

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
MARCH 8, 2017

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair Adam Strachan, Melissa Band, Preston Campbell, Steve Joyce, John Phillips, Laura Suesser, Doug Thimm

EX OFFICIO:

Bruce Erickson, Planning Director, Francisco Astorga, Planner; Kirsten Whetstone, Planner; Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney; Jodi Barnett, Outside Counsel

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

Chair Strachan called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

February 22, 2017

Chair Strachan referred to page 7, first paragraph, and changed Heinrich Deter to correctly read Heinrich **Deters**

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to APPROVE the minutes of February 22, 2017 as corrected. Commissioner Thimm seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC INPUT

There were no comments.

STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planner Astorga introduced Tippiie Morlan as the new Planner. Ms. Morlen is a USC graduate and she worked for Lehi City prior to coming to Park City.

Planner Astorga reported on the Alice Claim applications and noted that the applicant was able to obtain an access easement over the adjacent property. Since it had already gone through City Council review and public hearing, he expected the City Council to remand it

back to the Planning Commission at their meeting tomorrow evening. Planner Astorga stated that because it was different than what the Commissioners had forwarded their recommendation on, the application should be back before the Planning Commission very soon.

Commissioner Phillips disclosed that he would be recusing himself from 40 and 46 Silver Strike Trail due to the fact that he works for them.

Commissioner Suesser disclosed that she would be recusing herself from the Intermountain Health Care Amended Master Plan Development because she worked on the original plan. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that since this item was only a Continuation, Commissioner Suesser should refrain from the vote but she would not have to leave the room.

CONTINUATIONS (Public Hearing and Continue to date specified.)

Intermountain Healthcare Amended Master Planned Development (MPD)-
Ratification of Development Agreement (Application PL-15-02999)

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing. There were no comments. Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Phillips moved to CONTINUE the Intermountain Healthcare Amended Master Planned Development, Ratification of Development Agreement to March 22, 2017. Commissioner Band seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Commissioner Suesser abstained from the vote.

REGULAR AGENDA - DISCUSSION/PUBLIC HEARINGS/ POSSIBLE ACTION

NOTE: The Treasure Hill portion of the Minutes is a verbatim transcript.

1. **Treasure Hill Conditional Use Permit, Creole Gulch and Town Lift Mid-station Sites – Sweeney Properties Master Plan** (Application PL-08-00370)

Chair

Strachan: Francisco, what's our---what are we going to be doing tonight? What's our road map?

Planner

Astorga: Yeah, I think we're going to have a---I'm going to do a quick introduction to the Staff report. I have several introductions. And then the applicant has two five minute presentations is what they've told me.

Chair

Strachan: Okay.

Planner

Astorga: Three, three five minute presentations.

Chair

Strachan: Three five minute presentations.

Planner

Astorga: And that's why we've got that clock right in front of them. That's a joke. And obviously---I'm sorry, that was just a really bad joke. But with that said, we do ask you to hold a public hearing. We do ask you to provide any comments and direction, and then we'll continue the item to April 12th, 2017 where hopefully we will be discussing transportation and traffic. I say hopefully because I haven't seen any of the reports yet, and I do need time to review the updated transportation analysis. So I do ask for that. So if it's okay with you I would like to start the, the item here.

So on page 20 of your Staff report, where in anticipation for the April 12th meeting with the updated information that's coming to the City soon, we thought it would be convenient to discuss some of these items that are semi related to transportation. The first one is Item 4, emergency vehicle access. Skipping around a little bit, Item 6 as listed in the conditional use permit criteria is internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation system, as well as control of delivery and service vehicles, loading/unloading, and the last one is the expected ownership of the project. I'll let the applicant focus on those. They provided four exhibits. Three of them were the simple sheets that are already part of the packet. So, I'll let them talk about that. But we really did a quick introduction to the parking as, like I said, we're going to be talking about transportation and traffic.

And I'll be more than happy to answer any questions. But we do want to point out that the applicant is requesting to place 424 parking spaces. When I say parking, let me clarify that to you. I mean, off-street parking. This is

nothing to do with any mitigation that they need to mitigate regarding transportation and the street parking. But this is the required parking spaces per the filed conditional use permit where they had a specific finding and/or condition of approval development parameter, which indicated they've got two options for the parking requirements. They could either use the parking ratios that were identified on page 22, I want to say, that it had a table. I copied that table on the Staff report on the bottom of page 25. That's the entire table. I blew up that specific, they called it Table to Modified Parking back in 1986. And it provided specific parking ratios depending on the size of each residential unit. The table below that on page 26 shows that the required number of parking spaces is 367 parking spaces. I've got the math right in front of us there.

The other standard that they could utilize is the, the parking ratios, I believe that the MPD says at the time of approval. And the vest, this application is vested under the 2004 LMC, the 50th Edition of the LMC. I didn't go into much detail on that as the applicant is suggesting and proposing to go with this modified parking analysis per the Master Plan. And I also included another exhibit that was part of the original submittal or updated submittal as of December 2008, which shows us a little bit better of the parking locations as currently---in these four identified areas.

