

TOWN OF SNOWMASS VILLAGE

**PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

November 13, 2024

Members Present:

Brian Marshack, Chair
Jim Gustafson
Doug Faurer
David Seglin

Staff Present:

Dave Shinneman
Brian McNellis
Ashleigh Huff
Anne Martens
Greg LeBlanc
Cameron Luck

Members Absent:

Elise Denis
Matt Dube
Stan Clauson

Others Present: Stacey Kelly, Elle Peterson, Jay Shumaker, Skyler Stark-Ragsdale, Doug Endicott, Andrew Wickes, Bart Johnson, Jordan Sarick, Colby Christoff, Richard Shaw, Matt Armentrout, Rich Carr, Lucy Peterson, Norman

Call to order: The meeting was called to order at 4:00 pm and roll was called. Commissioners Clauson, Denis, and Dube were absent.

Item 1: Approval of October 16, 2024, Meeting Minutes:

The Minutes from the 10/16/2024 meeting were brought for approval. Commissioners made no comments or changes. Commissioner Faurer motioned to approve, seconded by Commissioner Gustafson, and were unanimously approved.

Item 2: Snowmass Center Minor PUD:

Brian McNellis, Senior Planner, introduced the discussion on the Snowmass Center Minor PUD Amendment. He introduced the applicant, Eastwood Snowmass Investors, who had previously submitted the project through the PUD process from 2017 to 2020 and were now seeking approval to amend the development by separating the commercial and residential components of the Snowmass Center. Specifically, the applicant proposed separating the residential parcels (2, 3, and 4) while retaining parcel 1, which included commercial spaces like Clark's Market and the Post Office.

Commissioner Gustafson inquired about the relationship between the land use amendment and the potential property deal. Dave Shinneman, Community Development Director, clarified that while the two were interconnected, the Planning Commission's focus was solely on the land use amendment, not the ongoing negotiations between the applicant and the town on the land purchase. Mr. Shinneman clarified that the Commission's role was to review the land use changes, not to assess the property deal.

The applicant's team then presented the proposed changes in detail. Richard Shaw, representing the applicant, outlined the minor amendments to the Snowmass Center's approved Planned Unit Development (PUD), emphasizing how the proposed improvements aligned with community-oriented goals. A key change was the creation of a separate residential area, allowing independent development of both the residential and commercial components.

Mr. Shaw discussed several modifications, including the removal of two smaller buildings and the creation of a public amenity area on the on the second level, envisioned as a town square with views and potential amenities like a coffee shop. The plan also proposed reserving 4,000 square feet permanently for the post office. The original commercial floor area of 58,344 square feet remained unchanged, with no building heights or leasable space alterations.

The design emphasized pedestrian-friendly elements, such as wider sidewalks, an improved parking layout, and better transit services. The new transit center location was proposed to enhance circulation and support future residential units. Snow management plans remained the same, with snow being pushed downhill, and provisions for snow storage were addressed.

Architecturally, the design retained much of the original plan's character, incorporating varied building masses and materials to enhance the streetscape. The entrances would be redesigned to improve accessibility, preserving the "Main Street" feel. Compact parking spaces and improved delivery service corridors were also part of the plan.

The redevelopment would proceed in phases, starting with infrastructure work and the construction of the parking garage, followed by the expansion of the eastern building and grocery store. The project would also incorporate a loop water line for fire protection, and fire lanes would be maintained throughout construction. An interim transit loop was introduced to ensure continuous access to the center during redevelopment until permanent transit facilities were built.

In conclusion, Mr. Shaw stated the goal is to develop a functional, sustainable, and aesthetically pleasing mixed-use center meeting the needs of both commercial and residential tenants while ensuring the center's continued vitality and accessibility throughout the construction phases.

92 The discussion of the project was transitioned to commissioner comments by
93 Chair Marshack. Commissioner Fauer raised several questions, including who
94 would be responsible for maintaining the rooftop space, and sought clarification
95 on the loading zone areas and service corridors. He expressed concern that the
96 potential addition of affordable housing could create a traffic bottleneck.

97 Brian McNellis interjected, suggesting a traffic consultant study might be
98 beneficial. Commissioner Seglin agreed with this suggestion, reiterating
99 Commissioner Fauer's concerns about traffic flow. Commissioner Fauer also
100 noted to the applicant that the inclusion of affordable housing would likely lead
101 to an influx of year-round residents, further impacting traffic.

102
103 Commissioner Gustafson expressed concerns about potential traffic congestion
104 with the addition of residential housing but supported the architectural concept.
105 He questioned emergency access and the flow of traffic. He also inquired about
106 the phasing of the project, tenant impacts, and service access, receiving
107 assurances that access would be maintained. Commissioner Gustafson raised
108 concerns about delivery truck visibility, which would be addressed by the
109 proposed service corridor. He also asked about the retaining walls, access points
110 to the potential new housing above the center, and the east end of the site,
111 acknowledging the project's site constraints.

112
113 Commissioner Seglin agreed with previous comments from Commissioners
114 Fauer and Gustafson, particularly regarding the project's overall direction. He
115 supported the architecture but raised concerns about several issues. He inquired
116 whether it was possible to integrate civil infrastructure for the residential area
117 with the Village Center's development to save costs, although he acknowledged
118 that the steep grades made this challenging. He also emphasized the need to
119 consider ways to shield parking areas from view, particularly from Brush Creek
120 Road, to avoid an expanse of visible cars. He recommended adding berms or
121 decorative walls to improve aesthetics.

