



PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION

August 28, 2017, 1:00 PM
Vail Town Council Chambers
75 S. Frontage Road - Vail, Colorado, 81657

1. Call to Order

Present: Brian Gillette, Pam Hopkins, Ludwig Kurz, John-Ryan Lockman, Karen Perez, John Rediker, and Brian Stockmar

2. A report to the Planning and Environmental Commission on the Administrator's approval of an amendment to an existing Conditional Use Permit, pursuant to Section 12-16-10, Amendment Procedures, Vail Town Code, to allow for a steel-frame tensile fabric shelter at the softball fields spectator plaza area, located at 580 South Frontage Road East (Ford Park)/Unplatted, and setting forth details in regard thereto. (PEC17- 0032)

Applicant: Town of Vail
Planner: Jonathan Spence

Motion: Table to September 25, 2017
First: Kurz **Second:** Perez **Vote:** 7-0-0

Staff requests that the report to the Planning and Environmental Commission (PEC) be tabled to September 25, 2017 in order to address design considerations.

3. A request for a final recommendation to the Vail Town Council on a major amendment to Special Development District No. 36, Four Seasons, pursuant to Section 12-9A-10, Amendment Procedures, Vail Town Code, to allow for reconfiguration of existing accommodation units, fractional fee units and dwelling units, located at 1 Vail Road/Lots A-C, Vail Village Filing 2, and setting forth details in regard thereto. (PEC17-0038)

Applicant: Braun Associates, Inc.
Planner: Matt Panfil

Motion: Table to September 11, 2017
First: Stockmar **Second:** Kurz **Vote:** 7-0-0

In the short time period since the application for a major amendment to Special Development District (SDD) No. 36, Four Seasons, was submitted on July 31, 2017, there has been a clarification of the Town's notification policy for property owners within a subject SDD. The clarification requires the notification of all property owners within an SDD, including fractional fee owners, whereas previously notification was provided only to a representative homeownership association or property management company.

Staff asks that the item be tabled until the next Planning and Environmental Commission (PEC) meeting on September 11, 2017 in order to provide all property owners with proper notification of the requested major amendment to SDD No. 36, Four Seasons.

4. A request for final review of an amendment to a conditional use permit, pursuant to Section 12-9C-3, Conditional Uses, Vail Town Code, pursuant to Title 12, Chapter 16, Vail Town Code, for an existing healthcare facility, amending the development plan to allow for the reconstruction of the east wing, including healthcare facilities, ambulance district facilities, heliport building and associated structured parking located at 180 South Frontage Road West (Vail Valley Medical Center)/Lots E, F and 2E, Vail Village Second Filing, and Lot 2E-1, Block 1, Vail Lionshead Filing 1. (PEC17-0022).

Applicant: Vail Valley Medical Center
Planner: Jonathan Spence

Motion: Continue to September 11, 2017
First: Stockmar **Second:** Kurz **Vote:** 7-0-0

Spence stated that this meeting is intended as a fourth and final work session. The applicant anticipates a fifth and final meeting on September 11, 2017. Topics to be addressed during this work session include: traffic and circulation, heliport EIR, South Frontage Road improvements, employee housing units, and other revisions that have occurred since the last meeting.

Tom Braun, Braun Associates, Inc., made a PowerPoint presentation to the PEC. Braun summarized the topics discussed at the previous meetings. Braun then discussed the commercial linkage requirements for the proposed project. The projected amount of commercial linkage in the development agreement made in 2015 is being reviewed for any necessary changes. The necessity of an EIR (Environmental Impact Report) for the proposed heliport was discussed. The applicant believes a full EIR is not necessary primarily because there are limited occurrences (approximately 70 visits a year), helicopters stay for a limited period of time, and emergency vehicle noise is not regulated by the Vail Town Code.

Stockmar – Asked about an assumption that flights to the heliport will decrease in frequency.

Braun discussed the proposed vehicular, pedestrian, and ADA movements and circulation throughout the site, including the proposed improvements for South Frontage Road. The applicant is working with Public Works to coordinate the improvements.

Skip Hudson, Turnkey Consulting, provided a detailed summary of the traffic study. It is estimated that the proposed changes will result in a reduction of approximately 1,400 vehicles per day on West Meadow Drive. Traffic conditions were evaluated for the years 2020-2025 and 2040.

Stockmar – Asked about traffic conditions during construction of the east wing. Hudson stated that this has been analyzed and they do not anticipate much of a change in traffic on West Meadow Drive or the intersection of Vail Road and West Meadow Drive.