So the applicant, in their table on Page 16 of their submittal, indicates that they're proposing 424 parking spaces. And again, the entire purpose of this meeting today, or one of it, a big part on the City's end is to have this introduction to parking, see if we could clarify any questions upfront. The applicant, in conjunction to their transportation traffic updates, they're also going to be providing an updated parking analysis coming up on April 12th.

And that's all I have for you, other than I want to update you that we've received three or four additional public comments after that last public hearing in February. And all of our public comments are posted on our website, should you want to look at those. I know that there's another video that was sent directly to you. I don't know why, but whenever I opened the video I could only view it sideways. I couldn't figure that out. If you want to look at that video I'd be more than happy to, to pull it up. But that's all I have for you.

I'm here to answer any questions regarding the introduction provided regarding parking in the Staff report. And I believe that the applicant will want to discuss the four other items that were also listed on the report.

Chair

Strachan: Great.

Planner

Astorga: That's all I have.

Chair

Strachan: Okay. The four other items? Or some other approach?

Shawn

Ferrin: So three five minute presentations and a two-minute introduction. It's great to be back with you again. As always, the entire Treasure team is here. The owners, planners, engineers, architects and lawyers. So any of us are available to answer questions. Francisco gave a very good introduction. A little bit of road map going forward. We have proposed to Staff an agenda for not only next month's meeting, which will be traffic and parking, but meetings going forward to try to make sure we're following a schedule getting things to you in the proper order. We'll talk with Staff about that sometime this week, and get a good schedule going forward.

The four items that will be discussed; Emergency vehicle access, Criteria 4; Internal vehicle pedestrian and circulation systems, Criteria 6; Control of delivery and service vehicles, loading/unloading zones, and screening of trash pickup areas, Criteria 13. All tie to traffic and parking, and that's why we're presenting them tonight, to give you some background about those items so that you can be better prepared to discuss traffic and parking in more detail at the next meeting. We're also throwing on the agenda tonight, ownership and management.

So, Steve Perkins, David Eldridge, and Pat Sweeney are going to address those items. And as they do, I want you to keep one critical fact in mind. Treasure Hill was designed so that all of the activities they're going to talk about; vehicle access, trash storage and pickup, transit stops, emergency vehicles, valet parking and hotel registration, all occur off-street. Treasure is designed so that all those activities are located on or under the project. Unlike Main Street and many other developments, you're not going to have food delivery, supply deliveries in the morning, trucks parked on the street loading and unloading.

That design is a significant mitigation of the impacts that the Treasure design has implemented. It's a very expensive mitigation. It's also a mitigation that causes additional excavation. But it significantly mitigates the impacts of Treasure. That's what we're going to talk about tonight. I'm going to turn it over to---

Pat
Sweeney

(Applicant): Pat Sweeney. I'm going to start with the exhibit that's on your screens, and really start with our beginning, which was the fire protection plan that involved the County Fire Chief at that time, and the City Fire Marshall. And it, it drives a lot of the other circulation, but it's really the starting point of circulation off the street. And so access to, to the project for emergency vehicles is really three places. One where my pointer is right now, it's near the top of Lowell. One that is only for emergency vehicles, in particular fire trucks, but also ambulances. And it's a heated melted sidewalk that goes up into the middle of the Creole side. And then the final one is down towards Empire which is the driveway that goes over to what we call the One Buildings, or what in the Master Plan is called the Mid-Station Site. There is a turnoff there that goes to the fire department control center, which is located here. Key to that plan, which had a number of things in it is that where you see the red lines fire trucks can drive. So, for example, a fire truck can drive through this parking structure and back out. Once again, this is where they have their control or emergency center, which is a requirement of that fire plan. The other access for fire trucks is on the heat melted sidewalk in the winter, and in the summer on the sidewalk up into the middle of the project. And then, finally, over to the One Buildings.

And the reason there is a retaining wall here and what looks like a road outside these buildings, is that the fire department required that they be able to park outside in the event of, of a fire. And they gave us an exception to be able to drive through that parking structure to get there, subject to installing additional equipment that made that safe.

For ambulances, they can use any of the red paths obviously, because they are much smaller. But they also can drive through the parking system or internal street way and get to all the main elevator shafts and the Creole side. They can also get to the elevator shafts on, on the Mid-Station side. That was very important in the development of that fire protections plan.

Those two things, the fire access and the EMS access then drove the clearance in our garages, and for ambulances it's 12 feet. That leaves us a couple feet for drop downs and structure that we can't anticipate at this point, and fire sprinklers and lights and so on. And then the clearance for the fire truck through these two garages through here and here is 14-foot clear. And once again, that, that drove a lot of the structure of the parking within the project associated with those driveways.

At this point I think I'll turn it over to, to David Eldridge. And I'm just going to switch seats. David, actually, if you talk I can drive. Just tell me where you are.

David
Eldridge
(Architect):

Well, as you may recall from the site plan, there are basically three clusters of buildings and then on more substantial building, which is the Hotel 4B. The parking garage on the left is between the rows of townhouses and the one midrise building, which is 1C. In all of the cases, as best they could we tried to locate the parking directly beneath the structures above, which set some, if not all of the boundaries. Part of the problem is that parking garages are wider than most all of our buildings, except for the hotel. So there are areas where the parking garages extend beyond the boundaries of the buildings. But we tried to locate them as best we could directly beneath the buildings.

