

West of Castle Creek Corridor Small Group Meeting Summary

The Session was held on October 18, 2010 in the Council Chambers Room. Policies are in **bold font**. Action Items are regular front. Public feedback is inserted directly under the relevant Policy or Action Item, and is in **large font, bold and italic**.

The name of this chapter is confusing – you might rename it “West Highway 82 Corridor”

I. Transportation Policies & Action Items

I.1. Improve the convenience, reliability, comfort, affordability, safety, capacity, and quality of experience of transit services and improve efficiency and coordination between all related aspects of transportation in the West of Castle Creek Corridor.

Eleven people agreed with this policy

***Reduce the needs for all movements – mainly auto
More bike lanes.***

Want to see a Transit Oriented Development (TOD) master plan for the area

Communing from ABC (by bike?) is difficult because of hills – it discourages people

E-Bike technology. Use Electric bikes for link between buttermilk and town

Bridge preserved for rail

Terminal in Aspen or Snowmass

Doesn't reference economic realities. How are we going to pay for all of this?

Goal should be reducing vehicle traffic (traffic counts) → connect with the transportation chapter

1993 numbers might not be the best guide

Trail on the back side of Deer Hill is desired

The use of shuttle buses in the bus lanes should be considered.

Electric shuttle links.

Implement the 1998 Record of Decision.

I.1. a. Create a comprehensive transportation master plan for the West of Castle Creek Corridor based on, but not limited to existing planning efforts, including the Entrance to Aspen Record of Decision, the Highway 82 Access Control Plan, and RFTA's Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) program.

The purpose of such a plan is to coordinate and improve all aspects of auto, air, transit, parking and trail function in the context of planned development or redevelopment of activity nodes in the corridor. (I – T, RFTA, PW, A)

Like this action item

Don't like if it bifurcates open space

I.1.b. Complete and implement the Highway 82 Access Control Plan to ensure that design and location of intersections, access and signalization facilitate, rather than impede the highway's status and function as the main, year-round access to and from Aspen. As a part of that Plan, improve the safety of the signalized intersection at the entrance to the Business Center and ensure that the location of signalized intersections support effective mode transfers from transit to Park N' Ride facilities. (I - PW, CDOT)

I.1.c. Determine the parking need in the ABC, with an emphasis on encouraging transit and trails as preferred modes of transportation where possible. Develop and implement a plan to accommodate needed parking on individual parcels and on streets within the ABC. (I - PW)

I.1.d. Explore the creation of a transportation district in the West of Castle Creek Area to ensure that development pays for transportation improvements in the corridor. (LT - T, PW)

Creation of transportation district should be expanded. All funding sources should be explored and existing taxes and user fees.

Make sure goals are open space preservation rather than transportation

To pay for all elements in the plan open space and trails redirect – connections.

I.1.e. Create a transit shuttle in the West of Castle Creek corridor, connecting the City of Aspen to Burlingame, Truscott, BMC, the Airport Business Center and North 40. (I - RFTA, T, PW)

At Burlingame, 1 vehicle per household should be encouraged.

Create a shuttle between Burlingame and North 40

No additional transit is needed here.

I.1.f. Coordinate the location of RFTA Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stations at Buttermilk and at the Pitkin County Airport with safe pedestrian access across Highway 82. (I - RFTA, PW)

I.1.g. Explore options for enhancing the transition between transportation modes at Park 'n Ride locations that would improve the quality of the transit experience. (I – RFTA)

I.1.h. Explore options for the Stapleton property adjacent to Buttermilk as a link in the transit system. (LT - County Attorney, PW)

I.1.i. Maintain Highway setbacks, rights of way and easements where necessary to preserve the rural transitional and open visual character of the corridor and to maintain flexibility for location of future transit and/or trail alignment alternatives. (I - P)

I.2. Ensure safe and efficient pedestrian and bike connections exist within the West of Castle Creek Corridor and connect the area to the Aspen downtown. **Ten people agreed with this policy.**

Fix the underpass, path to Owl Creek crossing. Right not a crossing at buttermilk is non-existent.

The Maroon Creek Club and existing path are similar. There needs to be a straight path and a scenic path

Add connections to the airport, school campus

I.2.a. Explore and implement funding options for building a safe pedestrian crossing on Highway 82 at the Airport Business Center. As one option, consider a grade-separated crossing, with preference for an underpass. (LT – A, CDOT, RFTA, ABC Group, City Manager, County Manager)

This is very important for the airport.