Hudson continued by summarizing the anticipated traffic conditions during 2020-2025. If necessary, they can restrict outbound or inbound left turns at the access points. The 2040 predictions are based on the construction of an anticipated roundabout near the Evergreen Lodge, VVMC, and Town Hall.

Braun reviewed previous PEC comments made regarding the site design, building aesthetics, and landscaping. Nate Savage with Davis Partnership described the design changes in more detail. Planters have been added near the loading dock doors, aspen trees have been added along the middle of the south building façade, and planters have been added to the upper level patio. The amount of glass was reduced on the tower feature.

Rediker – Stated that there needs to be more landscaping in the loading dock area. Nate Savage responded that they can look at options, but the required turning movements for the loading docks limits the available area for landscaping. Braun stated that they have performed exhaustive research on this issue. Braun suggested more vertical planting in the three (3) proposed landscape planters along the loading dock columns.

Perez – Asked about any changes that have been made to the upper level patio. The suitability of open style railings versus the proposed closed style railings was discussed.

Braun summarized how deliveries, patient/guest parking, and employee parking will operate during the construction process.

Stockmar – Asked about the frequency and timing of deliveries. Braun stated that the biggest challenge will be accommodating the larger trucks, not the smaller, more frequent small trucks.

Rediker – Asked how the larger trucks will get to the site. Braun responded trucks will use West Meadow Drive.

Braun stated that during the construction process there will be approximately 20 on-site parking spaces for employees. 150 spaces are leased in a parking lot in Edwards, which are serviced by a shuttle. VVMC also purchases ECO bus tickets for employees. Other employees park in the Lionshead structure.

Lockman – Asked where construction workers will park. Chris Knight of ProjectOne stated that construction workers will park all over the Town of Vail. ProjectOne does not dictate where construction employees park, but reimburses them for the cost.

Rediker – Asked how many construction workers will be on the project. Knight stated that up to 250 to 300 workers may be on the project. Rediker stated that the amount of construction workers that will impact parking in the Town is a problem. Lockman concurred.

Braun concluded by stating the next step for the project is to prepare a “final” plan package and to resolve the commercial linkage mitigation rate.

Lockman – Asked for clarification on how bicyclists can move north to south on the hospital campus. Spence stated that due to the 25'+ grade change there is no good way to ride a bicycle from the north to south part of the site and a bicyclist would have to follow the same path as a motorized vehicle. Lockman asked if staff sees any conflicts with the loading docks. Spence stated that the proposed loading docks will allow for increased safety.

Kurz – Asked if the west wing construction will have more, less, or similar impact as the east wing. Braun stated that the impact will be similar to the construction of the Arrabelle project in Lionshead and will last approximately two (2) years.

Rediker – Suggested an alternative route for construction-related trucks leaving the site. Braun stated that they will examine this possibility.

Hopkins – Asked staff to have the Design Review Board (DRB) take a closer look at the landscape plan and upper level patio. Gillette concurred and added that he still feels there is too much glass associated with the project.

Gwen Scalpello, 9 Vail Road, expressed her concern about the traffic impact on West Meadow Drive and the main Vail roundabout. Asked that more information be provided to the community regarding the impact of construction on the neighborhood. Also expressed concern about the “light deliveries” at the loading docks.

Stockmar – Expressed concern about the level of traffic at the main Vail roundabout. Finds on balance that the applicant has provided a good plan and has responded to his concerns and comments.

Gillette – Stated that there is always ongoing construction in Vail and is less concerned about the construction worker parking. Suggested a permit parking system on the South Frontage Road for construction workers.

Kurz – Encouraged the applicant to review the construction management plan to ensure the construction worker parking is addressed. Also suggested more landscaping along West Meadow Drive. Stated that he feels the applicant has addressed most of his concerns.

Perez – Also feels most of the questions and concerns have been addressed. Is also concerned with the impact of construction worker parking. Requested more information on how the new underpass roundabout will impact traffic.

Hopkins – Concurred with Commissioner Kurz. Would also like to see more landscaping along West Meadow Drive.

Lockman – Feels that the circulation issues have been fairly well addressed. Also expressed concern about the construction management plan and the need to accommodate construction workers. Stated that the new underpass is a good example of a communication plan between CDOT and the community.

Rediker – Stated that he feels signage is needed for the north-south pedestrian path. Is also concerned about the lack of landscaping along West Meadow Drive. Asked the applicant to provide more information about the operation of construction deliveries. Braun stated that large deliveries will be broken down off-site into smaller deliveries using smaller vehicles, primarily in the evening. Understands Commissioner Gillette’s comment that there is always construction going on, but still believes that a better management plan can be created for this project, as well as other future projects. Rediker concluded by stating his interest in the final commercial linkage determination.

