

TOWN OF SNOWMASS VILLAGE

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

February 15, 2023

Members Present:

Brian Marshack, Chairman
Matthew Dube, Vice Chairman
Jim Gustafson
Stan Clauson
David Seglin

Staff Present:

Dave Shinneman
Jeff Conklin
Sara Nester
Jim Wahlstrom
Sam Guarino
Clint Kinney
Greg LeBlanc
Jim Wahlstrom
Brian McNellis
Betsy Crum

Members Absent:

Doug Faurer - Excused

Others Present:

Jay Shumaker
Matt Gwost
Alex Jaunch
Colton Conrad
Dave Mercatoris

Call to order: The meeting was called to order at 4:02 p.m. by Brian Marshack, Chairman.

Item 1: Approval of February 1, 2023, Meeting Minutes:

The Minutes from the 2/1/2023 meeting were brought up for approval. Matthew Dube made a motion to approve, second by Jim Gustafson and approved unanimously.

Item 2: Parking Code Standards:

Jim Wahlstrom, Senior Planner, started the conversation by providing the background on the Parking Code Standards. He reviewed the redlined section

of changes with the group that had been reviewed and modified last year. Jim welcomed any questions from the board members.

Stan Clauson made a motion to approve resolution 1 series of 2023, second by Matthew Dube and approved unanimously.

Item 3: Transit Center Special Review – Continued:

Brian McNellis, Senior Planner, opened the conversation by stating that the last time that we met on the Transit Center was on January 4. We took some time for the architects to respond to some of the design questions. Town staff is happy to make any changes as needed to the resolution. Staff is recommending a vote on this matter tonight. Since the January 4 meeting, we have had many public comments which are attachment H. In the supplemental application that was included by the applicant, there was a supporting letter from RFTA. Brian is happy to answer any questions before we move things over to the applicant.

Dave Shinneman, Community Development Director, stated that we received a public comment today around 1:30 and it has been emailed to all Planning Commission Members. This will also be included in the minutes.

Sam Guarino, Transportation Director, started the conversation by stating that he is here with Alex Jauch, Architect, and Matt Gwost, Contractor. Sam stated that the reason for building a new mall transit center has been based on two underlying needs. The first is a transit functionality of the Snowmass Mall. The Village Shuttle and RFTA combined have a million boardings per year. There is a financial spend on \$9 to \$10 million dollars on their services for the mall. The planned transit center would combine the two transit systems on a single platform allowing them to function in this location as a cohesive operation. The new platform would also provide an adequate space for current and future demand, and helping riders know with confidence will be picking them up and dropping them off. This would avoid the current space constraints which often require loading and unloading in less than ideal and sometimes unsafe locations. This segues into our second underlying need for the project which is improved rider and guest experience. The village shuttle and RFTA depots along with lot 6, are in many ways the welcome center to the town. It is the first experience that many people have when they arrive to the town as well as a daily experience for many residents and employees. Currently, it is often disorganized and often unsafe. Riders from the village shuttle find themselves unsure of the best path to mall business and will have to carry their gear up multiple stairways. Riders from the RFTA system find themselves dropped off in a cramped and unlevel area, and during busy times, may find themselves in a roadway. Those parking in time parking in lot 6 find themselves crossing traffic at a steep grade, then climbing a stairway onto an uneven and sometimes slippery surface. All users may have difficulty finding a restroom, and finding answers about Snowmass Village as a whole. With the

help of the last three meetings of the Planning Commission, we believe that we have designed a mall Transit Center that meets the needs for improved function and experience, but also creates a facility that the Town of Snowmass Village can be proud of. We think that it will feel familiar to those who know the village, and give those who don't, an impression that the town cares about its employees, its residents, and the environment. There are letters of support from RFTA, SkiCo, and the Snowmass Mall Investment Group, which hopefully demonstrate that this feeling is shared beyond those are presenting tonight.

