

Brooke Hontz
PO Box 2128
Park City, Utah 84060
brooke@dalysummit.com

Charlie Wintzer
Wintzermc@aol.com

12/7/2015

RE: Alice Claim aka Alice Lode Subdivision and Plat Amendment, Gully Site Plan Discussion PL-08-00371

Dear Planning Commission:

Thank you for forwarding a negative recommendation to the City Council on the Alice Claim applications a few months ago. Please consider thoroughly reviewing and referencing all of the previous issues that have been brought forth since 2005 that have not been addressed in any of the plans including this “new” gully plan and putting these issues on record, again, as part of the December 9th 2015 work session.

As you are aware, by Land Management Code, the Commission is required to review Chapter 7.1 – Subdivision Procedures, 7.3 (A)-(C) Subdivision Policy and Section 1.112 Good Cause when processing a Subdivision application (at a minimum). At all of your previous meetings the Commission has addressed these requirements. In particular, Commissioner Band has provided specific language regarding the deficiencies of the character of the land in this application that it cannot be subdivided safely to meet the Subdivision and Good Cause Standards, with other Commissioners in support. As a Commission, public health safety and welfare are mandatory elements of review and cannot be ignored. To make a clean record for the applicant and the public, I am requesting you clearly list the numerous inadequacies of this application that still remain unaddressed and incapable of being fixed with a density over the allowed one lot.

In this application a slope map has been provided that is extremely valuable information proving that good cause to create 8 new lots from one platted lot does not exist. Lots 1, 3,4,5,6 and 7 all are partially or entirely over **50% slope**. A steep slope CUP cannot mediate the increase of density from one to 8, as the development impacts are much larger than just the amount of soil that will be removed and retention of earth that will take place. As required by the LMC we need to pay “particular attention to the arrangement, location and width of Streets, their relation to sewerage disposal, drainage, erosion, topography and natural features of the Property, location of Physical Mine Hazards and geologic hazards, Lot sizes and arrangement, the further Development of adjoining lands as yet un-subdivided, and the requirements of the Official Zoning Map, General Plan, and Streets Master Plan, as adopted by the Planning Commission and City Council.

It would be helpful in this work session to again indicate clearly that King and Ridge roads are located outside of their platted location for some or all of their entire length. The capability of these roads to support the existing platted rights of homes (which are very few) plus 8 more lots is impossible. Other traffic, transportation and civil engineers have deemed the new 6 road intersection and the additional 8 un-platted lots as unwise and unsafe. Respectfully the public has repeatedly submitted testimony

regarding the health, safety and welfare negligence of a plan that puts forth 9 lots related to the roads, traffic, and also fire danger. I have personally met with Scott Adams of the Park City Fire District regarding this project and showed the previously submitted application and the entire area's roads, current development and platted but unbuilt lots. He had not been contacted by Park City Municipal to discuss the plan although the public had asked questions and submitted issues and the Commission had queried the former staff member about them. In our meeting he did not feel comfortable with servicing the 9 lots when presented with the entire area's information (the platted lots on Ridge, Anchor and King).

In efforts to be productive for the Planning Commission and the Applicant, the time has come for better records that summarize findings. It would be so helpful to have the Planning Commission direct staff to create a table of all of the issues brought up over the 10 year period this application has been in front of this body AND DID NOT ASK FOR A RECCOMENDATION. The work has been done over and over again by many members of the public and the different Planning Commissioners and never followed through with by staff or the applicant. The Planning Staff typically does not create task lists or summaries of input because applications typically don't turn on and off over a ten year period. I believe this is the 9th Planning Commission work session since 2005 (with only 2 Public Hearings during the same time). The Applicant has gone back and forth on a plan and not made substantial progress with the legislative process based on their volition. Here's an example of what staff could create – this is only a fraction of the list of issues:

Issue	Direction	Date	Findings
Does Application meet HR-1 Zone standards	Review each lot and site plan against code requirements	12/9/15	To be presented at next Planning Commission Meeting
What version of LMC and General Plan is the new Gully plan under and does the PC and the Public have access to those documents	Arguments have been made by the applicant that they are under a pre-2007 code and current General Plan. Is this accurate?	7/2015	City Attorney to present findings at next Planning Commission meeting
Fire District – Does fire district agree to support this plan with the complete understanding of ALL platted lots, per the requirement of the LMC	Planning Commission member plus staff member Meet with Scott Adams with the area plat.	Fill in	Fill in
Mine Shaft	Determine if mitigation and explanation is satisfactory to Plan Commish.		
GeoTech	Determine if mitigation and explanation is satisfactory to Plan Commish.		
Traffic	Review impacts of 9 lots		

	versus 1, include traffic generation, steep slopes and winter conditions		
Adequacy of King and Ridge to serve the property	Review impacts of 9 lots versus 1, include traffic generation, steep slopes and winter conditions		
Sewer	Review entire site for acceptable service with Sewer District – with Planning Commissioner		
Does Application meet Subdivision Purpose, standards? Purpose of HRL, E, SLO and Chapter 7 Subdivision	Review each lot and site plan against code requirements	7/2015	Each Planning Commissioner to create list against code requirements
Does Application meet good cause?	Review each lot and site plan against code requirements	7/2015	Each Planning Commissioner to create list against code requirements

Thank for your continued hard work. We appreciate all that you do.

Best regards,
Brooke Hontz
Charlie Wintzer