

TOWN OF SNOWMASS VILLAGE

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES

November 2, 2022

Members Present:

Brian Marshack, Chairman
Matthew Dube, Vice Chairman
Stan Clauson
Doug Faurer
Jim Gustafson

Staff Present:

Dave Shinneman
Sara Nester
Jim Wahlstrom
John Dresser

Members Absent:

Christy MacLear
Elese Denis

Others Present:

Call to order: The meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Brian Marshack, Chairman.

Item 1: Approval of Meeting Minutes from October 19, 2022: The Minutes from the 9/21/22 meeting were brought up for approval. Stan Clauson made a motion to approve, second by Matthew Dube and approved unanimously.

Item 2: Discussion of Parking Standards – Continued:

Jim Wahlstrom, Senior Planner, started the conversation by walking the group through the presentation of the latest changes and version of the minimum parking required standards. Staff made the changes that were discussed at the last meeting. The Planning Commission discussed changing the zone districts for Single Family detached estates, and duplex unit zone districts. This would apply to both the free market and restricted units. The following changes were made:

1-to-2-bedroom units: 2 spaces minimum
3-bedroom units: 3 spaces minimum
4+ bedroom units: 4 spaces minimum

Multi Family PUD Zone Districts:

1-3-bedroom units: minimum of 1 space per bedroom
4+ bedroom units: 4 spaces minimum

Mixed Use/PUD/Commercial Core/PUD Standards:

1–3-bedroom units: 1 space per bedroom minimum

4+ bedroom units: 4 spaces minimum

Restaurant requirement:

1 space for 300sf of commercial space except one space before indoor seats for restaurants vs requiring the applicants include the outdoor seating. Staff decided to exempt the outdoor seating where it is allowed within a particular plan such as a PUD.

Under minimum inclusions we did further research on other ideas for these requirements. We added an excerpt from the US Green Building Council which had some good ideas. Staff took the liberty to add a clause regarding the proximity of the spaces to pedestrian entry area. At the last meeting, for maximum parking allowance, we decided there would be no maximum parking standard for SFR's, and under MF PUDs in the commercial core district, we capped it at 125% of the required minimum parking for a project.

If the Planning Commission approves these changes, staff recommends sending this out for review to town review agencies, and for the December meeting, a draft resolution can be brought back with these attachments.

Gus commented that it seems that under MF, requiring four spaces is high. It's a different distinction for him between SF and MF, as there are other parking options. He thought that we were going to be looking at a somewhat less parking requirement.

Brian commented that he thought we were moving away from per bedroom to one space per unit.

Dave responded that at the end of last meeting, he reiterated these totals. This is a slight reduction for restricted units. Another option could be one space per bedroom for up to three bedrooms, with a maximum of three spaces per unit.

Gus commented that we could do one space per unit, then a markup depending on how many bedrooms the unit has. One space per bedroom for up to four bedrooms for MF units, which isn't much different than what we are doing now.

Gus brought up what Base Village did with their parking – they have $\frac{3}{4}$ space per unit which is a tenth of a space per bedroom.

Dave responded that this would still be able to be done if a parking management plan was done.

Stan commented that in the MF PUD that three-space maximum should be sufficient.

Matt agreed with other commissioner's comments that four spaces for a four-bedroom unit seems excessive. He feels that three spaces would be more appropriate.

The board had a lengthy conversation about different numbers of space options for MF residents.

Dave summarized what he heard based on the conversation that the board members had. One space for a one bedroom, two spaces for a two or three bedroom, and three spaces for four or more bedrooms. 125% of the entire developments parking requirement would be the maximum. The board members all agreed on how Dave summarized the conversation.

Gus asked for an explanation on the thinking of parking spaces per square footage of a restaurant. One space per 300 sf, or one space per four seats for restaurants.

Jim responded that one parking space per four seats was always in the code because it's a more intense use. This was changed to reference indoor seats because we found that if it's a nice day, most people eat outside and there are limited people inside. Base Village had a requirement of one space per eight seats. Dave clarified that outdoor seating does not require parking.

Doug asked how employee parking factors into the restaurant/commercial parking standards.

Jim responded that it's part of the basic off-street parking requirements for the different uses.

