Official Minutes

MEETING OF THE MINTURN TOWN COUNCIL
Minturn Town Center, 302 Pine Street
Minturn, CO 81645 • (970) 827-5645

Wednesday October 21, 2015

Work Session – 5:00pm
Regular Session – 6:30pm

MAYOR – Gordon "Hawkeye" Flaherty
MAYOR PRO TEM – George Brodin

COUNCIL MEMBERS:
Shelley Bellm
Earle Bidez
John Rosenfeld
Matt Scherr
Jason Osborne

These minutes are formally submitted to the Town of Minturn Town Council for approval as the official written record of the proceedings at the identified Council Meeting. Additionally, all Council meetings are tape-recorded and are available to the public for listening at the Town Center Offices from 8:30am – 2:00 pm, Monday through Friday, by contacting the Town Clerk at 970/827-5645 302 Pine St. Minturn, CO 81645.

Work Session – 5:00pm

Please remember to bring your FY2016 Budget Book

- 2016 Budget Review: Decision Points – Powell/Brunvand

Regular Session – 6:30pm

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Mayor Hawkeye F. at 6:30pm.

- Roll Call

Those present included: Mayor Hawkeye F. and Town Council members, George Brodin, Matt Scherr, Earle Bidez, Shelley B., and Jason "Ozzy" Osborne.

Staff present: Town Attorney Jeff Conklin, Town Manager Willy Powell, Town Clerk/Treasurer Jay Brunvand, and Town Planner Janet Hawkinson.

- Pledge of Allegiance

2. **Approval of Agenda**
   - Items to be Pulled or Added

Motion by George B., second by Ozzy O., to approve the agenda as presented. Motion passed 7-0.

3. **Approval of Minutes**
   - August 19, 2015

Motion by John R., second by Shelley B., to approve the Minutes of August 19, 2015 as presented. Motion passed 7-0.

- September 1, 2015

Motion by Shelley B., second by John R., to approve the Minutes of September 1, 2015 as presented. Motion passed 5-0. (Abstaining were Earle B. and Ozzy O. as they were not at the meeting.

- October 7, 2015

Motion by John R., second by Ozzy O., to approve the Minutes of October 7, 2015 as presented. Motion passed 7-0.

4. **Public comments on items, which are NOT on the agenda (5 minute time limit per person)**

Mr. Masson Davey, Weston Snowboards, requested the Town wait until spring to start the entry way construction as it would be a burden on a small business.

Willy P. noted the construction deadline is October 30 for phase I. Matt S. asked if the concern was the new layout of the project or the impact of the construction. Mr. Davey stated the project impacts his parking so it is a problem both during the construction and long term. Willy P. stated the project is in accordance with the CDOT right of way clear vision policy. CDOT has said they will not issue a permit with the said parking. Willy P. noted the pedestrian friendly improvements included in the project. Willy P. stated that Mr. Clark (Weston owner) has always known that he owns basically the footprint of the building and the property has essentially no parking. The Town has continually worked with Mr. Clark on this aspect.

5. Special Presentations

- Updated from Castle Peak Senior Care Community by Lisa Pease

Ms. Lisa Pease, Augustana Care, updated the Council on the project. The construction is on time and on budget for completion fall 2016.

Shelley B. asked about Medicare/Medicaid and inquired if a person without that would have to pay out of pocket; yes this is the case. She felt this would be a significant impact on the local senior community.

Ms. Marka Brenner, Minturn Realty, asked if there were veteran benefits or privately funded opportunities for those that are not able to pay; they are working with this.

It was noted Medicare does not pay for assisted living at all, Medicaid will in a qualified program. It is recognized that many do not have the savings and so important for Castle Peak to control their costs.

Direction was to include the additional $5,000 funding request in the 2016 budget. FY 2016 will total $15,000 and 2017 will total $10,000. This will finish the Town's contribution commitment.

- Update from Eagle County Sheriff's Office – Powell

Sheriff Van Beek, Eagle County Sheriff's Office, introduced Under Sheriff Mike McWilliams, and introduced Deputies Phillip Cusick and Josiah Hart. The two Deputies are our two full time officers.

Ozzy O. noted that it does not appear that we are getting the full contract patrol hours. Sheriff Van Beek noted the concern and explained how the data is collected. He stated it has been a struggle but felt we were being afforded the full coverage.

The Council stressed their concerns of in-Town speeding, the school bus routes, etc.