A lot of what we have heard over the last three meetings is about softening the look of the structure and making it blend in with the surroundings. With an effort to do so, we have made several material changes and we think that the result is a much-improved project. Horizontal wooden planking, similar to the look and color of town hall, was added and extended downward to improve the aesthetic, and black lighting and utilities within the garage while improving the aesthetic. The railings around the platform are like other bus stops that you see around town. A stone veneer was added to the columns which is seen at town hall, and light fixtures like what you will see around the Base Village area. The exterior of the platform is now a bullet form concrete that is stained. It will give off more of a natural look and feel. There will be red siding used to match other parts of the town such as Town Park Station and Town Hall. The material changes will also continue up on to the platform. Sam welcomed questions from the commission.

Matthew Dube commented on the reduced size of the planter which he thinks looks much better.

Sam commented that in addition, the color of the paving patterns had been changed to give it a more natural feel. It has been changed to more of a brown color instead of red.

Sam commented that another thing he heard from the board was landscaping. Staff made an effort to add as much landscaping to soften the appearance of the structure and give it a more wooded feel. There was a roughly 20-foot-wide bench added near the retraining wall to add landscaping, and break up the height of the retaining wall.

Sam commented that in the last meeting that there was discussion to add a sidewalk to the new Carriage Way. They studied the issue, and came up with a two-prong solution. The section between the garage entrance and Daly Lane will have the paved steppers behind the landscaping to provide a safe path to the pedestrian area behind Daly Lane. For the section uphill at the garage entrance, the study showed that putting a sidewalk at this location would require moving the new Carriage Way further downhill, increasing retaining wall heights all the way around the project, and putting pedestrians in a less-than-ideal location. Therefore, we did not design a sidewalk in this location,

rather we planted a staunchly landscape to discourage pedestrians using this route. Planning for the instance for when a pedestrian finds themselves on this section of road, a 24" grass buffer was added.

As far as the construction of the project, we are developing two possible construction management plans. First is a roughly 28-month plan that would move as quickly as possible throughout construction but create more disruption to the mall by having longer closure durations and closing RFTA completely for a long duration. The second, which is provided in the packet is a 40-month-long plan that would be less disruptive to mall operations, but with a longer window. It would allow lot 5 to be open and accessible before the first winter of the project, and for RFTA operation to continue unabated through the first winter while the new road is being completed. The access to Daly Lane would never be completely cut off, and RFTA service to the mall would be provided for the entire duration of the project. This would need to be finalized by RFTA.

Matthew Dube asked if there was a price difference between the two designs.

Clint Kinney commented that it's over a \$1 million dollar difference.

Jim Gustafson asked what the location of possible shuttle van drop offs is.

Sam responded that we will begin with dropping off in what is currently the Daly Lane bus depot using this as our van/skier pick-up/drop off. If this is to become inadequate, we do have locations within the existing garage design which we believe will be adequate.

Gus brought up the recent parking regulations resolution that was recently passed. This requires shuttle van parking/accommodations for parking lots, and that we are now requiring pick-up points, but where are the delivery points?

Clint responded that we are recommending Daly Lane. This adjustment can also be made in the future, and we are open to it.

Gus commented that the kiss-and-ride function and the van drop-off are important features. He isn't sure if Daly Lane is the best option.

David Seglin brought up a couple of questions. He feels that the landscaping looks nice with the tiered wall. He is wondering if there are any winter condition landscaping options?

Alex Jaunch responded that there are now renderings to provide at this time. There are some winter greens and low shrub evergreens for variety of landscaping.

David Selgin mentioned that he would appreciate a logistics plan being included. He is wondering if there is a timeframe for each phase of construction.

Clint responded that we don't have one that we can stick to yet. Right now, 40 months is what we can stick to.

Stan Clauson commented that someone from Pokolodi wanted to speak about his concern with the parking, and Stan said that he could not discuss it and to have someone from Pokolodi come to the meeting to discuss their concerns.

Gus asked what the program requirement is for the number of RFTA vs the number of shuttle buses.

Alex responded that the program for RFTA is four 45-foot MTI's all at one time. Three of these being able to work independently.