I.2.b. Connect all West of Castle Creek residential development within walking or bicycling distance by trail to the Airport Business Center. (LT - P, P/OS)

I.2.c. Improve trail connections from the Airport Business Center and the immediate environs to the Highway 82 bike path, the Roaring Fork River and to the Down Valley area. (LT - P, P//OS)

This is a good action item

I.2.d. Improve pedestrian safety and circulation within the Airport Business Center. (I - PW)

This is very important for the airport.

I.2.e. Improve summer and winter pedestrian access from the Airport Business Center, North 40 and Colorado Mountain College to RFTA bus stops on Highway 82. (I - PW)

II. Scenic Policies & Action Items

II.1. Density, size and scale of new development and redevelopment in the West of Castle Creek Corridor should maintain the open views of the natural environment seen as one travels through this portion of the Highway 82 corridor. **Four people agreed with this policy and four people disagreed with this policy**

**Views are why we came here.
Like the concept of “pockets”**

**Concern about the airport runway expansion (accidents at buttermilk).
Two people agreed with this statement, and one person disagreed
with this statement ...this statement is a mistake. It would only be a
concern is the height of buildings breaks the federal air regulations
The runway should be one-way in, one-way out.**

Keep our open spaces

**You can't not agree with the policy. The policy doesn't tell me
anything.**

**Concentrate development and density in existing footprints. Raise
height limitations at Buttermilk and ABC to focus density on existing
footprints. Two people agreed with this statement and four people
disagreed with this statement.**

**Like the idea of step-backs for buildings. St. Regis is an example of
step-backs on buildings working. ABC covenants also include step-
backs**

Add something about perceived heights → context is important.

**Example: Highlands hits you in the face. Don't do this at Buttermilk
Master plan so Highlands and Snowmass never happen here.**

**Concentrate development on ABC and Burlingame to protect open
space and views. One person agreed with this statement and three
people disagreed with this statement**

**Concentrating development on the existing footprints at the airport is
not feasible. It would make redeveloping the main terminal difficult
and prohibit visual improvements there.**

**Don't want to see increased heights at ABC – concern about available
parking/infrastructure. Roads out there are already crowded and
packed.**

**Visual considerations should not be driving this policy. Visual can be
a partial driver. Three people agreed with this statement**

**Concerned about this policy: It leaves no room for beautiful
architecture, which could be an important element to the entry.**

This policy will be used to make redevelopment difficult.

**The policy prohibits realizing important goals in the corridor. Any
structure higher than existing height will be prohibited.**

"Open views of the natural environment" doesn't mean much.

**Reword policy to "Identify/seek to promote and protect views with
scenic value." Four people agreed with this statement**

**Not everything is of equal value, but this policy makes all views equal
and everything should be preserved.**

Excellent action items

***This can be accomplished by using concentrated TOD.
The policy doesn't address what we want to see for development.
Add as an action item that we create a typology of land uses,
architecture, etc that "work" in this area. This would be a good guide
to have.***

***X-Games is not scenic and is dangerous for airplanes...this is an
overstatement about airplane danger.***

***Agree that X-Games isn't scenic, but it's event and not supposed to
be scenic. Four people agreed with this statement***

***Buttermilk is a key component to the development of town. Put an
intercept lot there and charge people to come into town past it.***

II.1.a. Visual modeling should be undertaken for the West of Castle Creek Corridor to provide a baseline for the existing visual aspects of bulk, height, density, setbacks and land use patterns, and to provide a basis for amending the City and County Land Use Codes, as necessary to guide and/or regulate the visual aspects of future development and redevelopment in the area. (I - P)

Master plan in 3D with animations.

***Identify views, don't just model. Two people agreed with this
statement***

This sets a good framework

II.1.b. Amend the City and County Land Use Code as necessary to require development and redevelopment to utilize existing topography such as dry ridges and hills to screen development. Large landforms, earthmoving, and landscaping to create continuous man-made visual barriers to screen developments should not be relied upon to allow development in visually prominent areas. (LT - P)

***Past berms negatively impacted views – should not be allowed to
happen again***

II.1.c. Update Pitkin County lighting regulations to specifically address a limitation on glare from exterior and interior lighting associated with new development viewed from the Highway 82 corridor. (LT - P)

II.1.d. Maintain the 200 foot setback from Highway 82 at the Airport Business Center and the 100 foot setback in the rest of the corridor. (LT - P)

***The 100 foot setback should be reconsidered – it doesn't make for an
interesting entry***

***Maintain the views and setbacks at buttermilk. One person agreed
and one person disagreed with this statement.***

The 200 foot setback is more appropriate for a freeway. It prohibits intimacy with the built environment. We might want better buildings with better street relationships.