Tom Kassmel, Public Works Engineer, discussed the impacts of construction projects on parking demand. There are incentives to use a company van for carpooling. The new roundabout underpass should reduce overall frontage road traffic by 10%. Expressed a willingness to work with the applicant on their construction management plan.

Rediker – Asked if Kassmel had concerns about the left turns during the construction process. Kassmel responded that it will be similar, if not slightly better, than existing conditions. Rediker asked about left turns once the nearby roundabout is completed. Kassmel stated that it will be more difficult to make a left turn onto the South Frontage Road at that time. There was a conversation about the timing of the roundabout and potential redevelopment of Evergreen Lodge.

5. A request for the review of an amendment to a Conditional Use Permit, pursuant to Section 12-9C-3, Conditional Uses; Public and private schools, Vail Town Code, in accordance with the provisions of Section 12-16-10, Amendment Procedures, Vail Town Code, to allow for a renovation and addition to the existing Red Sandstone Elementary School, a conditional use permit, pursuant to Section 12-9C-3, Conditional Uses, Public parking structure, in accordance with Title 12, Chapter 16, Conditional Use Permits, Vail Town Code, to allow for the construction of a public parking structure, and a request for the review of a variance from Section 14-6-7, Retaining Walls, Vail Town Code, in accordance with the provisions of Title 12, Chapter 17, Variances, Vail Town, to allow for the construction of a retaining wall with an exposed face height greater than six feet (6'), located at 551 North Frontage Road West/Lots 8, Block 2, Vail Potato Patch Filing 1, and setting forth details in regard thereto. (PEC17-0031)

Applicant: TAB Associates

Planner: Matt Panfil

Motion for an Amendment to an Existing Conditional Use Permit:

Approve conditional use permit for RSES, with the three (3) conditions and the findings on page 21 of staff memo dated August 28, 2017, plus an additional condition:

- 1. The conditional use permit approval is contingent upon the applicant obtaining Town of Vail approval of an associated design review application;**
- 2. The applicant shall revise the submitted plans to depict a minimum twenty foot (20') wide drive aisle, instead of the currently depicted twelve foot (12') wide drive aisle, along the southwest part of the access drive and in the general direction of the southwestern crosswalk and the access point for the second level of the public parking structure;**
- 3. The applicant shall reconfigure the proposed landscape island, located south of the proposed entrance to RSES and in the Pre-K Parking Area, to allow for a complete turn by Fire Department equipment; and**

4. The applicant shall provided additional safety measures at the southernmost east-west crosswalk and nearest to the main entrance to the site.

First: Kurz Second: Gillette Vote: 7-0

Motion for a Conditional Use Permit for a Public Parking Structure

Motion: Continue to the September 11, 2017 meeting.
First: Gillette Second: Lockman Vote: 6-1 (Rediker opposed)

The applicant was directed to provide a parking plan for Level 3, prohibited and permitted entrance and exit times, with a focus on morning congestion. The applicant is also to provide details on how disabled persons will have required access to ADA parking spaces on Level 1 during times when access to Level 1 is restricted to the general public.

Motional for a Variance from Section 14-6-7, Retaining Walls, Vail Town Code

Motion: (Variance) Continue to the September 11, 2017 meeting
First: Stockmar Second: Perez Vote: 6-1

Panfil gave an update on some of the changes that were requested at the last meeting, and plan revisions since the last meeting. PEC concerns at the last meeting included student and pedestrian safety, bike circulation, and access to and from Level 3 of the parking structure. The Town plans to prohibit access to Level 3 of the parking structure during times that students are arriving at the school. Aesthetics of the parking structure were raised as a concern by the PEC.

Applicant has provided more details on the connection to the overpass and bus stop. The drive aisle to the west of the parking structure will be 20 feet wide for fire truck access, but the lane widths can be striped for only one vehicle. Signage will be used along the Frontage Road to indicate if the parking structure has parking vacancies. Signage will indicate which levels of the parking structure have space available.

Gillette – Suggested the use of gates to ensure that vehicles first fill Level 3 of the structure first, then other levels of the structure, with gate control access at the intersection.

Panfil – We will pass along your suggestions. Panfil then reviewed the landscaping plan. Two additional trees are proposed on the south side of the parking structure. Photovoltaic (PV) solar panels are now proposed only on the top level of the structure. Roof forms over the entrances to the garage have also been modified. Staff wants to ensure that the PEC is comfortable with the safety features of this plan. A fence or other barrier will also be needed at the top of the retaining wall.