The second cluster is the one right off of Lowell, which is the Three Buildings and the 4A Building. And that, because we have plazas and because they are deeper buildings by the nature of their use, we were able to get two rows of parking beneath. The big green and partially brown structure sits directly beneath the hotel. And then the blue up towards the top of the page sits beneath the 5A and 5C Buildings. And you'll see the green stars in all of those, that is the point at which the vertical circulation core for all of the buildings reaches all the levels of our parking structure.

Pat, I don't know if you want to go to the service. You'll see, there again you'll see those elevators. And at each bank of vertical pedestrian elevators, or guest elevators, there are also service elevators. And that's what the red lines going vertically represent. Those are just the service elevators, which are then all connected via this internal roadway for underground tunnels, so that all of the buildings can be accessed from the

main receiving and trash area, which is right at the, just off the road off of Empire. All of that is underground and screened. And not just being recessed, but also by the fire access lane, which is the ramp in front of it. So it's, it's really buried from sight from the neighbors.

I don't know if there's anything else that needs to be added.

Pat
Sweeney: Turn it over to Steve Perkins.

Steve
Perkins: Good evening. I think David and Pat have covered the emergency vehicle and the control delivery and service vehicles. I'm going to look at this diagram that's labeled V6. Pat, if you'd put that up. Right there. Which does show, in addition to pedestrian and skier circulation, some of the emergency vehicle and circulation that David and Pat just discussed. But I'm going to focus tonight on the skiing and pedestrian circulation that's shown in this diagram. If you can look at the sort of purplish-pink colors on the project, that represents the skiing through the project. The Creole run coming from the left side of the diagram remains in pretty much the same position that it is today. Then the return from the Quitting Time Run coming from the bottom portion of the diagram goes through what we call the One Buildings. And then the town run from the Mid-Station or the convergence of those two runs remains the same down into the Town Lift base.

This, the skiing is a part of a larger change to the ski plan that we're proposing that includes additional runs up the hill, an improvement we think in the level of skiers that will be able to access the skiing on this side of the mountain. We will be discussing that in greater detail at later meetings. But for now we're just going to focus on the immediate skiing within the project. There are some blue areas that are shown on the diagram. Those typically represent skier access areas. Those are important from a ski to-ski from standpoint so that our guests are able to ski from units and ski back to their units. And we've widened the runs at those locations so that can occur. Through the middle of the project as you get towards the lifts that are shown in blue, you can see that the, we have a yellowish color on the runs. That's a slow skiing area because there's going to be obviously people stopping to load on lifts, people coming off the Cabriolet, which I'll talk about, and moving through the project as well. That basically is the ski pattern.

The lift pattern is changed from the current Town Lift, which will be replaced. A new high speed quad, which is shown going off the diagram over the legend, will then be routed up to the top of approximately the top of Payday. It's a little higher than the Town Lift goes now. Then there will be a lower lift, which we're calling the Cabriolet, which is really a transport lift, much like the Cabriolet at the Canyons. And it will be available to transport both skiers and project guests to and from Main Street. And in that respect they will be able to then further access bus stops on Park Avenue, the Main Street Trolley, and the Old Town Transportation Center. So people will be able to go from the project to Main Street and to other areas in town without having to utilize their individual cars.

The pedestrian circulation, then, is shown by the dotted---the primary pedestrian circulation is shown by the dotted green lines. You can see it's quite extensive. It allows the guests of the project to circulate from one area, building area to the others. We have---where the ski run interrupts or goes through the project, we've provided a funicular, which is shown in the darker red color, which connects between the Five Building complex to the Three and Four Buildings so that guests can cross the ski run without having to walk across it. There's also a tunnel or underground connection under the ski run from the Five Buildings over to the Four Buildings. In addition, from the One Buildings you can, there is, will be an across snow connection, as well as an underground connection that pedestrians can utilize.

As we go to the adjacent site areas, there will be improvements to the Sixth Street stairs, so they'd be extended up to the project. And then a connection from the Eighth Street as well, with new stairways and walkways to connect that to the existing Eighth Street stairs.

The yellow dotted lines on the diagram represent emergency egress routes that are required on the fire protection plan from the buildings. These also will be available as secondary circulation routes for guests of the project, and will allow them to get to the primary circulation routes in a number of locations.

The last thing that's probably important to note is that we have expanded the amount of trails and trail connections for summertime use. Bike trails and hiking trails. Those are shown in the dashed, dark dashed lines.

The existing trails are shown in the lighter gray lines. And that then is a continuation of the existing trails system that's available both to local residents, guests of the project and visitors. Just as a matter of information, these patterns that are shown here haven't really changed since the 2004 addition of the plan. So it's been fairly consistent throughout. And we believe it is a comprehensive system that really gives both guests and the community access to the project.

Pat

Sweeney: So the, the final thing, and once again we're not going to get into the detailed parking numbers, we're do that next time. We'll provide a written response, a position on that, and also a presentation. And then the traffic engineer will talk about what he believes is the adequate number of spaces for this project.

So the final thing that we have to talk to you about tonight is ownership. And it's really quite simple. There will be a master condominium association, which will be the point of contact for the fire department, for the City, for Park City Mountain Resort. And that central one entity contact was very important in terms of the fire protection plan. And it goes along with a physical space where in the event of any kind of incident, the EMS system can utilize as a control center. And it will have all sorts of monitors, etc., in it. The other ownership of the project will simply then be sub-condominiums of various elements.

