfacing would permanently alter this space. I worry about the environmental effects—such as dust, runoff, and habitat disruption—as well as the visual change to what is now open, scenic land. Mountain Village has long held conservation and sustainability as core values, and I trust those principles will help guide your decision.

3. Preserving the Spirit of the Community

What brings so many of us back to Mountain Village is its sense of calm, its views, and its thoughtful balance between nature and development. A large gravel parking lot in this location would not only diminish property values but also the day-to-day experience of those who live and spend time nearby. It would change the character of a neighborhood that so many of us cherish.

I truly believe this proposal doesn't align with the vision outlined in the Comprehensive Plan—especially in terms of neighborhood harmony, safety, and stewardship of the land. I respectfully urge the Board and Council to consider the long-term impact and protect the beauty, safety, and spirit of Mountain Village for current residents and for future generations.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful service to our community.

Warm regards,
Brianna Burckhalter

Erin Howe

From: Carlotta Horn <carlotta482@mindspring.com>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 3:19 PM
To: Martinique Prohaska; planning; Scott Pearson; Pete Duprey; Harvey Mogenson; Tucker Magid; Huascar (Rick) Gomez; aarguelles@mtnvillage.org; John Horn
Subject: Proposed parking lot on Country Club Dr.

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

July 7, 2025

Dear Council Members,

Unfortunately, no one anticipated the potential problems caused by the hair pin turns on Country Club Dr., especially for pedestrians who tend to walk on the pavement. Also unfortunate, is that there has been no designated sidewalk for pedestrians to get them off the road and out of the way of vehicles.

Over the years traffic of all types has increased, especially in the summer. Added recently, are construction trucks of all sizes. Now the proposal to add a parking lot with access off one of those turns will add more traffic to an already existing problem.

I also believe that the quality of life of the residents living closest to the lot will be affected by the coming and going of a relatively large group of cars. These homes will experience more noise and increased activity in what is a normally quiet neighborhood.

Finally, I understand that there is pressure for more parking, but could it be placed somewhere that is not residential? A parking lot is unsightly and does not fit in to the general feel of a residential neighborhood. Let's keep residential, residential.

Thank you for your consideration.

Carlotta Horn, 261 Country Club Dr.

I am writing in opposition to the proposed parking lot on Lot 122/123. As a resident of See Forever Village, I value the peace and beauty of Mountain Village and the proposed gravel parking lot between us and our beautiful views of Wilson Peak will be marred by dust and increased traffic. There are also safety issues, with increased cars on the street in front of our unit, a street we use frequently to access hiking trails. This is a narrow road, with several blind corners that are already treacherous without sidewalks, but will be made much more dangerous with the increased traffic. The increased needs for parking should have been anticipated by Town Council when they approved construction of two new large hotels in our immediate area. The proposed gravel parking lot does nothing to address this much larger problem and will only degrade our quality of life.

For these reasons, I am opposed to this new gravel parking lot. It is not the solution.

Sincerely,

Cary Savage

See Forever Unit 4-133

From: Cindy Harrington <drskin13@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 7:22 PM
To: planning
Subject: Opposition to TSG Conditional Use Permit – Parking Lot on Country Club Drive

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Mountain Village Planning Department,

I am writing as a concerned homeowner of Mountain Village to express my strong opposition to the proposed Conditional Use Permit submitted by TSG to build a 33-space surface parking lot within the first elbow of the S-curves on Country Club Drive, between the See Forever Cabins and the residences of Dr. Alan Safdi and Dr. Harlan Waksal.

While I understand the need for employee parking solutions, this particular proposal is ill-conceived and inconsistent with the values and goals of the Mountain Village Comprehensive Plan. I respectfully request that both the DRB and Town Council deny the application for the following reasons:

1. Inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan makes clear that development should preserve the natural character of our neighborhoods and should not reduce the quality of life for residents. A dusty, noisy surface parking lot located in a scenic residential corridor is fundamentally at odds with this vision. There is no indication that this area was ever intended for high-traffic, high-impact uses such as this.

2. Adverse Impact on Neighborhood Character

The proposed lot is surrounded on three sides by single-family homes and adjacent to sensitive wetland areas. A parking lot designed exclusively for TSG employee vehicles will introduce industrial-level activity and traffic into an otherwise quiet and serene residential setting. The incompatibility of the use with the surrounding neighborhood is clear and will likely result in a reduction of resident satisfaction.

3. Environmental and Visual Degradation

The plans show that over 60% of the disturbed area falls within open space. This includes the removal of existing trees and vegetation, grading, and the creation of a dirt-surface parking lot. Such development not only negatively affects the local ecology and aesthetics but also violates the intent of preserving Mountain Village's open space and visual quality.

4. Safety and Traffic Concerns

Country Club Drive is a narrow, winding road that already poses significant safety concerns due to its blind curves and lack of sidewalks. Introducing 33 additional daily vehicle trips (at a minimum) will increase the risk to pedestrians, cyclists, and local traffic—especially during the winter months when road conditions are already precarious.

5. Precedent for Permanent Use

Although the application suggests a temporary five-year use, history demonstrates that such uses often become long-term fixtures. The temporary employee lot in the Village Core has existed for over two decades. We are concerned that if approved, this lot could similarly remain in place indefinitely.

6. Failure to Minimize Environmental and Visual Impacts

Rather than proposing any meaningful mitigation or alternative solutions, the current plan maximizes environmental degradation. It does not demonstrate serious consideration for minimizing visual or environmental harm, which is a required standard under Section 17.4.14.D of the Town Code.

In conclusion, while we support the continued growth and operation of our community's businesses, it must not come at the expense of the neighborhood's safety, tranquility, and environmental integrity. We urge the Town to consider alternative locations more appropriate for employee parking that align with the long-term vision of Mountain Village.

Thank you for your time,

Sincerely,

Cynthia Harrington

117 Sunny Ridge Place, Unit 131, Mountain Village, CO 81435

214-404-8293

drskin13@gmail.com

Erin Howe

From: Cindy Lange <cindy@thelanges.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 11:37 AM
To: planning
Subject: Proposed Parking Lot on Lots 122 and 123 and Tract OS-1R2

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Design Review Board
Town Council
Town of Mountain Village
Via email

I strongly oppose the proposed parking lot on Lots 122 & 123 and Tract OS-1R2. I ask you not to approve this.

