



(1 page)

Julie Saylor &lt;julie.saylor@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**East Meadows homeowners that do not support the new parking lot**1 message

---

**Bonnie Matlock** <bonniematlock4@yahoo.com>  
To: julie.saylor@edcgov.us  
Cc: Tod Francis <tod@shastaventures.com>

Tue, May 5, 2015 at 6:03 PM

Dear Julie Saylor:

My husband and I have owned a house in East Meadows for ~ 16 years. Additionally we own 2 other lots in the East Meadows. So we have a vested interest in what is best for Kirkwood.

We do not support the new parking lot that is being proposed for the following reasons:

- This proposal is not consistent with the Kirkwood Specific Plan that has been put in place. According to the Specific plan this land should be reserved for residents for parks, recreation, open space or employee housing...not used for the benefit of visitors.
- This proposal would mean the removal of many large mature trees in the area that cannot be replaced. this would change the view from the east side of the meadow and from the meadow itself. These trees currently act as a good visual barrier from the PUD buildings. And replacement trees won't work....there have been trees planted on our KW home property that have never grown at all.
- Additionally, the annual reports for TR-TAC have shown that there has been a surplus of parking even during very heavy snow years. So extra parking is not needed. And if extra parking is needed the Specific Plan encourages multi-level parking rather than spreading surface parking over more of the meadow, forested and recreational land.

Julie, we sincerely hope that as homeowners and property owners at Kirkwood our perspective is listened to.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Matlock and Tod Francis

(1 page)



Julie Saylor <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

---

**parking lot**

1 message

---

**christoph rubach** <christophrubach@gmail.com>  
To: julie.saylor@edcgov.us

Wed, May 6, 2015 at 6:43 AM

Dear Ms Saylor

I love Kirkwood, and am very concerned about paving more land for parking. It had been discussed, that parking would be built multi-story. This is a far more efficient use of space, keeping Kirkwood open, and thus attracting more users to the beautiful valley.

Please consider my concerns, and those of many others.

RUBACH

SINCERELY

CHRISTOPH

(2 pages)



Julie Saylor &lt;julie.saylor@edcgov.us&gt;

---

## Kirkwood Parking

1 message

---

**Don Erickson** <donerickson@rocketmail.com>  
Reply-To: Don Erickson <donerickson@rocketmail.com>  
To: "julie.saylor@edcgov.us" <julie.saylor@edcgov.us>

Wed, May 6, 2015 at 8:23 AM

Dear Ms. Saylor, and Tri Tac Committee Members,

As Kirkwood homeowners and part-time residents for more than thirty years, we write to state opposition to the Village East, LLP, proposal for an amendment to the Specific Plan for Kirkwood and for the rezoning, as currently described, of an area off Loop Road, for a parking lot.

We are sure you are well aware of the concerns of many individuals, organizations, and agencies that have filed documents opposing these changes. With many others we filed written opposition and spoke against this project at the TCTAC meeting on April 10.

It will serve no purpose to repeat what has been said clearly and forcefully by many of us; we are sure the Committee is well aware of the issues.

However there are two fundamental problems that have not been fully discussed.

Village East filed as little as it could in support of the changes it seeks. No reason for these changes was provided beyond a description of what was sought. No need was demonstrated. (In fact, at the hearing on April 10 it was stated, without contradiction, that there is not a current need for more parking at Kirkwood.) No overall parking plan for Kirkwood was submitted. If Village East is contractually obligated to supply 75 additional parking spaces as part of its sale to Vail, which was the only basis mentioned in its proposal, that has not been supported by documentation so cannot be evaluated, and, in any event, is not properly before this Committee because it is simply a private relationship between Vail and Village East. Nonetheless, it is important to understand absolutely no reason was given why this alleged obligation to Vail resulted in a request for 190-200 parking spaces. Several of the representations of the impact of this project on residents, and on the environment, as stated in the proposal are false. (These problems are described in many of the documents before you, and were stated, without contradiction, at the April 10 hearing.) In this writer's opinion, more must be demanded from Village East before its proposal should be accepted for any purpose whatsoever.

The lack of Village East's transparency in its proposal allows a wide field for speculation. However one possibility, based squarely on Village East's recent record, should be considered: Is Village East seeking additional parking based on projected need for the resort, or does it want to convert existing parking to residential/condominium construction — as it has done in the recent past? If the latter, does this justify the extensive environmental damage this project entails? We think not. But at the very least a case should be made by Village East.

Why 190 – 200 spaces rather than 75? Without a parking plan this cannot be evaluated. If the Committee does allow Village East to proceed, its recommendation should be limited, at most, to the only obligation Village East has stated: 75 spaces. This could be achieved with much less environmental destruction by locating it along the already developed corridor of Loop Road.

The fact is we do not have a clue about Village East's intentions. We believe that the TCTAC should demand enough information from Village East so that a reasonably accurate understanding of this project, and its implications for Kirkwood, can be formed by the Committee and understood by the Kirkwood community. After such information is supplied, a much more useful hearing on the need for Village East's proposed parking project and its impact on the environment could be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

5/6/2015

Edcgov.us Mail - Kirkwood Parking

Donald and Elizabeth Erickson



(1 page)

Julie Saylor &lt;julie.saylor@edcgov.us&gt;

---

**KCP's proposed parking lot**

1 message

---

**Owner 1** <lolli-54@charter.net>  
To: julie.saylor@edcgov.us

Wed, May 6, 2015 at 1:31 PM

Dear Ms. Saylor,

I am writing to comment upon the KCP's proposal to develop a parking lot on the property that is known as the school site. My husband, Victor, and I attended the TR-TAC meeting last month and voiced our objections to that project.

We are the owners of lot 212 in East Meadows. Our deck overlooks the meadow and is directly across from the proposed development. Unfortunately the power station and utility buildings already serve as a backdrop to that otherwise spectacular view. I am appalled by the notion of further disruption of Kirkwood's natural landscape! The proposal by the Kirkwood Capital Partners to cut down more trees is unconscionable and is without regard to the overall beauty of Kirkwood as a resort. In addition, it disregards the detrimental impact to property owners surrounding the site and of those, like myself, who view it from across the meadow.

At the April meeting, several spoke quite eloquently to the reasons why this is a terrible idea. Notwithstanding the visual impact, there are concerns with respect to water quality, safety to skiers, impact upon the cross-country trail, and interference with emergency vehicles. I would urge the board to listen carefully to these concerns and would like to go on record as echoing those objections.

I would like to point out, as well, that the statistics cited at the April meeting brought into question the true need for additional parking at this time. It was suggested that the KCP provide a comprehensive list of alternative sites for consideration. I would hope that they will come to the May meeting with that in hand. If the KCP was so worried about parking, I question why they chose to obliterate the parking near Timber Creek. Obviously, the profit motive in the building of more ski-in/out homes at that site and the undesirability of having parking in THEIR back yards won out over consideration for the resort as a whole or for the existing body of Kirkwood homeowners.

I urge you to forward this letter to the committee members. Unfortunately, we will be unable to attend this meeting. I see no reason to prolong this matter further with subsequent review by other regulatory commissions. From my perspective the TR-TAC exists to protect the interests of the property owners in their respective counties, as opposed to bowing to pressure from profit-oriented property developers. Please encourage all to vote in opposition to this zoning change request.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of my comments.

Linda Drakulich