And that's it.

Chair

Strachan: All right. Anything further from the applicant at all?

Pat

Sweeney: No.

Chair

Strachan: All right. Francisco?

Planner

Astorga: I, I do have one more comment that I would like to address, or bring to your attention. And it's---I would like to simply read development parameters in Condition #3. I believe it's important regarding to the on-site parking. It says, "The approved densities are those attached as an

exhibit, and shall be limited to the maximums identified thereon. Parking shall be provided on-site in enclosed structures and reviewed in accordance with either the table on the approved restrictions and requirement exhibit, or the adopted ordinances at the time of approval. All service commercial uses shall be oriented and provide convenient service to those residing within the project, and not designed to serve off-site or attract customers from other areas”.

So this finding was a three-part. The first part talked about density. It took us to the, the density table. It tied it to parking, and then support commercial. Why do I bring it up? I do bring it up because we have a concern with the management of the parking in terms of how they are planning on managing their parking so that they don't attract customers off, from outside of the project.

Submitted with the 2008 update, December 2008 update V7, there's four shaded areas that they indicated as parking. One is hotel club residential, and the other one is staff, slash visitor parking. We would like, the Staff would like to find out supplemental information from the applicant in terms of how they're going to manage the parking so that they're in compliance with this finding, which was in the parking clause regarding no being able, or, or, yeah, not being able to attract customers from off-site. And that's what we wrote on the bottom of page 29 and 30, does the Planning Commission agree with this statement? All we have is the number of parking per site. We copied that same exhibit on page 25, their chart that says that they're requesting 424. And all we have is this exhibit that you've got on your computer, V7, which has a slightly different number, 427 and identified, identifies these four different areas.

So we would like to see if the Commission also shares that same item from Staff in terms of we're concerned how we're going to manage the parking so it complies with that specific development condition. And, and we fully understand that they're going to provide a position statement in preparation for the April 12th meeting.

Chair

Strachan: Well, we'll leave it to them whether they want to address that or not. But I'm sure if it's a question Staff has, then it's probably a question many of the Commissioners have as well. So, leave that to their discretion.

Anything further from Staff.

Planner

Astorga: No, that's it. Thank you. That's all from Staff.

Chair

Strachan: Any questions before we move to public comment?

Commissioner

Joyce: Yeah, I, I have a few.

Chair

Strachan: All right.

Commissioner

Joyce: You, you were showing---can we go back to the pede-, uh, shoot, it was the one that showed kind of the pedestrian walkways or---yeah, there you go. So are the things that are green lines and the things that are yellow lines, are those both something that are going to be cleared of snow year round and everything? Is that---

Steve

Perkins: Yes.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay. So those, those are year-round available, especially the emergency pieces there in the yellow? And, and can you tell me a little bit more---we haven't paid attention to the little funicular that you have there. And it, is that doing anything from the standpoint of elevation gain, or is it literally just across the ski resort? I mean, you got a ski run coming perpendicular to that.

Steve

Perkins: There is, there is an elevation gain from the base of it at the four, Three and Four Buildings up to the Five Buildings. So there is a change in elevation there, as well as the crossing the ski run.

Commissioner

Joyce: So, I, I'm just, I was trying to picture---I mean, it, it looks like a fairly narrow place there, like, you know, maybe a 100 feet or something. It's so hard to tell on these, you know, big scaled in things. But it doesn't look like its 100 yards. It looks like it's 100 feet. I'm just worried about kind of a

safety thing that, you know, if you've got people who have an alternative of I can walk 100 feet or I can go over here and wait for the funicular, and then get in the funicular and ride the 100 feet and come down, you know, whatever, to park the funicular, that you risk having a lot of people walking perpendicular to a ski run coming through there. And I'm just wondering if---why you chose a funicular and not something like an overhead walkway that people would just be more inclined to go. I mean, I just see this---like clearly the funicular at the St. Regis, you pretty much, that's your only way to get up the side of the cliff. But it's not uncommon to have to wait long periods of time and stuff like that. And I think people are going to be impatient and the alternative is to walk across the ski run.

Pat

Sweeney: Steve, I'll address part of that and then Steve will address the other part. But working with the Park City Mountain, they are very concerned about that conflict, and we are as well, of skiers coming through here with speed and pedestrian on the ski, on the ski run. And so without making this some sort of penitentiary like thing, the solutions that we came up with were really this; visibility, less grade, and alternatives. And two alternatives to get to this building, there is a pedestrian connection from the lower plaza into this elevator corridor right here. So that's one alternative. That's inside kind of standard transportation.

Commissioner

Joyce: So that's underground then.

Pat

Sweeney: Underground, yeah.

Commissioner

Joyce: That's under the ski run? Okay.

Pat

Sweeney: Yeah. And then the other thing, we wanted to be fun and didn't invent the word funicular, but it's in there. And it, it's pretty steep here. It's like the one over at the St. Regis. And so a walkway we didn't think would really, it would be too inconvenient. And this is very short. And it's just, it's just back and forth. And we think that that will mitigate this, you know, skiers coming in the project. We have the same situation over in the One Buildings. And of course, it, you know, it exists already with people

walking down the runs and so on. And we're very concerned about that. Steve?