I have read John Horn's comprehensive analysis of this project and stand in complete agreement with him. His points and observations are all valid. Our family has driven Country Club Road for the last 25 years to and from our home. This location has always been a stretch of road that isn't very safe and requires one to proceed cautiously while watching out for people, pets, bicycle riders, cars and trucks. With the already approved development further down the road, things will only get worse and become more dangerous. Please don't add to this situation by approving this proposal.

This is an ill-conceived proposal. Please consider its negative impact to the homeowners directly across the road. Surely those responsible can invest the time and find a better solution. Are you really o.k. with wiping out all those trees (probably between 50 and 100) and replacing them with 33 parking spaces in an ugly, dusty or muddy parking lot? This is not a positive or environmentally-friendly addition to the area. Rather, it is detrimental and will have a negative impact on air quality, the scenic views and property values.

This application does not meet the requirements of the Comprehensive Plan. Please do not approve this proposal.

Thank you for your consideration,

Cindy Lange
248 Country Club Drive
317-407-1151

Design Review Board
Town of Mountain Village
455 Mountain Village Blvd.
Mountain Village, CO 81435

Subject: Opposition to Conditional Use Permit for Temporary Gravel Parking Lot (Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2)

Date:05 July 2025

Dear Members of the Design Review Board,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Conditional Use Permit for the temporary gravel surface parking lot submitted by Telluride Ski & Golf (TSG), to be located on Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2 adjacent to the Peaks Resort and Spa.

As an annual client of the property at 184 Country Club Drive, where I spend two or more weeks each year, I have a deep appreciation for the unique character and carefully maintained aesthetic of the Mountain Village Core. The pedestrian-oriented design, clean air, and tranquil alpine setting are what draw me—and many others—back year after year.

I have been working with the environmental conservation community for well over three decades and in my current role at The Pew Charitable Trusts, an environmental NGO, I have had the opportunity to study and evaluate numerous development projects across the country. I've seen firsthand how so-called "temporary" infrastructure—particularly gravel lots—often becomes semi-permanent, with long-lasting impacts on the surrounding environment. Once land is cleared and compacted for vehicle use, it becomes significantly more difficult and costly to restore. Trees and native vegetation cannot regrow at the pace of development, and once the ecological integrity of a site is compromised, it is often used as justification for continued or expanded use.

This proposal is not just a visual and experiential degradation of the Village Core—it is an environmental risk. Gravel lots contribute to dust pollution, runoff, and habitat disruption. They also invite more vehicle traffic into an area that was intentionally designed to be car-free, undermining the purpose of the gondola system and the community's long-standing commitment to reducing emissions and congestion.

The short-term financial benefit to TSG from increased patronage does not outweigh the long-term costs to the community's environment, aesthetics, and quality of life. I urge the Design Review Board to reject this application and work with TSG to find solutions that align with the values and vision of Mountain Village.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely,

Daniel Schaeffer

Senior Manager

The Pew Charitable Trusts

& Annual guest at 184 Country Club Drive

dschaeffer@pewtrusts.org

Erin Howe

From: Diana Grubbs <dgrubbs44@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 12:06 AM
To: planning
Cc: Diana Grubbs
Subject: Conditional Use Permit for Parking Lot on Country Club Drive

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

July 8, 2025

From: Diana Grubbs
236 Country Club Dr
Mountain Village, CO 81435

To: Design Review Board
Town Council
455 Mountain Village Blvd. Ste. A
Mountain Village, CO 81435

VIA EMAIL

Re: Lots 122 and 123 and Tract OS-1R2 – TSG’s Application for a Conditional Use Permit for a Temporary Parking Lot

Dear Members of the Design Review Board:

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the Special Use Permit application currently under consideration.

I do not believe this proposal aligns with the standards or values of the Mountain Village community. The proposed use is incompatible with the surrounding single-family and multi-family residential character of the area. Furthermore, the development would require clear-cutting the lot—a fact that has not been adequately disclosed or addressed.

There is no plan for pedestrian access or improvements to support such access. This is particularly troubling given the nature and scale of the proposed use. TSG has been aware of this need since they sold their existing lot several years ago. The delay in addressing this need should not justify the imposition of the ill-suited development of an employee parking lot in a residential setting.

Also important to note, the proposed use offers no discernible public benefit. It serves private operational needs without offering amenities, access, or value to the broader community.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Design Review Board to deny the Special Use Permit application.

Sincerely,

Diana Grubbs

MAD Investments Group, LLC

(408) 656-1528

Design Review Board
Town of Mountain Village
455 Mountain Village Blvd.
Mountain Village, CO 81435

Subject: Opposition to Conditional Use Permit for Temporary Gravel Parking Lot (Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2)

Date: 07 July 2025

Dear Members of the Design Review Board,

As an avid outdoor enthusiast and frequent visitor to Mountain Village, I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Conditional Use Permit for a temporary gravel parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2.

Mountain Village has always stood out to me as a rare gem among mountain destinations—where the built environment complements the natural one, and where the pedestrian-friendly Core allows residents and visitors to immerse themselves in the alpine setting without the intrusion of cars and traffic. This harmony between nature and thoughtful design is what draws me back year after year.

The proposed gravel parking lot would severely disrupt that balance. It would introduce a stark, utilitarian feature into a space that should remain welcoming, walkable, and visually cohesive. The dust, noise, and increased vehicle presence would degrade the outdoor experience—not just for those staying nearby, but for anyone who values the tranquility and beauty of the Village Core.

As someone who chooses Mountain Village specifically for its commitment to sustainability, clean air, and a car-free lifestyle, I find this proposal deeply disappointing. It runs counter to the very principles that make this place special. The gondola system was designed to reduce vehicle traffic and promote a healthier, more connected community. Approving this parking lot would be a step backward.

If this project moves forward, it would seriously impact my decision to return in the future. I urge the Board to protect the integrity of Mountain Village's outdoor and pedestrian experience by rejecting this proposal.

Sincerely,

Elaina Stanton

Outdoor enthusiast and frequent visitor to Mountain Village

Stantonbunch2@yahoo.com

Erin Howe

From: George Barutha <gbarutha@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 10:24 AM
To: planning
Subject: Country club parking lot

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

I am the owner of a house at 255 CC Dr . I am NOT in favor of a parking lot at your proposed location. Thank you,George Barutha .