Hawkeye asked about business and bar checks; it was noted the officer's schedule does float so they have a presence in Town during the day, evening, and night at various times.

- Committee Report

PUBLIC HEARINGS AND ACTION ITEMS

6. <u>Action Item</u>: Resolution 13 – Series 2015 Consideration of a Resolution of support for the submission of a grant for trail funding – Metteer

Michelle M. introduced a project that has quickly presented itself for the Town and is asking the Council for its support of a grant that will be used to build a beginner bike/hike trail. Michelle M. introduced Mr. Bill Hoblitzell who outlined the project and the grant for the Council. It was noted much of the trail currently exits and would only require upgrades. The

trail runs along the right-a-way from the Minturn Townhomes and exits at Cemetery Rd. A second trail runs from Cemetery Rd around the back of Public Works and the Lease Lot area (810 Cemetery Rd). It was noted that the grant writer is already secured, the grant would be approximately $20,000; the Town's portion would be approximately 3%.

Discussion ensued as to the planning of the trail locations to include the Colorado Parks and Wildlife and other state and state wide organizations; yes, this will be part of the process.

Discussion ensued as to the long-term maintenance of the trails and like issues. It was noted this is a long term project and often the mountain bikers themselves help to maintain the trails at little cost to the Town but that it would involve some costs from the Town.

Ozzy O. noted the Grand Junction area has a lot of state and out-of-state visitors for their path systems. The trails proposed would be for pedestrian and mountain bike use. It was noted Minturn has one of only two gun ranges in the County and it is important to keep the distance.

Motion by Ozzy O., second by Shelley B., to approve Resolution No. 13 – 2015 a Resolution of support for the submission of a grant for trail funding with a Town funding cap of $1,500 as presented. Motion passed 7-0.

7. <u>Action Item</u>: Resolution 14 – Series 2015 Consideration of a Resolution to approve a variance at 175 Williams St – Hawkinson

Janet H. introduced the Variance and the location. She noted this is not a conditional use consideration as it is a use by right in this district, it is for the Consideration of a Variance requesting a modified parking plan. The plan under consideration is to lease specific designated parking spaces in the Municipal Lot to the applicant. This differs from other Town parking agreements in that they do not have specific spaces leased, rather they have nonexclusive parking throughout Town that may be available.

Janet H. introduced the applicants Ryan and Nancy Richards. Mr. Richards outlined the plan as a boutique bunkhouse and suites, with 24 hour staffing, drug and alcohol free sustainable company. The variance request is for 20 offsite parking spaces requested to be in the Municipal Lot (muni lot). The cost of each space would be determined based on the calculation for other leases.

Public Hearing opened.

Janet H. read the conditions placed on the variance by the Planning Commission which are included in the proposed Resolution.

Discussion ensued as to the enforcement of the parking plan. The Richards outlined their proposed vehicle regulations. Handicap parking and access were also discussed; the building is handicap compliant. It was noted that the building is a difficult area and in a tight corner.

Ms. Marka Brenner, Minturn Realty, noted that area of Williams St is used for snow storage and is removed in an inconsistent timeframe. This storage would directly affect the proposed project.

Mr. Brian Sipes, 102 Nelson, is not opposed to the Bunkhouse concept. He feels the Town is setting a precedent in that we are considering a variance for parking which would set the use for the building. He said the code actually requires only seven parking spaces based on the number of units in the "lodge".

It is noted here that three letters were submitted from the public regarding this proposal and they are attached at the end of the Official Minutes.

Mr. Tom Sullivan, 116 Nelson Ave, stated the Town has to decide if they want business or does not want business. He stated that with the smaller lots, most buildings in Town would need a parking variance. He felt the restrictions placed on this proposal were very restrictive, and cumbersome to manage. That will affect the Town in that the Town will have to manage the restrictions. The more regulations we place on a business the harder it is for them to be successful. Mr. Sullivan stated he was in support of the proposal.

Ms. Beth Levine spoke as the architect for the Richards. She spoke in support of the variance to allow a specific use in an existing building which has been vacant since the building was completed.

Ms. Marka Brenner, Minturn Realty, spoke in support however she has a concern that Minturn lacks an overall parking plan and policy. She encouraged the Town to address this issue.

Mr. Eric Cregan, owner of Magustos Restaurant 101 Main, spoke in support of the project.