Steve

Perkins: You know, I think the response is, is that yes, you could put a bridge across there, but because of the elevation change you probably would still have to have an elevator or stairs to make the connection down to the lower elevation. So either way, you're probably going to be forcing people to circulate vertically as well as crossing the ski run.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay. Kind of a similar question, and this had come up once before. But we talk about really the main way to keep people from getting in a car and driving over to Main Street kind of thing is, is to provide the Cabriolet going down. And I guess at some point, whether it's tonight or, or right now, you know, right now or later on, I'm just concerned about, you know, what are people going to---it's one thing when you're riding up from the Canyons when you're coming up from parking, because for the most people are doing that to go skiing. And so if it's really inclement weather you're wrapped up, you're bundled up, you're ready to go skiing, whatever. But if you're trying to go out to have dinner at Riverhorse and, you know, you're not dressed that way and it's 40 miles an hour winds and whatever, what happens? And the other question is, and what would the hours of that be? Because obviously if people are going out there for entertainment and stuff, how, what do you, how do you anticipate that?

Steve

Perkins: Well, first of all, unlike the Cabriolet at the Canyons, we anticipate this would probably be an enclosed car.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay.

Steve

Perkins: For two reasons. Because of weather considerations, and also from a sound standpoint that there are adjacent residences and all that. And an enclosed car would then allow that to be mitigated, the conversations on that Cabriolet.

The second issue or response is that it's a short ride. It gets you immediately to the, this trolley system which would again, transportation,

you don't have to walk if you have inclement weather. So we don't, we don't think that people are going to necessarily want to take their cars and chance a DUI to drive down to Main Street. That may be different if it's to other areas in town. But I think for Main Street this is going to provide very convenient access.

Pat

Sweeney: A couple other points I think are worth mentioning. The first one is that your, your point is very valid Steve. And, you know, all we can do is lessen that activity by creating more convenient, more fun opportunities.

In addition to what Steve talked about for people that aren't afraid of getting a little exercise or want to get a little exercise before or after dinner, you can take these Eighth Street stairs and walk down the Crescent Walkway and get to the intersection of Heber and Park Avenue. Or you can take the Sixth Street stairs and get to Main Street. So there's, there's, if people are willing, they can use their feet.

The other thing, up in through the project, everything on the surface is heat melted, so that will help a little bit in terms of making it clear in snowy conditions.

And then probably the biggest factor of all is that, that we think is the reason why you want to have some nice amenities on-site so people don't have to go down to Main Street as their only option.

Steve

Perkins: And I think one other question you asked about was hours of operation. And I would anticipate that it would probably be like a 7:00 to 11:00 p.m., 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. operating schedule, and possibly later on the weekends. You know, I mean, that's going to be a management issue, and it's really going to be determined by what kind of demand you have, how many people are using it, and what kind of activities are going on. Obviously, during Sundance you may run it all night long, I don't know.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay, thank you. Oh, I'm sorry, I do have one other one. I guess this is maybe a Francisco thing as much as anything. Just reading through the fire plan that we have, it's from 2004. And where most of the stuff seems fundamentally consistent, there's a lot of references to old fire codes, that we've added 150,000 square feet to the project since then. Is there an

update that would happen somewhere along with the fire plan? Is there another, you know, kind of redo of that? I mean, I just, if, if nothing else we've added dramatically to the, to the project since then.

Planner

Astorga: Yeah, we---this discussion was intended to be an introduction. But, yeah, we would need a full update from the current Building Official and current Fire Marshall, both with the City and also with the Fire District. So we would absolutely need an update because the one that was included in this packet was one that was submitted to the City prior to them filing their conditional use permit, even. So, absolutely we would need an updated letter or a fire plan that would go in conjunction to the submitted application. You're absolutely right.

Commissioner

Joyce: And I assume all the latest and greatest City Codes and everything are what would---Fire Codes are what would apply.

Planner

Astorga: It would, yes. It would be subject to current Building Codes.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner

Suesser: I have a comment about the emergency vehicle access. I assume the criteria applies to not just vehicle, emergency vehicle access within the project, but to the project as well, up and down Empire and Lowell. And she was wondering if that was going to be---if that was considered in the traffic study that's going to be updated.

Planner

Astorga: I believe, yes, that it would be part of the update of the transportation traffic study.

Commissioner

Suesser: Okay.

Chair

Strachan: Commissioners, any other questions before we open the public comment? I've got a couple. Do you have any quantifications on how much the

chairlift---how many vehicle trips the chairlift eliminates? I mean, I, I assume you guys assert that the chairlift mitigates some type of traffic impact, is that correct?

Pat

Sweeney: Yeah. Adam, I think that would be the April Meeting. Gary Horton does have an opinion on that that's based on traffic science. So, we'll see what that is.

Chair

Strachan: Okay. All right. And then you guys said you submitted a, sort of an agenda or a timeline of when, you know, the next few meetings would take place. Is there an anticipated decision date? At least what you guys think when you want a decision by?

Pat

Sweeney: We, we would like to be---ask for a vote. We intend to ask for a vote in the August meeting, but don't expect that vote to take place until the October meeting. And we'd be available for the September meeting to wrap it up. That's our, that's our agenda.