Daniel Alvarado, AICP

From: Hillary G. McCall <hillarygmccall@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 2:54 PM
To: planning
Subject: Opposition to Conditional Use Permit for Parking Lot

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Planners,

My name is Hillary McCall and I am a resident of Country Club Drive. I am writing to express my strongest opposition to the Conditional Use Permit application submitted by Telluride Ski & Golf (TSG) to construct a 33-space employee parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2.

I'm writing to you today as a concerned resident about the proposed parking lot. While I understand the need for employee parking, my primary concern, and one I believe many of my neighbors share, is the safety of our families and friends who use our local roads daily.

Specifically, my worry centers on the planned access point for this lot. It's located on that particularly steep and blind section of the hairpin curve on Country Club Drive. As you know, there's no sidewalk along that stretch. This road is heavily used by so many members of our community – children walking or biking, hikers heading to the trails, and other neighbors simply out for a stroll.

Adding the daily coming and going of potentially 33 employees' vehicles right at that hazardous spot, on a road that's already challenging, seems like it would create a substantial physical hazard.

Speaking personally, I have two children who are frequently out on this road. The road is already quite dangerous without the added traffic this parking lot would create. The thought of increased traffic volume on that blind curve, where visibility is already poor, is genuinely frightening.

I truly hope the council will consider these safety implications very carefully before moving forward.

This proposal fails to meet the Town's criteria for a Conditional Use Permit. I urge you to please deny this application. I plan to attend the upcoming public hearings to express my concerns in person.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Hillary McCall

245 Country Club Drive, Unit C Resident, Town of Mountain Village

Daniel Alvarado, AICP

From: Jason Hannah <jason@dickhannah.com>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 7:44 PM
To: cd
Subject: Peaks parking lot

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

We wanted to let you know that we oppose the parking lot for all the same reasons other homeowners along Country Club Drive do.

Thank you,

Jason and Maggie Hannah
166 Country Club Drive

Jason Hannah
Director
Dick Hannah Dealerships
Desk 360-944-3372 Ext. 3372

dickhannah.com



We care about your security and privacy. Please do not send any sensitive personal information or any other non-public information by email. Ask one of our team members how to best share sensitive information.

Dear Town Council,

I have lived part time in Mountain Village for over 10 years. Since I purchased a unit at See Forever Village, I have seen the town of Mountain Village go through many changes and many of those changes haven't been positive for the quality of life I originally sought out when I decided to invest in real estate in the Telluride area. I was recently very disappointed when I learned of yet another request to permit a gravel lot as a temporary solution that does nothing to address the long term parking problem. I am opposed to the gravel parking lot addition on lot 122/1232 located on Country Club Drive in Mountain Village.

How is it possible to approve a 5 star hotel chain and not consider the parking needs of the TSG employees? The original approval process for these new hotels was the proper time to preemptively address the long standing parking issues in Mountain Village. This temporary patch does nothing to address the underlying lack of parking for TSG employees. However, adding a parking lot on a blind corner without a walkway and removing lush aspen trees seems to be the worst idea from a safety & aesthetic standpoint. Why wasn't the Telluride Golf Club current parking area ever considered as an option? I understand the need for growth and change, but I don't understand why the people who work in Mountain Village aren't a priority when the development decisions were made. It is my fear that if tax revenue continues to be the priority over quality of life, the original beauty of Telluride and Mountain Village CO may be lost.

Sincerely,

Jodi Earley

Owner, See Forever Village 4-133

Erin Howe

From: John Kritser <johnk@yhmc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 3:43 PM
To: planning
Subject: Parking lot on Country Club Dr

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear planning committee,

We strongly object to the dirt/gravel parking lot on Country Club Dr. We have strong reservations about it being temporary and this does not fit our neighborhood. It would be a tragedy to approve this parking lot. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

John and Nancy Kritser
192 Country Club Dr.

Erin Howe

From: Joseph Keogh <joseph.keogh97@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 3:26 PM
To: cd; planning; Martinique Prohaska; Scott Pearson; Pete Duprey; Harvey Mogenson; Tucker Magid; Huascar (Rick) Gomez; Alline Arguelles
Subject: Opposition to CUP Application for Temporary Parking Lot – Lots 122, 123, OS-1R2
Attachments: Opposition_Letter_Joseph Keogh.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Members of the Mountain Village Design Review Board and Town Council,

Attached is a letter from my wife and me opposing Telluride Ski & Golf LLC's Conditional Use Permit application for a temporary parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2.

As homeowners at 184 Country Club Drive—directly across from the proposed site—we are deeply concerned about the serious safety, environmental, and quality-of-life impacts this project would impose on our family and neighbors.

Our letter outlines specific reasons why this CUP should be denied, each grounded in the standards outlined in the Mountain Village Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code §17.4.14.D.

Thank you for your time and for your commitment to protecting the safety, character, and integrity of our community. Please feel free to reach out if you have any questions or would like additional information.

Warm regards,
Joseph and Harriet Keogh

Design Review Board and Town Council
Town of Mountain Village
Via Email: planning@mtnvillage.org

Subject: Opposition to Conditional Use Permit – Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2

To the Design Review Board and Town Council,

My name is Joseph Keogh, and I'm writing to strongly oppose Telluride Ski & Golf LLC's application for a Conditional Use Permit to install a so-called "temporary" parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2—directly across from my family's home.

My opposition centers on one critical issue: **safety**.

Country Club Drive is not designed to handle this. It's steep, narrow, and lacks sidewalks. The proposed lot would funnel dozens of employee vehicles onto a blind hairpin turn—dramatically increasing the risk to pedestrians, cyclists, and local residents. As someone who regularly walks, bikes, and drives this road, I can tell you: it's already dangerous. Adding more traffic—especially during peak ski season—puts people in real jeopardy.

The road conditions make visibility poor and reaction times short. In winter, with snowbanks narrowing the road further, the situation becomes even more hazardous. We're not talking about a minor inconvenience—we're talking about a scenario where someone could get seriously hurt.

This isn't just a personal concern—it's a community one. My future kids will walk this road. Other families do now. It's simply unacceptable to introduce this level of risk for the sake of overflow parking.

Mountain Village has built its reputation on being a safe, family-friendly, and thoughtful community. Approving this application would be a step in the wrong direction—prioritizing short-term convenience over long-term safety.

I urge you to reject this permit on the grounds that it creates an unnecessary and unacceptable safety hazard. Thank you for your time and for your service to the community.

