



R. Boucher 1  
Feb 1, 2012

Board of Trustees Town of Eagle

For Eagle River Station File

Although I do not understand why the Town is reviewing a project that is even bigger than what was defeated in January 2010, I would like to submit these comments on why I do not think the current proposal fits the Eagle Area Community Plan. From what I understand, the Eagle Area Community Plan was updated and is a main document for consideration on this project. I would also like answers to the questions if possible regarding the Eagle Area Community Plan as it relates to this project.

We can have a great project in many parts of Town including East Eagle and I fully support good growth. However, this project is neither a great project nor good growth!

Questions:

Did the Board review and discuss Eagle County's comments on this proposal?

Did the Board review the Eagle River Watershed Plan?

Page 74:

Is the passage for wildlife gate still open as referenced here?

Comments on the proposal:

Page 6:

I do not understand a typical big box shopping center adds anything to the unique identity as referenced in the vision

Page 7:

The site plan calls for development from east to west which seems to be in conflict with the comments related to compact development and that new development should occur within or adjacent to already developed areas to minimize a sprawling development pattern.

Page 9:

This development which is a fairly standard and old concept does not seem to fit the comments related to "future developments should also be responsive to the influences...as well as new and evolving design, construction, and transportation technologies. This is especially true when you look at the sustainability chapter of the PUD guide which is minimal at best. Plus it does not even require retailers who build their own buildings to follow any standards!

R. Boucher 2  
Feb 2, 2012

Page 11:

Per the previous wildlife study, this area is not defined as critical habitat. However, the Division of Wildlife representative did suggest that wildlife buffers be built into this project (actually, all projects in the Town). This does not seem to have been done from what I can see in the plan.

Page 12, section 9:

The community wants to avoid a shift to a resort based or second home community. The housing proposed does not seem to fit our community if the target base is workers. If it is not workers, the quality of life along a loud interstate with minimum open space does not seem high enough to attract another group of residents who would live there full time.

Page 17:

Development is called for in East Eagle which is certainly reasonable over the next 50 years in our community. However, this particular proposal that starts east and goes west. This concept seems to be the definition of sprawl which is the opposite of good land use referenced here.

Page 21:

This section references the specific challenges for mixed used developments. This project's location, size, and use do not seem to address any of these challenges in a manner that would fit our community and lend it success for a true mixed use development.

Page 27:

The location of this project and the fact that it starts east to west seems to warrant only mobility by an automobile instead of other means as referenced in section B.

Page 28:

The lack of open space and the amount of paved surfaces seem to do little to preserve and protect the quality of riparian areas and river and stream corridors as referenced in section c.

Page 29:

If I remember correctly, we had seen a drive by video simulation from Highway 6 in the first Eagle River Station proposal. I do not understand why this has not been done again (and also from I-70) in this proposal so the community can understand the true visual impact of the project.

Page 40:

R. Boucher<sup>3</sup>  
Feb 1, 2012

It seems obvious from the large white space on the west side of the site plan that this project is not being submitted as a single planned unit development. I understand there are some PUD requirements being approved which the second phase would be built under but I think the whole sketch plan should be understood and submitted as that seems the spirit of this requirement.

On item J, it says the project should provide site designs that maximize opportunity for shared parking. I do not understand how 5 spaces per 1,000 feet of commercial space and 1.6 parking spaces per residential address this issue in any manner. I believe we can do with much less parking!

Page 41:

I do not think the proposed site plan and expected building completion (from east to west), is designed to make it part of the larger Eagle area. Instead it seems this design makes it a stand-alone neighborhood as not wanted in section M. The idea that marketing, signage, or streetscape elements can accomplish this seems in contrast to the goal of the developer who touts one stop shopping and monument signs to identify the center.

As mentioned previously, I do not see how this project is unique in any fashion as these centers can be found in most towns across the Country.

It does not seem that the exercise stations, temporary park, or limited green space fits item E at all.

Page 70:

The amount of surface parking will no doubt have an impact on the Eagle River. I believe the amount of parking greatly jeopardizes the river corridor which is referenced as one of our most prized features.

Page 72:

The site planning and amount of surface parking does not seem to have been done with conscientious site planning.

Page 84:

It does not seem to me that a 732,000 square foot shopping center reflects a small town in any fashion. This is especially true when this is nearly 70% of the current commercial space in Eagle!

Page 88:

The amount of signage, the large monument signs allowed do not seem to be reviewed/done in conjunction with the rest of Town. I have a fear that the large signage for this proposal will seem like that area is Eagle, not just a part of Eagle.

R. Boucher 4  
Feb 1, 2012

Page 89:

From what I can tell, the sustainability standards do not seem specific enough to address the comments related to energy efficient design. Plus if the retailers do not have to follow the PUD guide in this area, the PUD guide seems irrelevant.

Page 91:

Section 1.1 A recommends that new standards be created that are currently lacking. It seems that Eagle would not have any standards in place for a project of this magnitude. This greatly concerns me as our standards will simply not be able to ensure that we have a high quality project.

Section 1.2 B references gateways should be enhanced through landscaping, signage, and public art. Besides the large retail signs on the backs of buildings, I do not see that this project addresses use of landscaping and public art. Landscaping is minimal at best.

Page 113:

A project of this size and scope seems to destroy the visual impact of the area instead of protecting it.

Thank you for your attention to my concerns.

Sincerely,

Rita Boucher

37 Chelsea Ct