Ms. Sage Peterson, Sticky Fingers Café 122 Main, spoke in support of the project.

Mr. Roy Vasquez, 201 Boulder, submitted a letter to the Council which was read into the record by Hawkeye in opposition to the project based on the parking concerns stated. He also stated the snow removal needs to be stepped up to alleviate the long term storage of snow in the parking areas.

Mr. Randy Milhoan, 141 Williams St, spoke in opposition to the project due to the parking concerns.

Mr. Masson Davey, 432 Main St., spoke in support of the project.

Jeff C. noted, based on the proposal, a parking space requirement was calculated. The variance is a result that much of that parking requirement is not available on site. The variance is to allow the project to have offsite parking. He noted the Planning Commission reviewed this project under the existing code.

Public Hearing was closed.

Shelley B. asked what the lease holders get for their parking agreement; they get first come first serve, the Town maintains the parking lot and snow removal. Under the agreement they would clear their own parking of snow, they would pay the same per space cost, and they would get exclusive spaces.

Discussion ensued as to the cost of parking and if we could expand the muni lot we currently lease.

George B. asked if they are required to lease from the Town or if they can show a lease from another owner that has the needed spaces. It was noted that this would need to be a long term solution not a seasonal accommodation. It was noted they could obtain parking and be in compliance with the variance as long as it was in conformance with the other requirements in the proposal/variance.

John R. stated that we need to encourage businesses and we need to work with the parking in Town. He stated he felt the conditions were fair and this was the definition of economic development.

Ozzy O. stated he supported Mr. Richards and supported his proposal. He stated the sales tax this business is expected to generate would pay for needed road repairs.

Earle B. stated the proposal is taking steps to provide parking outside the core of Main St. He stated the parking problem can be a burden to the other neighbors.

Shelley B. felt some of the conditions were overstepping bounds by the Planning Commission by saying who would use the onsite parking. She felt that it should be stated in the variance that there would be no on street parking along Main and the adjacent streets.

Officer Cusick, ECSO/Minturn PD, outlined the established parking regulations and how difficult or even legal it would be to enforce the proposal.

Discussion ensued as to the Resolution and what should or should not be included.

Hawkeye stated he had seen the Town over allocate the parking. His concern was where do the vehicles park over and above the 20 spaces allocated? Hawkeye felt the allocation was not sufficient and that would impact the existing residents or businesses. Mr. Richards stated the reservations would be closed when the parking was full. Jeff C. noted this is an allocation derived from a calculation, you cannot require a resident or business to stop taking guests if their parking is full.

Motion by John R., second by Ozzy O., to approve Resolution No. 12 – 2015 a Resolution to approve a variance at 175 Williams St. as modified. Motion passed 7-0.

COUNCIL AND STAFF REPORTS

8. Town Planner

9. Town Manager

Hawkeye asked about cost overruns on our street projects; Railroad was over but we did not do N. Main which accommodated that. The entryway has had to deal with various states of age and disrepair which has taken longer but it is still considered on schedule. Railroad Ave and Norman Ave are completed. It was noted the electric pole is on the schedule for Xcel Energy to remove.

10. Town Council Comments

11. Town Attorney

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Motion by Shelley B., second by Ozzy O., to extend the meeting past 11pm. Motion passed 7-0.

12. Executive Session: An executive session for the purpose of conferencing with the Town Manager for the purposes of receiving direction and advice on the purchase, acquisition, lease, transfer or sale of any real property or other property under C.R.S. Section 24-6-402(4)(a) and for the purpose of determining positions relative to matters that may be subject to negotiations, developing strategy for negotiations, and/or instructing negotiators under C.R.S. Section 24-6-402(4)(e) – Dowd Junction and CDOT legal matter – Powell/Sawyer

Motion by Ozzy O., second by John R., to convene in executive session for the purpose of conferencing with the Town Manager for the purposes of receiving direction and advice on the purchase, acquisition, lease, transfer or sale of any real property or other property under C.R.S. Section 24-6-402(4)(a) and for the purpose of determining positions relative to matters that may be subject to negotiations, developing strategy for negotiations, and/or instructing negotiators under C.R.S. Section 24-6-402(4)(e) and for the purposes of consulting with our attorney on the issue of CDOT pursuant to 24-6-402(4)(b) – Dowd Junction and CDOT legal matters. Motion passed 7-0.