Chair

Strachan: Okay. All right.

Commissioner

Suesser: I have one further comment, Adam. With regard to the control of delivery and service vehicles to the project, have there been any numbers of delivery vehicles, daily trips, that kind of information provided? That you intend to provide?

Pat

Sweeney: That, Laura, Gary plans to talk to that as well. So, it's been a long time, but my recollection it was several trips a day, mostly in the morning. And you know, they're the typical kind of vehicles you see going to condominium/hotel projects. And once again, they would end up off the street in this, I don't know if it's still up, but it's---there's, there's a number of really good drawings that David has that are very detailed architecturally that show this area conceptually in a schematic or pre-schematic way that allows, so that you can get those vehicles to pull in here, back in there and do their business underground.

Commissioner

Suesser: Okay, but the number of vehicles would also be dependent on the, the actual use of the commercial space?

Pat

Sweeney: Yes, and I think that's where we have to rely on the, the traffic science from Gary.

Chair

Strachan: All right. Any further questions before we move to public comment? All right. Let's open the public comment on Treasure Hill CUP. Anyone wishing to speak on this matter please come forward and sign in.

Public Comments

Nikki

DeForge: Good evening. Thank you again for this opportunity speak. My name is Nikki DeForge. I'm an attorney with Fabian VanCott speaking tonight on behalf of THINC, a non-profit group of Park City residents, business owners and homeowners.

We, we obviously still need to digest the information that's been presented tonight, and we'll reserve the detailed comments for that to another meeting. But I did just want to make a couple of observations based on what we've heard tonight. And they are that we seem to be seeing a pattern here where the applicant purports to mitigate one issue and one problem by creating a different problem that violates the Master Plan requirements and the CUP criteria.

For example, tonight they talked about putting all of this delivery and circulation and traffic and so forth underground, but to do so they've got to do considerably more excavation. And excavation was one of the issues with the Master Plan that was limited because of concerns about of all of the, the ancillary issues going there. And so again, in order to mitigate this issue with, with the vehicles and the delivery and parking and whatnot and put it underground, we then create another problem with another aspect of the project.

And I think another example of that tonight that you see is with this chairlift, where we see suddenly the chairlift ending right at the development, which is going to bring again a bunch more off-site visitors

and people to this site. They said this provides very convenient access for the people that are on-site to go down to Main Street, but the reverse is true, also. It provides very convenient access for anybody who wants to go downtown and who is downtown to come right up to this site and right into this, into this area. The stairs do the same thing. And this is going to be going, they said, from 7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m., potentially all night long bringing people up to this site.

And to echo what the Planning Staff said, we have a requirement in Paragraph 3 of the Master Plan that they not do this. This is a mandatory requirement stating that all of the support commercial use within the project cannot be designed to serve off-site, or attract customers from other areas. And you find this same language in the, in the relevant Land Management Code stating that the support commercial use is not to, to draw people off-site. And what they're proposing here does precisely that in, in great measure. And this fact, the fact that this project will draw these off-site people has been reiterated over and over in the documents and the presentations by the applicant themselves. Going back to our January 2017 meeting and the letter that they provided to the Planning Commission, the applicant in that letter stated that this, that the best they could say was that there would be a large portion of visitors to the support commercial areas who would be patrons, residents and employees. But again, the flip side of that is the concession that there will be others that are not residents, that are not employees, that are not patrons. They are the visitors that the Master Plan expressly said we could not attract to this site.

Also, in this Exhibit V7 that, that we've looked at tonight, the applicant telling allocated 56 of those parking spaces for quote "staff/visitor parking". Again, a concession that there will be visitors coming to this place. It's not just the residents. It's not just employees. And this allocation does not reflect an expectation of only 56 off-site vehicles per day, which would be substantial and contrary to the Master Plan, but actually reflects a need for parking for 56 off-site vehicles at any one time during the day. So the actual vehicle traffic coming to this site as expected by the applicant and is reflected in their plans is going to be considerable. And even the old traffic studies that we have, those expressly projected traffic coming from off-site to the on-site commercial uses. And keep in mind that those old traffic studies only anticipated 19 commercial units, and here we're talking now about 194. So if 19 is going to draw off-site people, imagine what 194 are going to do.

And then again, we see these plans today with, with chairlifts and stairs and everything providing quote, "very convenient access to this site going both ways". There is no way that these plans and these concessions that, that we're looking at, and these admissions, can comply with the Master Plan requirements. The only way that they can attempt to show compliance is with this no off-site visitor requirement for the commercial is to simply pretend like there would be none. And that seems to be what we're doing here, because in other places they claim that there will be no parking for the general public. Again we see 56 visitors, and then we have another statement saying no general parking. Well, even if there is no parking for the general public in this development, there will be a need for parking because of the people that are going to be coming. And so what happens then, is the burden of this additional vehicle traffic and parking gets foisted on the surrounding neighborhoods and streets, these narrow historic neighborhoods that cannot even manage the parking that they've got now, much less the additional traffic that's going to be coming on-site and off-site. And the emergency vehicles, the delivery trucks, all of these other things.