Gus brought up the old Silver Tree hotel and how there were 160 additional rooms, restaurants and additional commercial space added. The parking in the numbered lots was already there for the development, so they managed to not add much additional parking. He is unsure how this logic might apply to current day thinking on how the numbered lots were meant to provide parking for all West Village, both residential and commercial.

There was discussion amongst the group about redevelopment of the mall related to parking.

John commented on Gus' Silver Tree example – the Silver Tree was remodeled and became a much more intensive use of the property. The parking was there, and they maximized the smaller amount by going into a valet parking situation and managing very well. The proof in the pudding came through

when they took the restaurant and made it into a private club/ski changing area facility. They said they had the parking for that, but they didn't, so that service discontinued.

There was a continued conversation about commercial parking standards amongst the board.

Matt commented that the ratio for commercial should consider the availability of transit, how walkable the community is, etc. A standard shouldn't be based on developments that are primarily auto served. This should be considered when setting the ratio.

There was discussion amongst the board about eliminating parking with creative incentives. This could be something such as shared vehicles, improving our transit center, shortening wait times for shuttle, more frequent shuttles, etc.

Gus commented that he ran into an old Planning Commission member who commented that Zermatt has very sophisticated moving systems and that Snowmass Village should be more aggressive in thinking about futuristic ideas.

Stan commented that looking at Alpine Resort cities, we have focused on Switzerland as they have extensive internal transit facilities.

Stan commented on an idea to have a sign prompting people that lots are full and to park in the Brush Creek parking lot to minimize cars and avoid parking issues.

Matt suggested using the powering of our marketing department and the on-mountain app to message about parking.

Brian commented about adding the language for park drop-off. There was discussion about having a drop-off/pick-up point at every multi-family project. For projects of 25 or more, this would be required.

Matt commented on the transportation impact analysis – under preliminary plan section 2, it looks at trip generation rates. He inquired about how current these rates are and if they are still applicable. Jim responded that for ITE and other towns on the front range, eight trips per dwelling unit is a little high. This is something that staff could look out for and refer it out to see what transportation thinks. Jim commented that under the traffic impact section, there is a sub section dealing with capacity analysis. There can be a reference added that they assess the amount of parking being provided.

Dave suggested that if we want to get into updating some of these sections, we can engage a parking consultant.

Gus brought up a question on page 14 under 2D – how many parking spaces do you get reduced equestrian access? Dave responded that he's fine with taking this out.

Item 3: Discussion of STR Documents: Dave provided the regulations that are being brought forward by council. It is difficult for us to write down everything, so if you have specific comments that are outside of the relationships to the code or plan, then we would encourage you to go to the Town Council. If they are outside of the relationship to the comprehensive plan, then it would be best to go to the council. We won't be making many changes with the STR regulations. Community Development has been asked to develop an inspector/follow up with complaints and inspections for STR's. This position will also be covering AEU's inspections and follow ups to make sure that these are being used for the purpose intended.

Brian commented that his only comments are that parking rules are being enforced and that the AEU's are being used as they should be.

Matt would like to suggest that the commission draft a memo to Town Council saying that we have talked about this, and this is where we are at. In the next review of the Comprehensive Plan, that we consider adding a section on neighborhoods. He mentioned that he's surprised that the Comprehensive Plan doesn't mention neighborhood quality of life, or character.

Doug commented that he interpreted neighborhood to mean SFR's rather than townhomes. Matt responded that yes, this is what came to mind first.

There was a continued conversation about STR's and the business licensing amongst board members. The group agreed that Dave would draft a letter to Town Council with the following comments:

1. The Municipal Code states "Multi-family dwellings may be made available for short-term rental." As such the Commission would concur that separate businesses licenses should not be required for such units meeting the definition of Multi-Family A unit. Further, that additional regulations making it more onerous to rent out such units as STR's not be required.
2. To clarify, Accessory Employee Units (AEU's) or Accessory Caretaker Units (ACU's) shall not be used for STR's.
3. An idea for the next Comprehensive Plan update would be to include neighborhood planning to further develop strategies and/ or goals for various neighborhoods in Snowmass Village.

Item 4: Community Development Director Update:

- The transit center is currently out for review. Staff is prepared to get this to the Planning Commission by November 30. If needed, we can have another meeting on December 7.
- The next meeting will be on November 30.

This meeting was adjourned at 6:05 P.M.