Direction given as a result of the Executive Session was to authorize the Mayor to sign the Agreement of Intent with the Forest Service, subject to the review and approval of the Dowd Junction Committee, the Town Manager, and the Town Attorney.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

13. Next Meeting – November 4, 2015

- Meeting: Discussion/Action – 1st Public Hearing on proposed fiscal year 2016 Budget – review public funding requests – White/Brunvand 11/4/15
- Review of the Jake/air compression Brake law

14. Future Meetings:

- Meeting: Discussion/Action – 2nd Public Hearing on proposed fiscal year 2016 Budget and First Reading of Budget Ordinances – Brunvand 11/18/15
- Meeting: Discussion/Action – 2nd and Final Reading of proposed 2016 Budget Ordinances – Brunvand 12/1/15
- Marijuana discussion – late 2015/early 2016

15. Set Future Meeting Dates

a) Council Meetings:

- November 4, 2015
- November 18, 2015
- December 2, 2015

b) Planning & Zoning Commission Meetings:

16. Other Dates:

17. Adjournment

In that there was no further business to discuss the meeting stood adjourned at 12:05am.

Hawkeye Flaherty

Mayor Hawkeye Flaherty

ATTEST:

Town Clerk, Jay Brunvand

TOWN OF MINTURN, COLORADO
SEAL
1904

October 7th, 2015

Roy and Loraine Vasquez

62 Toledo

Minturn CO, 81645

970-827-9247

Minturn Town Council

RE: Variance application for 175 Williams Street, Minturn CO, 81645

Mayor Hawkey,

Please accept this as my written response to the application to the Minturn Town Council on the planned variance application for 175 Williams street, The Molly G commercial building. I speak as a home owner with a long history paying close attention to the parking issues of this town. Minturn has been my home for over 73 years. I am acutely aware of the parking situation. I personally have issue trying to park my own vehicles in front of my own home. My home is located within visual site of the building proposing a request for additional parking. My issue is that the parking situation in my immediate area is already at maximum capacity. The Ironworks building across the street is a prime example. The building has a pre designed parking situation that has daily overflow. Parking in this area is already at a shortage from this one buildings overflow alone. I cannot foresee where the residents of the Molly G building will be parking. If they believe they can park along Toledo, Pine, Main or Boulder there simply is no more room. The original parking design along these streets was for single family homes with some light commercial on Main Street. Over the years I have witnessed that many homes now have more and more people living in them with the added cars as the end result. Molly G would need to park in the area of the municipal parking lot to even consider adding parking. If the town would like to create more parking this area is seemingly the only last area left to facilitate this parking issue.

Please utilize this letter as my **NO** vote for additional approved parking for this application.

Roy & Loraine Vasquez

Roy M Vasquez
Loraine Vasquez
Oct 7- 2015

copy

SIPES ARCHITECTS
authentic + sustainable + modern
brian@sipesarchitects.com 970.390.0607
175 williams st, suite 204, minturn co 81645

21 October 2015

Mr. Mayor, Mr. Mayor Pro-Tem and members of the Council,

I am unsure if I will be able to attend your meeting on Wednesday, 21 October 2015 and ask that this letter be made part of the public record with respect to the Variance from town code parking standards that is request by the Bunkhouse project in the Mollie G.

My office is at 175 Williams St. Suite 204 (second floor of the Mollie G directly above the proposed entry to the Bunkhouse project). My wife and I are scheduled to close on the home at 102 Nelson Ave on 29 October. I am a 21 year resident of Avon and we have always loved Minturn and are committed to this community as our long term home.

We are not opposed to the idea of the Bunkhouse. We want that to be clear. We love Minturn because it is not Vail/Beaver Creek/Avon and dearly want it to remain authentic and funky! Bringing a different kind of visitor with a passion for our town and for the mountain lifestyle is a great idea. However we worry about precedent and the cumulative effect of decisions that are not made with respect to the town code.

I attended the Planning Commission meeting last week after seeing the public notice sign on our building. Our property owner and property manager had neglected to inform any of the existing tenants of this pending application. Over the last week I've had a chance to review the town code and I believe the variance application before you is premature because the town code currently does not have a parking requirement indicated for this use and therefore nothing against which to issue a variance.

All transient lodging uses currently listed in the code anticipate a series of rooms that individual guests would rent and the parking standard is per room. A literal interpretation of the parking requirements currently in the code would not require a variance. It is only because everyone agrees that this use will require more parking that a variance was requested. But no process was undertaken to establish the requirement. The applicants request was the only consideration.