Perez – Are there elevators in the structure. Panfil replied in the negative. Perez asked if staff has ADA concerns with this design?

Panfil described the location of the ADA parking spaces.

Perez – Concerned how people requiring access to ADA parking spaces would gain access if the parking or ADA spaces were on a level that was closed or full.

Stockmar – Could the roof designs at the garage entrances be modified to gain more solar PV space?

Hopkins – How will you provide safety protection from the upper level of the back of the structure, near the retaining wall?

Greg Macik – TAB Associates – The development team likes to use signage to direct parkers to the correct parking level, rather than gates. He reviewed the traffic circulation patterns for vehicles accessing the parking structure. He also discussed data on volume of cars using the Ford Park parking lots. He reviewed the student drop-off area. About 30 cars enter Ford Park soccer field early in the morning. Similar volumes are expected at this structure. Only a few students arrive from the east and would need to cross at the lower crosswalk.

Rediker – Are we doing anything at the crosswalk, even though there are only a few kids arriving from the east? If not, it's a bad idea.

Marcelle Laidman, Principal at RSES – We have only two middle school students coming from the east.

Rediker – Only 2 kids now, but we don't know what will happen in five years. Not concerned about parents, because they are more careful around the kids, but concerned about others heading to the mountain. Maybe use flashing lights at the crosswalks. Something to give some measure of safety for children on foot.

Macik – Reviewed the mid-day traffic patterns.

Perez – Asked if there is a stop sign in a certain location. Panfil responded that there is not a stop sign.

Gillette – Asked about the main entrance, preschool drop-off location, turning radius.

Hopkins – Who uses Level 4, is that staff? Could you give passes only for certain levels? It's parking for people who know the system, after a few days.

Macik – The Town could assign parking levels based on the parking pass. He described how the signs on the frontage road could work

Chad Salli, Public Works– Pass sales would exceed the number of spaces. Advanced signage would let people know in advance if spaces are available.

Macik – We will have space inside the structure to allow turning around.

Stockmar – Drawings show the possibility of a level 5 and 6. Will that change the access and circulation patterns?

Macik- Yes, it could. He showed some of the locations of the PV solar panels. Roofs are

designed to avoid snow shed onto cars below. Shed roofs are not oriented properly to be effective for solar panels.

Hopkins – Will kids walk up the east stair? There is no crosswalk there.

Macik – They could, but they are not supposed to. Back side of the structure will be very narrow, and will be capped to prevent access or falls.

Rediker – Will parking passes be for all three levels?

Salli – Yes

Rediker – Will you inform pass holders that you may be restricting parking during certain levels?

Salli – Yes, we will inform pass holders. They will need to confirm that they know these restrictions. There are condensed timeframes when most school activity (arrival and departure) happens.

Lockman – Where is snow storage?

Salli – On the west a gate on the top level. Also a gate along the west road. Snow removal should not be any more difficult than existing parking structures.

Public Comment – None

Final Commissioner Comment

Lockman – A lot of the issues have been addressed. Seems to be a pretty good plan. Agree to place the shed roofs east-west to prevent snow shedding on cars or pedestrians. Seems like the criteria have been met. Town has done a good job communicating the limits of parking passes. Crosswalk signage should be addressed now. Plan has come a long way. Happy to see where it is at now.

Hopkins – Is this parking structure so low, to accommodate housing in the future?

Salli – It is designed to accommodate housing, school use, possible parking. We do not know yet.

Hopkins – Ask the DRB to eliminate as many lighted signs as possible

Perez – Staff has done a great job. Still want info on ADA spaces on Level 1. Want to make sure stop signs are properly included in the renderings and/or civil site plan.

Kurz – Applicant has done a good job responding to commission concerns. Applicant is as concerned with student safety as the PEC. Believe that the pass for parking adds a certain amount of order. Overall he is comfortable with the direction this application is taking.

Gillette – Gates at the intersection would be better than just lights. Like idea of flashing lights at crosswalks. Does not mind making it perfectly clear that the lot is full before

people pull in.

Stockmar – Has been concerned about elementary kids mixing with parking, but believes the applicant has addressed that issue well. They have resolved many of the issues. On level 5 and 6, it will be very interested to see if they can make that work. Otherwise I support application.

Rediker – Staff and applicant have been responsive. We need some type of blinking signs at the cross walks. Understands commissioner Hopkins concerns on having too many electronic signs in town, but believes it is better to let people know the lot is full. Concerned that people will arrive at the sign time that kids are arriving at school. Need to make it very clear to pass holders when access to parking will be allowed, or allowed to leave the garage. Not in favor of the project. The Town has a huge parking problem, but will vote against for environmental reasons. He cited Condition/criterion #2 and believes there is a negative impact with exhaust and health of children at the school. I have seen articles on asthma, cancer, and other health risks to children. Studies from National Institutes of Health were mentioned. Not a good idea to have a parking garage next to an area where children will be playing.

