

**OPPORTUNITIES & CONSTRAINTS
For Sites within Crown Mountain Park**

4.22.10

Project: Crown Mountain Park

Site #1: Forest Service Site

Opportunities:

- Potential additional entry to the park off of Valley Road
- Minimal affect on existing park elements

Constraints:

- Currently outside lease boundary but within property, would require negotiations with Eagle County
- Limits on expansion
- Located furthest from public transportation and commercial core
- Additional cost for site demolition
- Relocates Future BMX site
- Relocates Existing Dog Park at time of building expansion
- Low visibility from highway or park entry

Public Comment:

- Too far away from transport.
- Too far from public transport. Difficult to get to.
- Too remote! Just silly!
- Too far, but nicely clustered to preserve open space.
- Too far away from transport.
- Too far from RFTA
- Too far from public transportation. Too much traffic on existing park road.

Additional Team Observations:

- Not a viable option and the public supports that conclusion

Site #2: NW corner of property

Opportunities:

- Connection to utilities are easiest and least costly
- Potential additional entry to the park off of Valley Road
- Centrally located on site

Constraints:

- Limits on expansion
- Relocates the existing entry road and some existing parking, upon bldg expansion
- Relocates existing volleyball, horseshoes and picnic pavilion
- Interrupts park functions during construction

Public Comment:

- I feel that this is the worst spot.
- Least acceptable residential area! Valley Road not equipped for traffic. Too far from bus.
- Too far from transportation.
- Adds too much traffic to Valley Road. VR has lots of bikers and walkers – this would be too dangerous.

- This triangle lot is only accessible from Valley road, so all traffic from future development would conflict with site.
- I like concentrating the mass on the periphery of the park.
- I don't like this one. Too close to valley road, neighbors, and too far from public transport and El Jebel Town Center.
- This site is 9-10 minute walk from the Downvalley RFTA stop. (Remember that the RFTA stop is next to Wendy's).

Additional Team Observations:

- Public support was overwhelmingly opposed to this option but the comments came from neighbors to the north
- The primary concerns are increased traffic on Valley Road and distance to the RFTA stop.
- The Phase I massing in this location has the least impact on existing park functions.
- The park and distant mountain views would not be impacted.
- Expansion of the facility in this location is more problematic.
- This location for the primary facility works well with the campus scheme.

Site #3: South of Eagle County Building

Opportunities:

- Ample space for expansion
- Compatibility and proximity to Eagle County Building
- Close to public transportation and commercial core
- No demolition required
- Proximity to homes could increase home values

Constraints:

- Relocates proposed Skate Park
- Shifts Existing Soccer Field
- Potential concerns from Sopris village with proximity to homes
- Requires additional entry road, or additional exit off of round-about

Public Comment:

- Close to movie theater and potential RFTA park and ride a real plus!
- Good location – 2nd choice for ease of access – skate park should be close to rec center. *Downside, might be too close to Sopris Village.
- Too close to Sopris Village. Too far from walking access from public transportation.
- Great location of fields. Close to Rec Center Building.
- Good Central Location to amenities –RFTA, Movie Theater, PED underpass. Good sun exposure, cluster of buildings.
- Good Location, easy access close to RFTA, Ditto on site.
- Best location for most use.
- If it were to be clustered with Eagle Co. Building this makes most sense.

Additional Team Observations:

- Public supports this option
- Best if clustered with Eagle County Building – how viable is a sharing of resources with the Eagle County facility?
- There were very few Sopris Village neighbors at the meeting

Site #4: South of Park Entry

Opportunities:

- Ample space for expansion

- Compatibility and proximity to Eagle County Building
- Close to public transportation and commercial core
- Visible from highway and park entry

Constraints:

- Relocates Existing Soccer Field
- Requires construction cost for additional exit off of round-about
- Close to baseball outfield

Public Comment:

- Good location. Least disruption of Crown Mountain Facilities already done.
- This is the winner. Feels more like a campus concept. Close to public transport and “downtown” el jebel.
- I don’t like looking over the parking lot, but could be integrated into existing county building. Also intrudes too much on open space.
- I love the idea of a rec center in Crown Mt. Park. Love it. (#3 and #4 are best though.)
- (#3 and #4) Kids could come to the rec center while parents vote and attend meetings.
- Good access to amenities. Good Grouping of buildings. Lots of parking seen from 82.
- Site #4 - No brainer! Access to bus expansion and least impact!
- The best!
- As a builder in the valley for 30 years, I feel this is the best site. Close to bus stop. Easy Hwy access. Close to Movie Theater. Not much Destruction to park. Can be seen from 82.
- Close to bus and future potential RFTA park and ride. Example: Drive to park and ride. Take RFTA. Workout at Rec Center.
- #1 choice for ease of access for kids and public transportation. Further away from Sopris village is a plus.

Additional Team Observations:

- Public supports this option – this option is the leading candidate in the public’s mind
- #1 choice for ease of access
- Visibility from Hwy 82 is a plus
- Visibility from Hwy 82 may be a negative once the community understands the mass of the building
- If the building blocks the views to the park beyond and Crown Mountain does it actually become a barrier instead of a gateway into the park

Site #5: Campus Plan

Site opportunities and constraints from each site #1-4 could apply

Opportunities:

- Core building could be located in most favorable location
- Ancillary Rec facilities located in proximity to existing similar uses on the site
- Reduced building mass and parking areas
- “Campus” idea is compatible with overall design and organization of the park

Constraints:

- Reduces shared uses within the facility
- Creates duplication in building program and staff
- May require additional infrastructure improvements

Public Comments:

- Good concept with excellent ability to phase and adapt and keeps buildings on the outside edges of the park. Clusters similar uses.
- Not a bad concept, but will probably be too hard to build out in the long run.

- Won't be able to pay for staffing issues.
- Requires additional staffing for the many buildings.
- I have a family... while I think the campus would be visually appealing, I think it would be a logistical nightmare for dropping off, picking up, and enjoying family time. Image... "Where is Tom?" "Oh, he is over at the pool." "I want to go .5 miles away and go to the ice hockey rink." "I don't want to swim!" A logistical challenge.
- Doesn't make sense! Duplication of infrastructure services staff. Families can't split up to do different activities (i.e. kids swim while parents workout).
- Picture people dropping their kids at the pool and then driving to one of the other buildings. People are lazy – with it being about .5 miles across the park, you know they would drive. Not my favorite idea.

Additional Team Observations:

- Public is concerned about the costs of this project from staffing and infrastructure
- Public is concerned about proximity of uses
- Allows the buildings to stay on the edges of the park
- Breaks up the massing of the building so that it doesn't dominate one area of the park