Sincerely,
Joseph Keogh

Joseph and Harriet Keogh

c/o Keogh Residence @ 184 Country Club Drive

Mountain Village, CO 81435

Joseph.keogh97@gmail.com, 540-207-9153

Date: July 7, 2025

Erin Howe

From: Kevin Denman <kcdenman@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 2:47 PM
To: planning
Subject: Opposition to Conditional Use Permit for Parking Lot

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Planners,

My name is Kevin Denman and I am a resident of Country Club Drive. I am writing to express my strongest opposition to the Conditional Use Permit application submitted by Telluride Ski & Golf (TSG) to construct a 33-space employee parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2.

My primary concern is the safety of my family and neighbors. The proposed access point is on a steep, blind section of a hairpin curve on Country Club Drive that has no sidewalk. Adding daily traffic from 33 employees would create a "substantial physical hazard" for the many children, hikers, and bikers who use this road.

This proposal is entirely out of character with our neighborhood. A noisy, dusty, unpaved parking lot is not "in harmony and compatible with surrounding land uses," which consist of single-family homes. It would have a substantial adverse impact on adjacent properties and the community's residential character.

This proposal fails to meet the Town's criteria for a Conditional Use Permit. I urge you to please deny this application. I plan to attend the upcoming public hearings to express my concerns in person.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Kevin Denman
245 Country Club Drive, Unit C, Mountain Village, 81435
Resident, Town of Mountain Village

Daniel Alvarado, AICP

From: Kristen Lange <klange892@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 2:44 PM
To: planning
Subject: TSG Parking Lot application - Kristen Lange - oppose

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

To: Design Review Board
Town Council
Town of Mountain Village
(Via email)

I request you to not approve the proposed parking lot on Lots 122 & 123 and Tract OS-1R2.

I, too, endorse John Horn's comprehensive review that notes the flaws of this proposal.

My father, Sandy Lange, also sent a detailed summary, all of which I agree with as well.

My main concern, as a mother with a young daughter, is safety. The increased traffic and desired location for the parking lot will undoubtedly create a very unsafe situation on a road with challenging curves that I commonly see people walking (+ with their dogs) and biking on. I enjoy walking / running on this road as well...it has changed a lot in the 25+ years we have had a home on Country Club Drive...this application, if approved, would be very concerning to me.

With how high the property taxes are becoming, as a property owner, you would hope that development enhances property values over time as well. This one unfortunately does the opposite, specifically for the homeowners directly across from this.

Please give it further thought and decide upon a better, safer location for this lot or an alternative mode of getting this transportation accomplished (shuttle, etc.)

Thank you for your consideration.

--

Kristen Lange

Cell: [\(317\) 752-2204](tel:3177522204)
Email: klange892@gmail.com

Daniel Alvarado, AICP

From: Lisa Boyce <lisaandboyce@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 11:49 AM
To: planning; Martinique Prohaska; Scott Pearson; Pete Duprey; Harvey Mogenson; Tucker Magid; Huascar (Rick) Gomez; aarguelles@mtnvillage.org
Subject: Opposition to Proposed Parking Lot on Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Mountain Village Town Council Members,

I hope this message finds you well. I'm writing to respectfully express my strong opposition to any proposal to convert Lots 122 and 123 and Tract OS-1R2 into a parking lot.

Prior to constructing our residence on Country Club Drive, we frequently stayed at The Peaks Hotel. Upon making room reservations, I was quoted varying rates, with rooms facing the golf course invariably commanding a premium price compared to those overlooking the front parking lot of the hotel. This disparity is readily apparent, as parking lots are generally considered unsightly and unattractive. Consequently, I believe that replacing the aspen grove green area with a parking lot would result in a significant decline in our property values, as parking lots are aesthetically unappealing. Furthermore, I anticipate that this parking lot would impose a burden on all residents, as they would be perpetually confronted with an unattractive expanse of vehicles for their view. We all relocated to Mountain Village for the lush green beauty of the mountains and to live in close proximity to nature. This proposed parking lot is utterly incongruous with the natural beauty and surroundings that we all cherish and that we all should protect and preserve.

As you know, these parcels, particularly Tract OS-1R2, serve as valuable open space that contributes significantly to the ecological, visual, and recreational character of Mountain Village. Putting a parking lot would not only disrupt natural habitats and increase surface runoff but also contradict the very principles of sustainable development and environmental stewardship that define our community.

Moreover, replacing open space with a parking lot would:

- Diminish the scenic charm that residents and visitors alike cherish,
- Introduce more vehicle traffic, noise, and light pollution into nearby neighborhoods,
- Pose risks to pedestrians and cyclists who rely on adjacent trails, and

- Set a troubling precedent for the future use of protected open space.

Telluride Mountain Village has long been admired for its innovative approach to transportation, particularly the gondola system and commitment to walkability. Rather than expanding parking infrastructure at the expense of natural areas, I urge the Council to explore more forward-thinking solutions such as enhanced transit options, remote parking with efficient connections, or improved wayfinding for existing lots.

Perhaps most importantly, converting this land undermines years of thoughtful land-use planning and public input. These open space designations were not accidental; they reflect our community's deep-rooted values and vision for a livable, sustainable mountain town.

I respectfully ask that you consider the long-term impacts of this proposal and reject any initiative that would turn these lots into a parking facility.

Thank you for your time and continued service to our community.

Warm regards,

Lisa Boyce
253 Country Club Drive
lisaandboyce@yahoo.com

From: Michael Harrington <harrington.m@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 7:27 PM
To: planning
Subject: Opposition to Proposed TSG Employee Parking Lot on Country Club Drive

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Planning Staff and Town Leaders,

I am writing to formally oppose the Conditional Use Permit application submitted by TSG to construct a 33-space surface parking lot on Country Club Drive, near the S-curves between the See Forever Cabins and neighboring homes. As a homeowner in Mountain Village, I am deeply concerned about the negative impacts this proposed development would have on our community. This proposal is troubling for a number of reasons:

1. It Conflicts with the Comprehensive Plan

The Town's Comprehensive Plan clearly emphasizes preserving open space, protecting the quality of life for residents, and ensuring development aligns with the character of Mountain Village. A large dirt parking lot located in a peaceful residential corridor directly undermines these principles. This site was never intended for high-volume vehicular use, and the proposal is plainly out of alignment with the Plan's goals.

2. Negative Impacts on Residential Neighborhoods

The proposed lot would bring daily traffic, noise, and dust to a neighborhood surrounded by single-family homes. This intrusion would significantly disrupt the quiet character of the area. It's difficult to argue that this use is either "compatible" with the surrounding land uses or "in harmony" with the neighborhood.