6. A request for a recommendation to the Vail Town Council for a Prescribed Regulations Amendment, pursuant to Section 12-3-7, Amendment, Vail Town Code, to amend Section 12-23-2 Employee Generation and Mitigation Rates, Vail Town Code, to reflect the recommendations of the 2016 Vail Employer Survey Summary of Results, February 2017 (Nexus Study) and setting forth details in regard thereto. (PEC17-0033)

Applicant: Lynne Campbell, Housing Coordinator, Town of Vail
Planner: Chris Neubecker

Motion: Recommend Approval with a recommendation for the TC to review the 11 year old program.

First: Kurz **Second:** Hopkins **Vote:** 4-3-0 (Rediker, Gillette and Perez opposed)

Neubecker provided the commission with a recap of the proposal and the previous meeting. Neubecker indicated there are no changes to the proposal resulting from the previous meeting. Neubecker summarized the reasons for the proposal and how what is proposed is not a change in policy but rather necessary to keep the regulations current.

Neubecker spoke to the Commission's previous concerns with the nexus study that the proposal is based on. Support from the VLHA (Vail Local Housing Authority) was mentioned as well as a staff's analysis of similar communities.

Stockmar asked about lodging properties.

Gillette followed up regarding the Commission's concerns with the study and how other methods, perhaps utilizing town business license procedures.

Neubecker spoke to requesting email addresses with a business license application/renewal.

Gillette spoke to using the business license process as a way of getting better survey

results.

Campbell spoke to the response rate of the survey, the merge data and the generation rates. Campbell also spoke to the question before the Commission and the need for a recommendation.

Stockmar asked for more information on Breckenridge's approach.

Neubecker spoke to this incentive based approach.

Gillette expressed his concern that changes to the survey process will not occur if not forced by the commission.

Rediker spoke to the challenges of getting accurate information on employment, i.e. contract employees etc.

Gillette spoke to the need for better information.

Perez spoke of AirBnB and the survey results. Spoke to a lack of confidence in the results based on the level of response.

Stockmar spoke to the survey results and that good results can come from a small response.

Gillette attempted to encapsulate the Commission's concerns about good data.

Lockman asked if concerns were across the board or more about a particular use (restaurant).

Rediker spoke to the problem with interfering with the business of commerce through legislation with poor response rates.

Rediker asked for public comment. There was no public comment.

Stockmar feels these are generally tweaks. Tends to be comfortable with the proposal as long as the numbers are looked at again in the future.

Gillette, no additional comments.

Kurz recommends that the board approve the request and feels the data is reliable.

Perez does not support moving forward because of a flawed study. Might support the measure if a different means of acquiring data was implemented.

Hopkins supports Kurz's position and feels the numbers are reliable enough.

Lockman points to the code that allows an applicant to provide alternative data. He points to the commission using the best information to make the best possible decision. Supports the proposal.

Rediker does not feel the survey is adequate. Feels that changes based on incomplete

results is unfair.

7. Approval of Minutes
August 14, 2017 PEC Results

Motion: Approve
First: Kurz Second: Perez Vote: 5-0-2 (Hopkins and Lockman Abstained)

8. Informational Update
Commercial Ski Storage Update

Neubecker provided the Commission with an update on the project and efforts made to date including meetings of the task force. An update to the Town Council will be provided on September 5, 2017. This item may return to the PEC in late September.

Rediker – Asked what items the task force was examining. Neubecker responded they are looking at ski concierge services, on-mountain ski racks, outdoor display, and enforcement.

Stockmar – Asked if the end goal is to have less visible ski storage. Neubecker stated that there are different opinions on the matter.

Perez – Have to evaluate impacts on ski storage businesses.

9. Adjournment

Motion: Adjourn
First: Stockmar Second: Kurz Vote: 7-0-0

The applications and information about the proposals are available for public inspection during regular office hours at the Town of Vail Community Development Department, 75 South Frontage Road. The public is invited to attend the project orientation and the site visits that precede the public hearing in the Town of Vail Community Development Department. Times and order of items are approximate, subject to change, and cannot be relied upon to determine at what time the Planning and Environmental Commission will consider an item. Please call (970) 479-2138 for additional information. Please call 711 for sign language interpretation 48 hours prior to meeting time.