Agree with this once important views are identified.

Concerned that the Highway 82 setback was changed from 200 feet to 100 feet → would like it returned to 200 feet everywhere. Four people disagreed with this statement.

The above comment would put the airport out of compliance on a number of buildings.

II.1.e. Update the City's Annexation Plan and Land Use Code, as necessary, to ensure annexation agreements maintain the setbacks along the corridor. (LT - P)

Some minimal set of standards would be helpful for annexations and de-annexations.

Clarify this. Is it "maintain current setbacks in county zoning code?"

II.1.f. Evaluate and update the City and County Land Use Codes as needed to maintain scenic view corridors from Highway 82. Explore creation of new scenic viewplanes along Highway 82. (LT - P)

Important views – Marolt Property, Pyramid Peak, view of Tiehack from Highway 82.

III. Land Use Policies & Action Items

III.1. Planning for the West of Castle Creek Corridor should support a well defined visual pattern for a series of distinctly different "nodes" of activity supporting limited uses that are physically separated by open space. ***Six people agreed with this statement and three people disagreed with this statement. One person was in the middle.***

Connection to the other functions in the area (TOD, noise, mixed use, pedestrian, and bike traffic → it's not just "visual")

Master plans should include items other than just visual.

Do charettes for the master plans.

Establish an expert committee through master planning and as development is applied for on a case-by-case basis.

Have a community Design Review Committee.

Keep open space/visual as a key distinct feature.

Maintain scale of development.

Look at higher density within existing footprints.

Buttermilk/Inn at Aspen – lodging, ski area, mixed residential, mega plex/a separate town

Visual pattern → make it concrete

Do it visually first, before words.

The statement is backwards – uses should be the focus, not visual

Open space currently is not a reality except for golf course and snow dump

Statement does not match what is there

Existing uses have undeveloped areas based on use – golf courses, ski area, runway

Reflects the existing character.

Determine wildlife areas.

Open...or separated by open space or the nature of some of the key uses (golf courses, airport, ski mountain)

Buttermilk is an event center – preserve affordable lodging and sensitive to transition and visual pattern into town

Buttermilk – have a grid for visual depth

III.1.a. Create a comprehensive Land Use Master Plan and Future Land Use Map for the West of Castle Creek Corridor that ensures planning in the area is coordinated and recognizes the need for improved transportation services in the corridor before significant growth is allowed to occur in the area. The Master Plan should preserve and improve current uses to maintain their functionality, vitality, and longevity. (I – P)

“Significant growth” should be defined. What are the improved transportation efforts that would need to be in place?

III.1.b. Amend City and County Land Use Codes to implement the findings of the Land Use Master Plan. (LT – P)

III.1.c. Amend City and County zoning in the area to discourage additional development of new free-market single family and duplex homes. (I – P)

III.1.d. Create and adopt joint City and County Design Standards for the area that reflect the diversity of nodes in the corridor. (LT – P)

Open spaces – view planes and corridors first and work re-zonings after that.

What views have value should be determined first

III.1.e. Maintain the existing use mix and balance at the Airport Business Center. (I - P)

Include retail, day care, etc in ABC

III.1.f. Maintain the Buttermilk/Inn at Aspen area as a lodge/ski/recreation area. (I – P)

Statement does not go far enough to promote lodging.

The term “maintain” may be thought of as “keep it as it is” vs. new development. What does the P&Z mean?

The chapter in general is reluctant to acknowledge the lodging use. Does the chapter want the area to stay the same vs. a future development plan for the area. What would be a positive change.

III.1.g. Ensure any redevelopment of the Inn at Aspen and the Base of Buttermilk is coordinated. (LT - P)

Coordinated with whom? Just property owners? City, county?

III.1.h. Ensure that the Airport Master Plan limits uses on site to transportation and supporting uses. (I - P)

III.1.i. Identify “pockets” of land or parcels within the West of Castle Creek area that should remain as open space buffers between activity nodes, and zone as appropriate. (I – P)

III.1.j. Create a master sign plan for the West of Castle Creek Area to facilitate user friendly access and circulation for residents and guests. (I – P)