3. Environmental Degradation and Loss of Open Space

Over 60% of the proposed disturbed area lies in designated open space. Approving this project would result in the loss of mature trees, habitat disruption, and substantial grading—changes that are irreversible in the near term. Mountain Village's open space is one of its most valued assets, and once compromised, it is rarely restored to its original state.

4. Pedestrian and Vehicle Safety Concerns

The proposed location lies on a blind curve on a narrow, winding section of Country Club Drive that lacks sidewalks and is heavily used by pedestrians, cyclists, and outdoor enthusiasts. The increase in vehicle traffic from this lot would pose a serious safety risk, particularly during the winter season.

5. Concerns About "Temporary" Use Becoming Permanent

TSG claims the use will be temporary over five years, but past precedent shows that these so-called "temporary" installations often outlast their stated timeline. The current employee lot in the Village

Core, which was also intended as a temporary solution, has remained in place for over 20 years. If approved, this parking lot will likely become a long-term fixture.

6. Failure to Meet Required Review Criteria

The project clearly fails to meet several of the Conditional Use Permit criteria required by the Town Code (§17.4.14.D). It does not align with the Comprehensive Plan, is incompatible with surrounding uses, poses safety risks, negatively affects open space, and lacks any meaningful environmental mitigation.

I urge the DRB and Town Council to deny this application and encourage TSG to pursue alternatives that are consistent with the town's long-term vision, protect our natural and residential environments, and respect the interests of current homeowners.

Thank you for your consideration, and I request that this letter be included in the public record. I also plan to attend the upcoming hearings to ensure our community's voice is heard.

Warm regards,

Michael Harrington

117 Sunny Ridge Place, Unit 131, Mountain Village, CO 81435

214-886-9260

harrington.m@gmail.com

Erin Howe

From: Sandy Lange <sandy@lange.us>
Sent: Monday, July 7, 2025 2:51 PM
To: planning
Subject: TSG's CC Dr. Parking Lot

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Design Review Board
Town Council
Town of Mountain Village
Via email

Please...do not approve the proposed parking lot on Lots 122 & 123 and Tract OS-1R2.

John Horn has filed a comprehensive review of this project vs. relevant design review criteria. I fully endorse and second his detailed response, so will not repeat here. As for my “summary”...

You could hardly pick a worse location for a parking lot. As all of us who drive Country Club know, it's not a safe layout. I've been driving it – cautiously - for 25 years and have had numerous “close calls” with cars, trucks, bicycles, pedestrians and dogs. With the already-approved development further down the road, this will only get worse. Don't add to that situation.

We are supposed to be stewards of the environment. Even with the PDF plans enlarged, I lost count of the number of trees to be cut for this, but disregarding size it looks like somewhere between 50 and 100...all gone in exchange for 33 parking spaces on a dusty or muddy parking lot. Apparently I'm not allowed to cut even a bean pole sized tree on our lot without approval, so this seems a tad bit inconsistent.

At best, the “temporary” lot will become “permanent,” just as the one being displaced by the hotel was. At worst, it sets the stage for some future development that is even worse.

This is patently unfair to the homeowners directly across the street from this. While I am not one of those, I can assure you that none of us when making our Country Club Dr. purchase decisions anticipated an ugly parking lot directly in our daily view. You are supposed to support ideas that generally and over time increase property values...this does the opposite.

Surely those responsible can find better solutions. I'm no parking and transportation expert, but how about a shuttle from Lawson Hill Park & Ride, or San Miguel River Rd./Greenfield Ln. lots? Even the Telluride Black Bear Rd. lot might not be too far. Or turn the almost-already parking lot in Lawson Hill at the intersection of San Miguel River Rd and Greenfield into this lot. A shuttle would likely have far less environment impact, and be much safer, than 30+ cars and trucks coming and going each day.

We've had a family home in the area since the early 1980's...first in Ski Ranches, and since 2000 on CC Dr. As such, we've seen lots of inevitable, and mostly positive development. Unfortunately, this is not one of those positive development ideas. Please go for Round Two and rethink this one.

Thanks for your consideration,

Alexander (Sandy) Lange
317-973-5160
248 Country Club Dr.



Design Review Board
Town of Mountain Village
455 Mountain Village Blvd.
Mountain Village, CO 81435

Subject: Opposition to Conditional Use Permit for Temporary Gravel Parking Lot (Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2)

Date: 08 July 2025

Dear Members of the Design Review Board,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Conditional Use Permit for the temporary gravel surface parking lot submitted by Telluride Ski & Golf (TSG), to be located on Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2 adjacent to the Peaks Resort and Spa. This proposal poses a significant threat to the aesthetic integrity and pedestrian-oriented character of the Mountain Village Core. The introduction of a gravel parking lot in such a central and highly visible location undermines the carefully curated alpine village atmosphere that residents, visitors, and businesses alike value deeply. The visual impact of a gravel lot—particularly one of this scale—would be jarring and inconsistent with the design standards that have long guided development in the Core.

Moreover, the increased vehicular traffic this lot would generate is diametrically opposed to the very purpose of the gondola system, which was established to reduce automobile dependence, improve air quality, and alleviate congestion in the Core. Encouraging more cars into the heart of Mountain Village contradicts decades of thoughtful planning and investment in sustainable, pedestrian-first infrastructure.

While we understand the temporary loss of TSG employee parking due to the Four Seasons development has created logistical challenges, the solution should not come at the expense of the broader community's quality of life, environmental goals, and long-term vision. The short-term financial benefit to TSG from increased patronage does not outweigh the long-term costs to the community—costs borne in the form of degraded aesthetics, increased traffic, noise, and a diminished visitor experience.