Alex commented that the other spaces will just try to maximize, not just for shuttles, but future growth or RFTA layovers if something happens and a bay needs to be found. The other bays were designed accordingly to try to be as flexible as possible, with the full intent since day one to be used as primarily being town shuttle stops.

Brian Marshack asked a question about the Daly Lane intersection – can two semi-like trucks get through – one going in, and one going out? He also inquired about the roadway widths.

Alex responded yes; this is possible. The width is at least 24, traditional roadway widths.

Matthew asked to see the redesigned bays – he commented that this is a view that he doesn't recall seeing. He likes the change of materials and reduction of the concrete. This is presented as the view from the platform of the buses. He asked about the entrance to the restrooms and if pedestrians would be able to see a clear path. He feels it could be improved if that planter could be shifted a bit so pedestrians can see the entrance to the restroom.

Alex said that this is something that they can look at and work on the proper location.

Sam commented that the area that passengers get on and off the bus is to the right of the planter.

Gus brought up a question regarding the garage design, parking, and the cost of parking and discussed further with Matt Gwost, Contractor.

Brian Marshack brought up a question regarding the design of the spaces. He struggles with this as there is ingress and egress, cars backing in and coming out. He is wondering how this is expected to work. It also has a potential to back up traffic.

Alex responded that it isn't too far off from a typical parking lot. It is a double-loaded two-way street, so in theory, they shouldn't be parking into this drive isle anyway. It is a 24-foot-wide drive isle, so they shouldn't be backing into their own lane or backing out.

There was continued discussion about the concerns of the parking spaces and garage. Alex provided clarification on many items.

Stan commented that this condition is no different from the condition to the entry of any of our parking lots and he doesn't feel that it's an issue. He feels that the safety issues have been thoroughly considered.

Matthew asked how many spaces are being lost in the iteration of lot 5.

Clint responded that it's a rough number, but he would say 10 spaces.

Brian Marshack welcomed public comments.

Dave Mercatoris, General Manager of the Pokoloti Lodge, commented that they want to be supportive neighbors, but voiced his concerns of the project.

Jay Shumaker, Architect, voiced his concerns of the Transit Center project and presented an email that was sent as public comments in the late morning/early afternoon. He also asked a couple of questions on the plan.

Stan asked Alex if he is a bus driver. Alex responded that he is not a bus driver. He asked if there are bus drivers in his firm that are designing this. He responded that there are not. He asked if there are qualified people in transportation design in his firm, and he asked for examples. Alex responded that himself, he designed Civic Center Station in downtown Denver, and he has done multiple projects for RFTA throughout the valley, along with his civil and traffic engineers. They also have offices throughout central and eastern states who also have a large amount of transit experience. Brian asked if RFTA is designing the project, or if it is the town. The applicant, the town, has designed this project.

The Planning Commission discussed how the project relates to the Comprehensive Plan. Each commissioner was given the opportunity to comment on each code review standard. There was a lengthy discussion amongst board members, staff, the architect, as well as the contractor. There were comments about safety, the size of the project, accessibility, ingress and

egress. The group feels that the project needs to be simplified and that better planning needs to happen.

Clint encouraged the board to include their honest comments and conditions of approval to share with the council as their feedback is valuable.

Dave commented that the planning staff was kept somewhat separate because we sit in a regulatory function. There has been a very good review of the application by the Planning Commission, and he does like the comments that have been made. He encouraged a motion to approve or deny with conditions. There have been changes made that responded to the architecture, landscaping, the concerns on safety and the crossings have been well documented, and we can further document it.

Matthew commented that all members of the commission should be present for the final vote.

Brian Marshack said the next step is to go through the resolution and conditions of approval, and at that point, the board can vote yes or no.

Brian McNellis commented that it would be helpful to staff if there are conditions of approval that would make the resolution more digestible, to come with the language to incorporate into the resolution or document that be voted upon.

Stan made a motion to have a continuance to the next meeting on March 1, and to create conditions for the resolution, second by Elise Denis and approved unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:13 P.M.