

Treasure Comments

From: Charles Stormont <cstormont@fabianvancott.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 14, 2016 11:13 AM
To: Treasure Comments
Cc: THINC; Francisco Astorga; Polly Samuels McLean; Nicole Deforge
Subject: RE: Treasure Hill Conditional Use Application
Attachments: 2016.12.14 Letter to Park City Planning Commission.pdf

Attached please find additional correspondence that THINC requests be included with the public comments relating to PL-08-00370, Treasure Hill Conditional Use Application, Creole Gulch and Town Lift Mid-station Sites. Please let me know if you have any difficulty opening the attached file. Thank you.

CHARLES A. STORMONT

Attorney

FabianVanCott

215 South State Street, Suite 1200

Salt Lake City, UT 84111-2323

Phone: 801.384.4541

cstormont@fabianvancott.com

www.fabianvancott.com

December 14, 2016

Via Electronic Mail

treasure.comments@parkcity.org

Park City Planning Commission
PO Box 1480
Park City UT, 84060

Re: Treasure Hill Conditional Use Permit Application

Dear Members of the Park City Planning Commission:

I write on behalf of THINC, Inc., a non-profit organization comprised of hundreds of Park City residents, business owners, and home owners. In light of the work session that occurred at the November 9, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting with respect to Project Number PL-08-00370, Treasure Hill Conditional Use Permit Application, Creole Gulch and Town Lift Mid-station Sites, THINC would like to take the opportunity to highlight a variety of questions that have been posed by members of the Planning Commission to date with respect to the application that it believes have not been adequately addressed by the applicant. Below is an outline of questions raised by various Commissioners, organized by the date of the Planning Commission meeting where the questions were raised:

September 14, 2016:

- Commissioner Thimm requested a better explanation regarding the apparent inefficiency of the proposed parking based on his calculation that the average square foot per stall was 578 square feet, compared to the average of most parking garages of 375 to 385 square feet per stall.
- Commissioner Phillips inquired of the architect's methodology for the mitigation of mass and scale.

October 12, 2016:

- Commissioner Joyce requested a view of the property as shown at page 119 of the Planning Commission Packet for the meeting that included the houses adjacent to the property, rather than the blurred view provided by the applicant.
- Commissioner Joyce also inquired how the proposed excavation would mitigate visual impacts compared to following the natural grade and topography.
- Commissioners Band and Campbell requested more details regarding excavation, including specifics about how much material would be moved up the mountain, how much would be moved off the mountain, and how run-off would be handled during construction to protect neighboring houses and streets.
- Commissioner Campbell also requested an estimate of how long the project would take to be built out, and an estimate of how many trucks were expected on Lowell and Empire on an average work day over the next ten years.
- Commissioner Campbell also requested details regarding the expected number of visitors who would use the property at various times of the year, what the projected water use would be for such visitors, and what additional infrastructure will be required to support such a project (e.g., water supply lines, power lines, sewer services, gas lines).
- Commissioner Strachan inquired whether any additional information would be provided regarding excavation mitigation (referencing Exhibit T, Excavation Management Plan, Appendix A-16), and project mitigation (referencing Exhibit U, Project Mitigators, Appendix A-18), specifically requesting which of the project mitigators apply to CUP Criteria 8.
- Commissioner Strachan also inquired whether the applicant disputed any of the measurements shown on pages 106 – 122 of the packet for the hearing.

November 9, 2016:

- Commissioner Thimm requested (1) a showing of existing and proposed contours of the development on the same plan; (2) a streetscape from Lowell Avenue and Empire Avenue; and (3) whether the applicant intend to propose alternatives in light of comments it has received from the Planning Commission.
- Commissioner Joyce requested additional information regarding how excavated materials would be handled, including management of contaminated soils and how blasting would be mitigated.

While the applicant cannot be compelled to respond to any of these inquiries, each topic raised relates to relevant criteria that the Planning Commission must consider. *See* 2003 LMC § 15-1-10(D), (E). The failure to respond to these inquiries, in THINC's opinion, highlights that the applicant cannot substantially mitigate the anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed conditional use, and thus denial of the application is appropriate. *See* Utah Code § 10-9a-507(2)(b); 2003 LMC § 15-1-10(D).

THINC would like to again reiterate how much it appreciates the thorough work that the Planning Commission and its Staff have dedicated to the review of this conditional use application. THINC remains optimistic that a continued public dialogue will benefit the citizens of Park City as this process moves forward. We look forward to an open dialogue on each of the items that the Planning Commission will review with respect to this conditional use application, and appreciate your consideration of THINC's concerns.

Very truly yours,
FABIAN VANCOTT



Charles A. Stormont

cc: Brian Van Hecke