I urge the Design Review Board to reject this application and work with TSG to identify alternative solutions that align with the values and planning principles of Mountain Village.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sarah DiPardo
Annual Guest at 184 Country Club Drive

Erin Howe

From: Bill Nictakis <bill.nictakis@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 8, 2025 5:14 PM
To: planning; Bill Nictakis
Subject: See Forever opposition to proposed parking lot on Lot 122/123

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Town Council

We owners at See Forever have become aware of the proposed parking lot to be built on Lot 122/123 on Country Club road. As residents of See Forever Village who chose to own here because of the tranquility and calm of our neighborhood, we want to express our strong concerns and opposition to this initiative,

- Mountain Village is a beautiful area, surrounded by trees and green space. Having a gravel parking lot diminishes our environment. Trees, grass, and then a gravel, dusty parking lot. While we appreciate that TSG does not intend to add parking lot lights, we all need to acknowledge that a parking lot does not enhance our community landscaping and natural environment. We did not move here to have a gravel parking lot and the associated traffic next door.
-
- Increased traffic poses a danger to our residents and our guests who use Boomerang and Jurassic trails, and many of us owners at See Forever use these trails regularly. The winding roads, blind curves, and lack of walkway already make us nervous traversing the road from See Forever down to the trail heads. The increased traffic associated with 33 additional cars driving back and forth down the road daily to park poses an increased safety hazard to us and our guests. As you are aware, there is no walkway or path along that road, and we are already concerned for our safety every time we walk down Country Club to the trail head...especially in the winter when the sides of the road are covered with snow and ice. The additional traffic attributed to the parking lot will compound the issue, and we are just asking for a pedestrian accident unless a pedestrian walkway were to be built.
-
- How temporary is temporary? The request is for 5 years. But once it is built, will the Town really remove the parking lot? Will the Town replace the grass and trees that will be removed? Unless a hotel addition is built on that land, we strongly suspect that we will have a long term gravel parking lot and the associated safety risk and environment downgrade.

It seems that parking is something that Town Council must have evaluated when you granted approval for Four Seasons and Six Senses development. TSG supported those initiatives, and Town Council approved them, so no one can be surprised at the loss of the parking lots. Approved plans for these development projects did not include building a gravel parking lot on Country Club that increases risk to pedestrians. Given the impact on pedestrian safety, increased traffic, and the loss of trees and green

space, we owners at See Forever ask that the Council not allow this parking lot to be built, and work to find an alternative parking solution

Sincerely

See Forever HOA and Owners

Bill Nictakis
Jean Nictakis
Andrew Czejak
Margaret Czejak
Zach Lee
Kathy Lee
Doug Hitchner
Lackland Bloom
Caitlin Bloom
Gary Hoover
Donna Hoover
Jack Roth
Elizabeth Grimm
Ronee Kipnes
Hart Robinovitch
Joe Howell
Kathleen Howell
Pete Edwards
Chris Edwards
Cary Savage
Jodi Early
Sheryl Woods
Gary Woods
Bo Billeaud
Diane Billeaud
Madonna Beale
Fredrik Eliasson
Danielle Eliasson
Nancy Daigh
John Olson
Laura Olson
Dale Boden
Dennis Dautel
Lisa McGraw
John McGraw
Bob Gutermuth
Orlean Smith
Mark Mai
Kate Mai
Shane Smith
Bill Bock

Cynthia Bock

Sent from my iPad

July 9, 2025

RE: Conditional Use Permit – Temporary Parking Lot (Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2)

To Mountain Village Planning Division and Design Review Board,

I write in my capacity as a member of the Mountain Village residential community to express my concerns with the application by Telluride Ski and Golf LLC (TSG) for a Conditional Use Permit for a Temporary Parking Lot at Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2. As the applicant, TSG bears the burden to demonstrate that submittal materials and the proposed development “substantially comply with the conditional use permit review criteria.”¹ CDC § 17.4.14(D)(2). TSG has not carried this burden.

The application purports to be in compliance with Conditional Use Criteria for Decision set forth in section 17.4.14(D) of the Code, but it provides only superficial and poorly explained discussion of certain listed criteria and omits consideration of other material ones altogether. More broadly, the application appears to conflict with Mountain Village policy regarding transportation planning; it contains no analysis to support a finding that the identified location would best support the proposed use; and the proposal itself appears to pose unaddressed physical hazards to residents and pedestrians and cyclists who use Country Club Drive and to otherwise be incapable of meeting multiple review criteria. I highlight the following non-exhaustive concerns.

First, the proposed use appears inconsistent with policies in the Mountain Village Comprehensive Plan and Mountain Village Transportation Plan. The Comprehensive Plan acknowledges that the Mountain Village as a whole has “more than adequate road and parking infrastructure to support the full buildout of the comprehensive plan.” Comprehensive Plan at 3G, p. 65. Future parking planning is to be guided by detailed parking study to ensure that parking comply aligns with need. *Id.* at Parking Policy A.1, p. 67. The detailed parking analysis in the operative Transportation Plan acknowledges that the Upper Mountain Village Blvd employee lot, containing a total of 30 spaces, represents a small fraction of parking supply, most of which is satisfied by the Gondola Parking Garages (475 and 535 spaces), Meadows Parking Lot (110 spaces), and Heritage Parking Garage (106 spaces). Further, the Transportation Plan calls for a policy of directing employee parking to the Meadows Lot—away from both the

¹ As an application for a proposed Class 4 use (CDC § 17.4.14(C)), TSG’s application requires public noticing and hearing with the review authority, preparation of a Planning Division staff report, and review by and public hearing before the Design Review Board, which shall make a recommendation for final decision by the Town Council following further public hearing. CDC § 17.4.3 (Development Review Procedures).

gondola lots and Mountain Village core—and recommends establishing “an incentive program . . . to encourage employees to relocate to the Meadows lot.” Transportation Plan at 21.

As a consequence, it is not at all clear that the removal of 30 employee parking spaces from the Village core necessitates the proposed use—creation of 33 new (albeit temporary) parking spaces in light of existing supply. Nor is there explanation as to how creation of temporary spaces, to be maintained for a period of no more than five years, would satisfy such need if it did exist. To the extent that the need for replacement spaces does exist, building 33 new parking spaces adjacent to the Village core appears to conflict with Village policies that call for directing parking away from the Core and toward the intentionally sited Meadows Lot. Analysis of employee numbers and transportation and parking patterns and uses relevant to available existing supply is required to support the need for the proposed conditional use. The application provides no such analysis.

Second, to the extent there is a demonstrated need for the proposed use, the Conditional Use Permit presupposes that the identified lots are the appropriate or perhaps only site for the use. The Code, however, requires that the location of the proposed use be determined not by the applicant but by “a selection process by the review authority designed to identify a location that best serves the proposed use while minimizing potential adverse impacts.” CDC § 17.4.14(E)(1). As the reviewing authorities consider the application, they must begin by identifying whether the conditional use is called for and then proceed to identify the best location to support that use. As discussed below and by other commenters, the lots identified by the applicant appear to be a particularly poor choice for the use, presenting serious concerns about public safety, adequacy of supporting infrastructure, adverse impacts in the immediate use areas, and contribution of traffic and congestion through the Village core and adding to the substantial traffic that already services the adjacent Peaks Hotel and other nearby hotels. And the choice of the subject lots appears to conflict with policies discussed above intended to alleviate these concerns by directing employee parking to the Meadows Lot and away from the Core. To the extent the reviewing authorities determine there is a need for the requested use, it should accordingly engage in the detailed selection process the Code calls for to identify the most suitable location rather than anchoring its analysis on the lots identified by the applicant.

