

Francisco Astorga

From: Nathan Hult <nathanhult@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 11:36 AM
To: Treasure Comments
Subject: FW: Treasure Hill meeting tonight

Commissioners: It looks like this email ended up at the wrong place. Here it is again. Thanks. Nathan Hult

From: Nathan Hult [mailto:nathanhult@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2016 11:32 AM
To: 'berickson@parkcity.org'
Subject: Treasure Hill meeting tonight

To the Planning Commission:

My wife and I will be unable to attend the meeting tonight. However, we attended a series of similar meetings with the Planning Commission several years ago when we voiced our strong opposition to the proposal. We think it appeared clear at that time that the Planning Commission was going to recommend against the project, so the Treasure Hill proposal was withdrawn. Here it is again, with very little if anything changed.

Treasure Hill could have come back with a proposal similar in size and scope to that of 1986 on which their legal claim is apparently based. Instead, they continue to push this huge project, 3 times the size of the original. We think this return to the commission is being brought in bad faith, hoping for a better outcome with new members on the commission. We hope the new commission members will remain firm.

The same issues remain. The project is totally out of place immediately adjacent to and above Park City's Old Town, that the city has been so good and firm in preserving these many years. The new project is an eyesore, not designed to blend in with its neighbors and to blend into the hillside, but to stick out and be seen and noticed. There is little or no concern for aesthetics.

Also, we do not want the huge increase in traffic past our place on Lowell Ave that such a large project would generate. Those streets were not designed for it, and the winter snows will not permit it.

We hope the present Planning Commission will look at this with deep scepticism and recognize the cynical bad faith conduct involved in bringing it back before you without revisions and substantial reductions.

Sincerely, Nathan and Christine Hult