One week of reading in no way makes me an expert in the code, but it would seem that a review of the proposed use to see what special and unique conditions it presents to the town is necessary to establish the requirements for parking and perhaps also establish where this type of use would be appropriate. It would also seem prudent to establish if this is a use by right or a conditional or limited use. Acting tonight to grant the variance in my opinion would say that both the requirement and the relief from the requirement can be granted by a variance application.

During the Planning Commission hearing last week, the planning commission seemed to make two findings that led to their approval of the variance. The first is that the Bunkhouse use is a use by right and the second was that the Mollie G would require a variance for parking for any use to occupy the main level where the Bunkhouse is proposed. I believe both findings are incorrect.

A literal reading of the code finds only two uses that would require more parking than is available - restaurant and clinic.

There are several examples in town of variances or exceptions to the parking standards being made for restaurant uses. It is therefore reasonable to assume that a parking variance for a restaurant in the Mollie G would be granted. Clinics users are very short term and it would be justifiable to assume they could use street parking without any significant impact to the town. Therefore neither of these uses sets a precedent that would transfer to the proposed bunkhouse lodging use.

The Mollie G has 12 garage spaces, one accessible space for the upper level that is accessed from Nelson and 6 (including 1 accessible) spaces in front. Each of the apartments and the upper level commercial space (my office) have 2 spaces in the garage leaving 4. My office is 750 sf and so requires 3 spaces per code and the accessible space off Nelson is my third. That leaves 4 spaces in the garage and all 6 spaces in front (10 total) for the downstairs tenant. The downstairs tenant space is 2,475 sf (not counting common area).

Here are the possible uses and parking as contemplated under the code:

Office	1 space per 250sf	2475/250=9.9 ~ 10 spaces
Retail	1 space per 300sf	2475/300=8.8 ~ 9 Spaces
Medical Clinic	1 space per 135sf (not including storage) Assume 500 sf of storage	2000/135=14.8 ~ 15 spaces
Lodge/Hotel	1.12 space per room (most restrictive) Due to code restrictions the maximum number of rooms is probably 6. 2 employee spaces are also required so the total required parking is 9.	6 rooms x 1.12=6.72 ~ 7

What this shows is that the Mollie G is <u>not</u> a non-conforming building.

As far as I know there are no variance that have been granted to lodges for parking in town and certainly not for such a high percentage of the parking requirement. Overnight parking is different than short term retail type parking and there are good reasons all lodges park all or nearly all of their guests on their premises.

Please note that your town code states that "Cost or inconvenience to the applicant of strict or literal compliance with a regulation shall not be a reason for granting a variance." Currently this application makes no findings that state why this variance is required for reasons other than convenience to the applicant and the parking requirement established by the variance during the Planning Commission hearing was the result of little more than extrapolation and guesses without any real analysis.

I believe that the only way to consider this application is to note that this is an entirely new use not contemplated by the code. Since this is a new use it is not necessarily a use by right and I believe that the Planning Commission also erred in thinking of it that way. All transient lodging uses in the code contemplate that all unrelated parties will be in separate rooms. There is no way to read the code to have anticipated a common bunkroom housing 30 people.

The code needs to be changed to add this use and parking is only one requirement that the code needs to establish for this use. Others include which location, traffic, trash, noise, etc. Totally unique situations presented by this use can also be properly analyzed (how does valet work at 9 am on a powder day? What safeguards are needed to respect the mixed use neighbors in the building?) This analysis will then also describe the basis for parking mitigation in a way that would be fair to future applicants and reflect the unique nature of this property.

I do believe that the planning commission idea to have this variance sunset after 3 years is a good one, but it is also evidence of the fact that we do not know enough about this use. As someone who will be directly affected by this project and with all due respect, 3 years is too long to correct a mistake if one is made.

Let's find a way to approve this project, but do so by using the process in the code designed to help evaluate new uses. Acting otherwise would unnecessarily open the door to unintended consequences.

Sincerely,

Brian Sipes, AIA, LEED AP
Owner
Sipes Architects

Mayor and members of the Town Council

Unfortunately I, Matt Holmes, and my fiancee, Elise Reynolds, are unable to attend tonight's meeting, so I have asked that this letter be read on my behalf.