Third, the application does not show, and indeed barely discusses, consistency of the proposed use with the nine Code criteria that “shall be met for the review authority to approve a conditional use permit.”² CDC § 17.4.14. Just to reference a few:

² Indeed, TSG’s application references at most five of the nine criteria, and even as to those, its discussion is vague and incomplete. TSG’s passing reference to certain Criteria for Decision is insufficient to meet its burden to demonstrate that the proposed development substantially complies with the review criteria. It also appears questionable whether TSG’s submitted materials are sufficient to support an initial finding of completeness that would allow the Planning Division and Design Review Board to begin processing the application.

- The proposed use must be compatible with surrounding land uses and not create a substantial adverse impact on adjacent properties and infrastructure. As other commenters have indicated, the proposed addition of substantial daily employee traffic and parking appears to be incompatible with the residential character of the street and its use as a pedestrian and cyclist corridor to access the popular trail system at the base of Country Club Drive. It also appears to impose a significant burden on Country Club Drive itself, a single-lane residential street that already experiences congestion from use of the Peaks Hotel parking lots uphill of the proposed use.
- Any proposed conditional use shall not constitute a substantial physical hazard to the neighborhood and shall provide infrastructure adequate to support the use. Country Club Drive already lacks sidewalks and infrastructure to support safe pedestrian and cyclist access between residential areas and hiking trails along the roadway and the Village core. Addition of 66 or more new daily vehicle trips around the hairpin curve at Country Club Drive would appear to exacerbate the already extent safety concerns on this corridor. While some consideration is made for employee access between the lot and portion of the roadway nearest the Peak Hotel, no consideration is made for safety conflicts between the added employee car traffic and pedestrians and cyclists that already rely on Country Club Drive and can be expected to do so in greater numbers as residential development expands along the Drive together with increased use of the recently expanded trail system. These concerns appear exacerbated by TSG's proposal to install the parking lot without installation of lighting in this currently unlit corridor, as TSG recognizes that installation of an appropriate lighting system would make the proposed use even more squarely incompatible with the location and surrounding residential uses and the Village's dark sky policies.
- Any conditional use development shall not have a significant adverse effect on surrounding property owners and uses or a significant adverse effect on open space and shall minimize adverse environmental and visual impacts. But though poorly explained in the application, this proposed use would appear to require significant removal of trees and other vegetation from an undeveloped lot for a use intended to be temporary. And the replacement of natural vegetation with unpaved, gravel-covered parking spaces would, as the application concedes, contribute dust and introduce unaddressed sediment runoff concerns while introducing traffic and noise and impairing the aesthetics of the area. The application proposes to restore the site after the use ceases in five years, but it is unclear how and on what timescale complete restoration could be accomplished if development of the use requires significant tree and other vegetation removal.

Providing for safe, adequate, and sustainable transportation to support TSG's valued employees should continue to be a Mountain Village priority. So too should be ensuring adequate pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure, sustaining the natural landscape and environmental aesthetics cherished by residents and visitors, and guaranteeing safety and compatibility of adjacent uses. TSG's proposed use does not appear to meet these values and policy commitments. Its sparse application is insufficient to carry its burden to support the proposed conditional use and certainly not in the odd location identified by TSG. It should be rejected in favor of a revised and complete proposal consistent with governing plans and Code requirements.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steph Safdi', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Stephanie Safdi

Erin Howe

From: Tom McCall <tgmccl91@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 3:55 PM
To: planning
Subject: Concerned Resident

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

We were recently made aware
of the proposed parking on
Country Club Dr.

Please consider the following
concerns before you go any
further with this plan:

- That street is already reduced to 10 mph
because of safety
- The narrow street has sharp-blind
turns exposing other cars and
pedestrians — many of them
walk or ride their bikes on
the same street
- Many bikers access mountain
trails on Country Club Rd
- Many ski employees hike
from housing units up
Country Club Road adding
more pedestrian traffic
- Placing a parking lot
in this same area
would be very dangerous.

**Pls Please consider another
location like Valley Floor —**

Tom McCall

Cell: [\(949\) 246-4786](tel:9492464786)

E-mail: tgmccl91@gmail.com

Erin Howe

From: Allykeoghh <allykeoghh@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 4:59 PM
To: planning; cd
Cc: Tom Keogh; Jill Keogh
Subject: Opposition Letter to Telluride Ski and Golf LLC Class 4 Conditional Use Permit Request
Attachments: Opposition document.pdf

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Dear Members of the Mountain Village Design Review Board and Town Council,

Attached is a letter I have written to formally express my opposition to the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application submitted by Telluride Ski & Golf LLC, which seeks approval for the construction of a temporary parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2.

My family owns the property located directly across from the proposed site, and we have serious concerns regarding the safety risks, environmental consequences, and long-term impacts this project would have on the surrounding neighborhood and greater Mountain Village community. I have outlined these concerns in detail in the attached letter, and I respectfully urge you to consider them as you review the application.

Thank you for your time and for your continued commitment to preserving the safety, character, and natural beauty of Mountain Village.

Sincerely,
Allison Keogh

Dear Members of the Design Review Board and Town Council,

My name is Allison Keogh, and I'm writing to express my strong opposition to Telluride Ski & Golf LLC's application for a Conditional Use Permit to install a "temporary" parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and Tract OS-1R2.

My family has owned a home in Mountain Village for many years. We frequently visit our home—skiing in the winter, hiking and biking in the summer, and soaking in the peace and beauty of this extraordinary place year-round. Even though I live elsewhere as a young adult, I return as often as I can to be with my family, recharge, and stay connected to the environment that has shaped my most cherished memories.

The proposed parking lot threatens everything we—and so many others—love about Mountain Village. It's not just a few trees and a patch of land. It's the view from our living room window. It's the trail where we would walk with our dog. It's the silence we enjoy with morning coffee. And most importantly, it's the safety and quality of life for everyone who calls this community home.