122
123 Commissioner Seglin also voiced concerns about the community atrium, noting
124 it could become congested with pedestrians, families, and deliveries. He
125 suggested that the area might become too crowded without a designated drop-
126 off zone for cars, which could lead to traffic flow issues. Additionally, he
127 highlighted the potential complications of the water line and other utilities that
128 would serve both the Snowmass Center and the future residential area.

129 While acknowledging the challenges, Seglin appreciated the improvements to the
130 project and endorsed the overall plan. He also noted the potential benefits of
131 integrating infrastructure, such as stormwater and fire protection, across both
132 the commercial and residential phases. However, he underscored the importance
133 of addressing these concerns to ensure the project's success.

134
135 Commissioner Marshack expressed support for the design but raised concerns
136 about future traffic and intersection flow, emphasizing the need for "future-
137 proofing" and more detailed traffic plans, including egress and overall traffic

management. He sought clarification on the 18-foot sidewalk and its continuity across the center, particularly around covered areas (e.g., arcades) and seating, and recommended incorporating barriers to separate pedestrians from traffic, similar to solutions seen at Whole Foods. He was positive about the second-story retail, especially the idea of a coffee shop or restaurant with a view, suggesting it could benefit from a concept similar to former restaurants. He emphasized that second-story retail should capitalize on the view and serve as a community amenity. Commissioner Marshack also raised concerns about the shuttle and hotel drop-off area, requesting more information on how many vehicles were expected and how they would flow through the site. He questioned whether 200 parking spaces were necessary, expressing concern about the number of compact spaces and the visual impact of a large asphalt lot. He suggested revisiting the parking design to potentially reduce spaces while accommodating alternatives like shuttle services or electric vehicle (EV) stations. He highlighted the need for ongoing discussions on parking, transit, and space for amenities like recycling stations, urging a further review of the parking strategy to balance parking needs with the design of the site and pedestrian experience. Finally, he agreed that these topics could be continued at the next meeting, with a focus on ensuring the project met long-term community and design goals.

Bart Johnson, the land use and real estate attorney for the project, addressed the unique timing situation surrounding the application. He explained that the town approached them to purchase the residential parcels, but the deal is contingent on the approval of a minor PUD amendment. This has created a "chicken and egg" scenario, as the purchase contract with the town relies on the approval of the PUD amendments, and the approval cannot happen unless the deal goes through. He acknowledged that the town is both the purchaser and the approving agency, which makes the process awkward but unavoidable.

The changes to the project flow from the town's request to remove the free-market residential units, which significantly affects the economics and design of the center. Jordan from Eastwood Snowmass Investors clarified that the purchase is subject to the minor PUD amendment process, noting that significant time and effort have gone into the application over the past 6 to 8 months. He added that the seller has the right to terminate the contract if the project does not move forward, as the existing PUD approval is expiring, and the pace of government processes has not aligned with the project's timeline. Despite the challenges, Jordan emphasized their goal of closing the deal within the next year, which is now at risk due to delays in the approval process.

In response, the town's Community Development staff clarified that the review process is separate from ownership negotiations on the land purchase. They emphasized that the department is following established review standards, including the minor PUD amendment process, and is working through issues raised during the review. The staff also acknowledged the applicant's pressure to meet deadlines but pointed out the review process takes time and some

unresolved issues, such as input from the fire district and the Town, still need to be addressed.

Jordan Sarick of Eastwood Snowmass, indicated that the applicant had hoped to be on the agenda for the following week, the town staff noted that their agenda was already set, and the project could not be brought forward at that time. After discussion with staff and the planning commission all agreed to bring the topic back to the November 20th meeting, and after a short break, they heard public comment on the project.

John Meley, Fire Marshal with Roaring Fork Fire Rescue Authority, commented he believed a looped water line would be beneficial to the design of the project. He requested additional fire hydrants within the parking lot and emphasized that the phasing of the project created concerns regarding fire access. Meley stated he believed the applicant would work with Roaring Fork Fire to address and alleviate these concerns. Mr. McNellis inquired if a condition added to the staff resolution indicating the applicant and Fire Authority would be sufficient, and commissioners agreed.

Jay Schumaker, a retired architect and Snowmass resident, encouraged the commissioners to consider the future impact of autonomous vehicles, suggesting that preparations should be made for their integration. He expressed concern that there was no connection between the proposed center and Base Village, and voiced his concerns about the lack of electric vehicle charging stations. Schumaker also raised the issue of the hillside potentially being developed exclusively for workforce housing, with no luxury housing included.

Doug Endicott, a Snowmass resident and business owner, expressed appreciation for the complexity of the project and encouraged all parties to move expeditiously toward approval.

Once public comment was concluded, commissioners agreed to continue this item to the following meeting.

Item 3: Community Development Director Updates

- The Little Red School House project is set to be presented on November 20.
- The Divide Workforce Housing "SHOP" project is scheduled for the Planning Commission on December 4.

Motion to adjourn by Commissioner Gustafson, seconded by Commissioner Seglin. All in favor. None opposed.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:44 p.m.