And so where we have a requirement of the Master Plan that all of the parking must be on-site and they purport to meet this requirement by saying we'll have no general public parking, the reality is we know that there is a need for general public parking, and that can only be met by pushing it off into these neighborhoods. So either way, you violate one of these requirements under the Master Plan. You, you can't, there's not a way to meet them both with this development as it is proposed.

And THINC has submitted a short video to the Planning Staff that I hope you'll have the chance to look at that shows the problems already there on these streets. And we have some additional videos that we'll be sharing that, that show an even greater problem with traffic meeting in the middle, people having to back out down these streets, having to pull in driveways, just to accommodate the traffic we have now in order to get the garbage trucks through, or in order to get just, just regular traffic passing. And yet, the plan for these streets is to narrow them. And in fact, the Lowell Road is going to be narrowed by about three feet next summer for a sewer update. So there really is no way to mitigate these problems without creating different problems rather than actually resolving problems. And again, that is, that is a pattern. We get sort of a slight of hand that's going on saying, look, we mitigated this by doing this. Oh, but now how do we

mitigate this with something else. It, it's just one thing that keeps getting knocked down and down and down and passed as we go without any actual solution.

As for the traffic discussion, which we'll also defer to the next meeting, we're very much looking forward to seeing these updated traffic reports, hopefully that show the, the dramatic expansion and the scope of this project. But we also want to reiterate the fact that any serious discussion on these traffic related issues cannot move forward until the applicant provides all of the information that was required in the Master Plan. Not just about traffic itself, but again, as its stated in, in Paragraph 9, "At the time of the Conditional Use review approval, individual projects or phases shall provide detailed landscaping, vegetation protection, and construction staging plans. This is all designed to ensure that the construction traffic impacts would be minimized, and that we would have the full picture of what's going to go on here, rather than just doing it piecemeal and mitigating here and taking away here. And none of that's been provided.

Similarly, we need information about how they're going to minimize site grading and what they're going to do with waste export, what they're going to do with excavation, because all of that detail is necessary in order to evaluate the actual traffic impact on this, on this, these neighborhoods as a result of this project. So until they provide not only the current reliable traffic study, but they also provide these detailed plans and, and additional information required by the Master Plan, the Planning Commission simply cannot adequately evaluate what the, the true impact of this project will be on traffic and related issues.

What we do know, however, is that this project as it has been proposed right now, does not comply with the parking related requirements of all on-site and not drawing any off-site visitors to the commercial. We know that that's not met. And so on that basis alone we would urge the, the Commission to deny this application, and then we can come back and talk about the other ways that this project doesn't comply next month. Thank you very much.

Chair
Strachan: Thank you.

Kyra
Parkhurst: Hello all, again. My name is Kyra Parkhurst. Just have a couple

questions. It's not supposed to---in dealing with not bringing outside people to the site. Right now when the parking lot down at Park City Mountain Resort is filled, Empire and Lowell become filled with skiers parking on the street and walking down the street to get there. So when all of a sudden skiers find out, wow, I can get on this high-speed and be on Payday and be up to the bowls this much quicker, they are now going to start to park at the top of the street, walk into the driveway. Now unless this going to be a private gated thing that you need a pass code to get in, people will just walk in and get on the lift right there. And right now the streets can't handle it. And I don't know how they will monitor people not parking on the streets to get to the site.

Another question is the roads that, and the safety areas that fire, that they're keeping clear for the fire department, how will these be monitored that people don't park on them. Is somebody going to stand there 24 hours a day moving cars and telling people they can't park there? Because, believe me, if somebody sees a melted down driveway, they're going to park there.

And then concern. We, unfortunately, live in an age of terrible terrorist activities and disasters that can happen. And let's say something really bad happens up there, or a major fire happens. So, this all sounds great, all the fire trucks and everyone else is going to be coming in, but what's also going to be happening is everyone staying there is going to be getting in their cars and wanting to leave. So now you've got people running around in the parking garage, you've got cars running around in all these service areas. Are we going to tell everyone, everyone just stay here while the buildings burn so that---you know, it, it's just not going to work.

And I don't understand how people will walk out of the place down---do they walk down Crescent Tram to the staircase? Well, Crescent Tram, right now people are sliding sideways and can't even---it's a disaster area. Which then just leads me to something that I think no one is, or we're sweeping it under the rug. I think one of the major prime concerns should be safety for the pedestrians and skiers because those two roads are not only street traffic, they are pedestrian and skier traffic with people skiing down them, snowboarding down them, riding their bicycles down, mountain biking down. And so it's not just cars and trucks that are going up there. And I'm so glad right now that the entire legal team and all the engineers and everybody is right here, and the Mayor is here, because right now somebody will sue every one of your asses, and I'm sorry,

because somebody is going to be killed or hurt on that street. And I see it almost every day. It's not safe the way it is right now. And no mitigation on this project will allow for safe passage for people on that street. Thank you.

Commissioner

Suesser: Clarification about where this staircase is and whether or not it goes down Crescent Tram.

