

Friends of Squaw Valley

Recommendations to DRC Village at Squaw Valley Design Guidelines For 5/1/14 DRC Meeting

Parking and Circulation

Adopted Policies and Guidelines from the Squaw Valley General Plan, Land Use Ordinance, and Design Guidelines

We first include items from the Squaw Valley General Plan and Land Use Ordinance (1983) and the Squaw Valley Design Guidelines (1985). These should be included in the Specific Plan Appendix B and should guide the work of the DRC as they recommend new guidelines.

Squaw Valley General Plan

The visual impact of buildings, parking lots, signs, roads and other man-made structures will play an important part in the success of converting Squaw Valley into an active, viable, destination resort community. (Page 19)

This new parking map indicates that approximately 3,630 parking spaces are available to the Squaw Valley Ski Corporation in a manner which satisfies County requirements; an additional 190 spaces are available on a year-to-year basis on the lands of Poulsen. Approximately 461 of the 3,630 spaces are required to satisfy the parking requirements of other developments on lands controlled by the Squaw Valley Ski Corporation (e.g., Squaw Valley Lodge). The number of presently available parking spaces is not adequate for peak ski days (for reasons described above). Therefore, any increase in skier capacity or other winter sports development by the ski area operator must also provide the number of parking spaces required by County Ordinance.

Only one ground should be allowed for any future variance to the required number of parking spaces: A showing by the project applicant of a quantified reduction in parking demand resulting from either transit or management of the transportation system. Any such variance shall be limited to the number of parking spaces shown by the applicant to be unnecessary because of transit or transportation systems management. Transit service shall be grounds for such a variance only if limitations on ticket sales to persons arriving by private automobiles are in effect. Without such limitations transit riders could be added to persons arriving by private vehicle instead of replacing the automobile as the means of transportation for skiers.

Consideration of such a variance should include the fact that an inadequate number of parking spaces already exists for peak days. (Page 45-46)

Squaw Valley Design Guidelines, Page 14, Parking Guidelines

2. Pedestrian access from the parking areas to the buildings should be integrated into the parking lot design.

3. All off street parking shall be located on the same property as the major land use it is intended to serve, unless located within a parking structure.
6. Striping of parking spaces, and identification of compact spaces, handicapped parking, and loading areas is required.
8. Parking layout design should provide ample stall and aisle widths and adequate turning radii.

Squaw Valley Design Guidelines, page 13, Circulation Guidelines

1. The circulation pattern should be easily comprehended by the user.
2. Separate vehicular and pedestrian circulation systems should be provided in order to reduce conflicts between pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists. Separation can be effected through the use of changes in grade, materials, screens, and structures.
4. Loading activity should not interfere with other site circulation patterns.
7. Pedestrian open space should be located to the south of the buildings, where possible, for maximum solar exposure.

Squaw Valley Land Use Ordinance Parking Standards

1 space per bedroom for hotels

.75 spaces per bedroom per residential unit

1 space per 300 sq. ft. per gross square foot of commercial space. \

These ratios can be altered by the DRC and the Planning Commission if part of a PD project.
(SVLUO, page 88, Section 220.26)

Guidelines/ Standards Recommended by FoSV

We now include specific recommendations being made by the Friends of Squaw Valley (FoSV)

Parking and Circulation

(Note) We have made recommendations related to amount of parking because it relates directly to urban design....need or lack of need for parking structures, maximum amount of open paving desired, parking spillage onto streets, etc. These are all aesthetic as well as quality of Village experience issues.

Background

It appears that the Specific Plan does not provide adequate parking to meet the needs of the project under Placer County parking standards, nor to meet any part of the current unmet day skier parking need, nor to fully retain current day skier parking. The Specific Plan (CP-10, SP page 5-3) proposes to “Provide adequate parking to accommodate day skiers within Squaw Valley on all but the four busiest ski days”, and CP-13 (SP page 5-3) states that number is 10,663 day skiers and 3,100 spaces. But this is inconsistent with earlier presentations by Chevis Hosea where he stated that as many as 5,000 cars squeeze into current surface parking on the busiest days. If the average car has 1.7 occupants (per Andy Wirth, March 20), currently required day skier parking would total 6,272 spaces. However, higher person per car ratio may occur on peak days. As a result, we conclude that a 5,000 day skier parking need may result on peak days and this is a number we support. Clearly the 3,100 day skier spaces proposed in Specific Plan CP-13 are too few. This would be further complicated by the stated 300,000 visitors per year to the Mountain Activity Center, and what impact that will have on day skier parking.