1.

Safety Risks Are Real and Immediate

The location is simply unsafe. Country Club Drive is narrow, winding, and lacks sidewalks. Our driveway sits on a blind curve making it already difficult to see the few cars that come up and down the road. Adding 30+ employee vehicles in this location—especially in winter—makes this road a hazard for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers alike. My parents, siblings, and I all walk this road regularly. One misstep or poorly timed turn could lead to a tragedy. This isn't a hypothetical risk; it's a foreseeable and preventable danger.

2.

The Environmental Cost Is Too High

The plan involves grading, tree removal, and gravel surfacing in what is now a quiet, forested space. That space is designated as active open space for a reason—it serves as a buffer, a sanctuary, and a visual reprieve. Turning it into a dusty gravel lot—no matter how "temporary"—undermines the town's environmental values and leaves long-lasting damage. Gravel lots don't just disappear in five years; the scars remain, visually and ecologically.

3.

It Erodes the Character and Quality of the Neighborhood

Our family's home faces the proposed site directly. Instead of arriving to serene mountain views and the quiet hum of nature, we'd be greeted by rows of parked cars, dust, and daily traffic.

Mountain Village has always felt like a retreat—an escape from congestion, not a place to replicate it. This proposal drastically changes the experience of being here. It's not just about property values—it's about protecting the soul of the neighborhood and the town itself.

I understand that TSG needs to find employee parking, but this proposal shifts the burden onto residents and the environment without sufficient justification. A five-year “temporary” lot is not temporary. It's half a decade of degradation in the name of convenience.

This plan violates both the spirit and the letter of the Town's Comprehensive Plan—particularly around safety, compatibility with surrounding uses, and environmental stewardship. I urge the Design Review Board and Town Council to stand with residents, uphold the values this town was built on, and reject this permit request.

Thank you for your time, and for protecting the character, safety, and long-term vision of Mountain Village.

Sincerely,

Allison Keogh

Erin Howe

From: Cyndi Bock <clbockatx@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2025 8:44 AM
To: planning
Subject: Conditional Use Permit - Temporary Parking Lot

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

I am writing to the Town of Mountain Village to express my opposition to granting Telluride Ski & Golf the Conditional Use Permit they seek to build a temporary parking lot on Country Club Drive. I am Cynthia L. Bock. My husband, William G. Bock, and I own a See Forever Village cabin located at 158 Country Club Drive.

Our property is directly across the street from the proposed parking lot. We presently enjoy a view of Mount Wilson, rising above a grove of aspen. Imagine our reaction to looking out on this parking lot in the future. You are hearing from other neighbors voicing concerns about traffic, safety, loss of open space, and numerous additional objections. All are valid.

But I wish to emphasize one primary reason to reject this Conditional Use Permit. It does not comply with the Criteria for such a permit as required by the governing Comprehensive Plan for Mountain Village. The Town Council and Design Review Board may follow the existing procedures and decline the request on this basis. It is simply sufficient.

Sincerely,
Cyndi

Erin Howe

From: Gregory Durham <gregorydurham@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 14, 2025 8:24 AM
To: cd
Subject: Big NO to new Peaks parking lot

Caution: External Message - Please be cautious when opening links or attachments in email.

Good morning,

I am a 15-year resident of Mountain Village resident. While I appreciate the Peaks' parking challenges and concerns (which are shared by many village businesses), I am adding my voice here to those who say NO to a new Peaks parking lot. My objections are:

1. **We've spent millions to avoid things like this:** As a community and county, we have spent millions of dollars, and decades, developing a public transportation system that, nationally, far exceeds nearly every other county of our size, not to mention many cities. My understanding is that we've done this not only to keep vehicles off the road but also to minimize and concentrate surface parking, and avoid a piecemeal parking approach.
2. **No actual acute need at this time:** My son and I both use our SMART system to commute to work in town. Our observation—though anecdotal and not scientific—is that the current capacity of concentrated surface parking, and the capacity of our SMART system, are enough that they can easily absorb those employees who would otherwise use the 33-space parking lot the Peaks is proposing.
3. **There is no such thing as "temporary" when it comes to parking lots:** Multiple times in their application, the Peaks uses the word "temporary" to describe the lot. This disingenuous use of "temporary" always shows up in applications like this in order to ease everyone's anxiety about the ongoing paving (or in this case, graveling) of paradise. There's nothing temporary about the disturbance of land and the cutting down of trees.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter,

Greg Durham

Subject: Strong Opposition to Conditional Use Permit for Parking Lot

My name is Joy McCall and I am a resident of Country Club Dr. in Mountain Village. I am writing to express my opposition to the Conditional Use Permit application submitted by Telluride Ski & Golf (TSG) to construct a 33-space employee parking lot on Lots 122, 123, and OS-1R2.

I am writing with urgency to express my opposition to the proposed parking lot. This proposal presents two critical and unacceptable threats to our community and I strongly take the position to reject it.

My primary and most pressing concern is the safety of my family and neighbors, as well as the visitors who rent homes on our street and walk to the village all the time. The designated access point for this parking lot is located on a steep, blind section of a hairpin curve on Country Club Drive – a road that has no sidewalk. Adding the daily traffic of 33 employee vehicles to this already challenging stretch would create a substantial physical hazard for the many children, hikers and bikers who regularly use this road. I have two grandchildren who walk along this very street and the thought of this proposal making it a dangerous street for them is negligent and extremely risky. Also, there are countless rental guests that walk our street up to the village with little kids, dogs, and strollers. We come slowly around those corners to often find them walking along the street and potentially in harms way.

Furthermore, this proposal is entirely out of character with our neighborhood and constitutes a flagrant disregard for its established nature. A noisy, dusty, unpaved parking lot is unequivocally not “in harmony and compatible with surrounding land uses,” which consist solely of peaceful single-family homes. Implementing this lot would have a substantial adverse impact on adjacent properties and severely degrade the essential residential character and value of our community.

For these critical reasons- the immediate and substantial safety risk, particularly to our children and guests unfamiliar with the road and the wholly incompatible impact on our neighborhood’s character – I urge the Town Council to deny this proposal without hesitation. I believe the well-being, integrity and safety reputation of Mountain Village depend on it.

I urge you to please, please deny this application for the Conditional Use Permit. Thirty-three parking spaces are not worth the very real risk and liability of having anyone injured.

Thank you very much for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Joy McCall
245 Country Club Drive
Mountain Village Resident