The town and the owners of the Bunkhouse have clearly gone to great lengths, working together to make sure that the parking situation does not become a problem. So thank you for your diligence. However, as a resident at Mollie G going on 3 years now, the issue of parking logistics comes – quite literally – a bit closer to home for those of us who live and work near the planned hostel, and share the parking resources. I hope that you can empathize with our situation and can take a few extra considerations as seriously as you would, were it you living above the planned hostel.

1. I think that the $100 fine on the Bunkhouse in the parking variance for parking violations was a great step towards incentivizing The Bunkhouse to adhere to their designated parking allotments. However, this only goes so far, in that it does not actually encourage The Bunkhouse to their own policing their guests's parking. In fact, it does just the opposite. If someone has parked in a spot not allowed for Bunkhouse parking (like on the street, or in another business's lot) and the Bunkhouse cannot locate the guest to tell them to move, there is no reason the Bunkhouse would call the towing company on themselves leading to a $100 fine. I'm not saying that The Bunkhouse would lie or actively try to beat the system, only that they would have incentive to turn a "blind eye".

   Perhaps the solution could be to levy that $100 fine on the Bunkhouse only in the case that the Bunkhouse is not the one the calls the police or tow company on the violator. In other words, if another entity or individual (for example a business owner, resident or authority) has to call to have a Bunkhouse guest's car removed, the Bunkhouse is charged the fine. If, however, the Bunkhouse is diligent and as effective as they hope to be, and they identify and violators first, then they are rewarded by not incurring a fine.

2. I'm concerned overall about the general policing of parking violators in general. I expect that many of the guests will be arriving back to the Bunkhouse after 10pm, after having gone out to enjoy downtown Vail and the surrounding areas. I would think it unreasonable to expect that most of the Bunkhouse's guests are done eating and sightseeing and are back to the Bunkhouse before 10pm. If I am correct about this, than I expect that without valet as an option, some guests will take advantage of whatever nearby spots along the road or in other lots they find that aren't explicitly marked as tow zone for Bunkhouse parking. My point is that all of this indicates to me that most of the parking issues that are likely to happen will occur after 10pm, the time at which the Bunkhouse has planned to have the fewest resources and manpower on staff to monitor and enforce their parking policy.

   For this, I suggest that The Bunkhouse be required to do any combination of the following:
   - Have valet operations ongoing through midnight.
   - Hire a parking management company to monitor the surrounding blocks a few times

during the night, and perhaps even during that day and evening. An example of such service is provided by Summit Security and info can be found at http://www.summitpatrol.com/page/parking-management.php. The Bunkhouse should be responsible for giving over the license plate numbers of all guests to the parking management company on a daily basis.
- The Bunkhouse and or town must put ample signage on the surrounding blocks, parking lots (including in the Mollie G building underground parking area) that specifically and clearly states something like "No Bunkhouse parking 24/7. Cars will be towed at owners expense".
- Have a second staff member to help monitor the area for a few extra hours in the late evening and earlier morning (so for example, two employees, one who can stay on site another to monitor outside when needed until midnight and again as early as 5am).

3. I know that the 17 space variance seems like more than enough spaces than will be needed, but I worry that at times it will not be enough. The number 17 was calculated referencing statistics that I don't think apply to the Bunkhouse's demographic. In particular, Ryan cited one study that showed overnight visitors to the Vail Valley are coming groups of 3.2 people per car. However, it is my reasonable assumption that the groups that go into making this 3.2 number is largely skewed either by families with children who would likely not want to stay in a hostel environment, or groups of friends that can likely pool resources to get a shared room at a hotel like the Hotel Minturn or a house through Airbnb or similar service. This in mind, I believe that most guests of the Bunkhouse will end up coming closer to 1-2 people per car. The 17 space variance might be fine for a large majority of the time, but if the Bunkhouse is ever going to be capable or reaching full capacity I believe they will sometimes need at least 20 spaces, and perhaps even 25. This will also give the Bunkhouse the ability to not have to turn people away once they realize that they have used the entirety of their parking resources

I hope that my concerns don't seem unreasonable or biased because of the fact that I live above the planned hostel. On the contrary, I hope that they are taken even more seriously and seen as even more imperative considering that we are residents. I want to believe that it is a top priority of the town council that assuring the quality of life for Minturn residents remains *relatively* unaffected by the granting of this parking variance.

Sincerely,

Matthew Christian Holmes
175 Williams St, Apt 203
Minturn CO 81645