Specific Plan pages 5.18 and 5.19 give a different view of the proposed parking plan. The Phase 1 plan proposes 4,216 spaces, with 526 of these in the East Parcel, meaning 3,630 left on what is left of the existing parking areas. That number is very close to the County required 3,630. However, the plan for Phase 2 reduces this number to 4007, with 1101 of these in the East Parcel, meaning only 2,906 left on what is left of the existing parking areas. However, if the number of cars that actually park in the surface lots today is approaching 5,000, both the Phase 1 and 2 spaces proposed will negatively impact the current day skiers.

The questions then remain: (i) what is the number of spaces required to be built, (ii) should the East Parcel spaces (which will also be used by employees) be counted in that total, (iii) have all additional requirements (eg MAC) been included in the analysis, and (iv) is there adequate parking for the condo-hotels under those structures. Our recommendations below attempt to ensure that the full amount of spaces needed to serve the existing Village plus 5,000 spaces used by day skiers on busiest days, plus the maximum parking need to be generated by the new development. (Though the Squaw Valley General Plan only requires minimum retention of 3,630 day skier spaces, it did not recognize the issue of the additional cars which can and do squeeze into the parking areas, since spaces are not striped. Please note that 3,630 is only a minimum requirement – more can be required as the project is reviewed if it is determined to be necessary.) We recommend that any new development should solve the existing parking problem, not perpetuate or add to it. Our proposals below

are an attempt to start the discussion on this critical issue from a point that would solve the problem.

Parking Standards/ Guidelines

1. Provision must be made within the existing parking area for 3,630 day skier cars through all phases of development since this is the minimum amount required by the County today. This can be accomplished by building a two story parking structure on lot 11, just as is proposed on lot 12. This will provide an additional 700 spaces, making the total for Phase 2, within what is left of the existing parking area, of 3,606 spaces.

The East Parcel parking structure would then be used for employees and the overflow day skiers on the busiest days.

In addition, 1,370 new day dedicated skier parking spaces must be created through all phases of development to provide for additional dedicated day skier parking need currently exceeded. (5,000 day skier parking currently generated on peak days- 3,630 day skier spaces required as minimum in SVGP=1,370 additional dedicated day skier spaces needed.) *(Note: This is a new concept which we think is important for the DRC to discuss. This is a critical design issue because the spillage of parking onto streets, while an economic impact and safety issue, is also an aesthetic and quality of life issue in Squaw Valley.)*

2. No amenity added to the Village (eg MAC) must impact the numbers specified in item 1. Either operational limitations must be provided for, or additional parking provided. *(Note: It is not likely that most users of the MAC will be guests. Given its size and potential amenities, it is expected to be a significant traffic attractant. This is an issue which will influence parking area needed and the resulting urban design of the project and should be discussed at DRC.)*
3. Parking for residents of the condo-hotels should not impact the numbers specified in item 1. The parking requirement for these users must be either provided for within the structures or added to the requirement in item 1.
4. New development shall conform to the Squaw Valley LUO parking standards. *(Note: It appears that these standards are not met in the Specific Plan for larger hotel and residential units (with 2 and 3 bedrooms) and possibly not for commercial space. It is unclear how much parking the MAC will need under maximum potential uses. We recommend that the DRC request Planning staff to report in this discrepancy in parking standards to assist in the discussion.)*
5. Transit may not be used as a technique to reduce parking space requirements unless it has been shown that new transit services will actually be provided (such as new park and ride lots). The effectiveness of other proposed transportation management proposals must also be demonstrated before used to reduce parking need. This will require rewording of the Specific Plan. *(The Specific Plan transit service proposals related to connections outside the Valley is vague (see SP page 5-29, last bullet. Specific Plan proposals related to other alternative transportation options which could reduce parking need are also vague "Squaw Valley will consider and implement where feasible..." – see SP page 5-30, last bullet.)*
6. Whenever there is surface parking, it must be screened by a combination of landscaping and berms, sufficiently illuminated and appropriately drained. Designated snow storage areas shall be provided. Large surface parking lots should incorporate planted islands.

7. Design and materials shall be consistent with the overall building design and related structures. The appearance shall be well detailed, friendly, and with appropriate signage and lighting
8. Free standing parking structures shall not exceed 2 floors. The first floor may be covered; the second floor shall be an open platform with an open guard rail. Total height shall not exceed 15 feet, not including the guard rail.

Circulation Standards/Guidelines

1. There must be accessible pedestrian connections from parking lots or structures to Village Core buildings, adjacent sidewalks, and/or trails.
2. There must be easily distinguished, separate pedestrian circulation routes within large surface parking lots or structures.
3. It must be possible to walk from any building in the Village Commercial – Core to any other building without crossing a street.