Olivier

Lhomomn: Good evening, everybody, my name is Olivia Lhomomn, and I live on Empire. And basically my main issue here is Empire is, you know, is a neighborhood street, it's a very small street, and pretty much we have to walk to go to skiing, to go take the bus and everything. And basically there is no pedestrian walkway there. And so what are they going to do for our safety? I mean, they, you know, are you going to double, I mean you're going to multiply traffic by 20 at least. And basically, you know, are, are we going to be able to move from our homes to, you know, anywhere walking. It's just going to be a completely nightmare. So if you have a, you know, a good plan for you know, letting the residents have, having access, you know, and being able to walk on the streets safely I would like to know about it. And you know, basically what you're doing is trying to build a resort with no proper access. I mean, that's pretty much the way I see this project.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you. All right, Commissioner Suesser had a quick question that may guide the public comment. Go ahead.

Commissioner

Suesser: Could you just clarify where the Eighth Street stairs runs from and whether or not it does connect to Crescent Tram Road, or if it's the Crescent Walkway, is my understanding, which kind of runs under the Town Lift from Crescent Tram Road.

Pat

Sweeney: Laura, this is, to answer the question. This is the Crescent Walkway right here. I don't know if you can see that little hand, but there's a little hand right there on the---

Commissioner

Suesser: And you're going to build that first, that, a staircase to the walkway?

Pat

Sweeney: This, yeah, this all exists. And then we're going to build this stair, this staircase.

Commissioner

Suesser: The walkway exists but the stairs, the stairway down to the walkway does not?

Pat

Sweeney: Yeah, that's something that we build. That, if I recall right, was a requirement of the original Master Plan.

Kyra

Parkhurst: But doesn't the walkway walk across the ski lift, the ski trail?

Pat

Sweeney: It does.

Laura

Suesser: Yes, it does.

Chair

Strachan: It does currently.

Commissioner

Suesser: I'm just clarifying that it's actually not down Crescent. It's not down the roadway.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah.

Pat

Sweeney: Well, it's, it's been that way for---

Commissioner

Suesser: No one will be walking down the roadway. It's the walkway?

Pat

Sweeney: Yeah. This, this part, the City's been making an effort to improve it. I

think they ran into some right-of-way issues here, but people have been walking across here for, since 1983.

Commissioner

Suesser: I know the walkway, yep.

Chair

Strachan: Okay. Thanks. Okay, let's continue with public comment. Any further comments from the public?

Nathan

Holt: My name is Nathan Holt. I was here last month to talk about what I observed in the month of January on Empire and on Lowell. One of the Commissioners mentioned Crescent, and so I did want to address the issues of Crescent Street, and then also talk a bit about parking. And I'm not talking about studies. I'm talking about things that I've observed, evidentiary type data. Last month when I was walking down to get on the Town Lift to go down to the, excuse me, the Town Run to get on to the Town Lift, at that first sharp corner on Crescent there was a car that had not made the corner and had ended up with the front of the car in the snow drift on the lower side of the, the street. He, the driver had the foggiest idea of how to get the car out, and traffic coming up Crescent, traffic coming down Crescent were backed up considerably. We found a neighbor that had a shovel. I personally had to shovel because the driver of the car was incompetent. Eventually we had four or five people that were probably I think skiers that were heading down to the ski run. We finally got the car turned around. It had been cross-eyed on the street. Got it turned around and headed back down the street. With the volume of traffic that we're talking about that will be increased by this development, I'm wondering how much more often we'll have such incidents.

Something was said by the developers about the Cabriolet being so inviting that everybody will use it. But I'm wondering about guests that for instance want to go to Deer Valley. Would not the obvious route to Deer Valley be from this development down Crescent, and down to Deer Valley Road. It seems fairly obvious that it's going to be a lot of traffic. There's not going to be any way that they can give instructions to their guests, "do not use Crescent" for mitigation that I can see that would be effective.

The second thing that I wanted to talk to you about is the parking. They

talked about elaborate plans for parking on-site, but our experience with parking issues that are already there have to do with overflow parking from Park City Mountain Resort, particularly on weekends, particularly on holidays they park at the top of Lowell because they know they can get off the slope there. And I'm thinking that with regards to all the additional traffic for commercial opportunities, visiting guests at this new development, that we're going to have tremendous additional parking on Lowell there, the top of Lowell. Sure, there are signs that say residential parking only, permit required. I think it would be interesting to ask the police department how many citations they issue, because every good weekend of snow, every holiday the cars are back there again. And I don't think there's going to be any effective way despite signs to eliminate that.

Those are the main issues. Of course, there are many other things I'd like to talk to you about, but thanks for the opportunity.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you.

Neals

Vernagaard: Hi, Neals Vernagaard, 822 Lowell. Just a note of practicality. From what I understand, once the applicant sells his project it will be a Four Seasons or Ritz Carlton or something like that. I can't imagine somebody going to the Riverhorse in their Four Seasons finery or their Ritz Carlton finery going down the Cabriolet, getting in a bus, and going to a restaurant. It isn't going to happen. They're going to call Uber, they're going to all a taxi, they're going to get in their own car. This Cabriolet is not going to mitigate one iota of traffic. Let's be practical about this. None of these people to go anywhere are getting in a Cabriolet and are getting in a bus. Thank you.

John

Stafsholt: John Stafsholt, 633 Woodside. I'm tempted to pick up where Neals left off, but I'm going to start with something different. CUP Item 14 is ownership, has to do with ownership. This is something that the developers have left this issue purposely open-ended. This gives themselves as much leeway as possible to develop the types of units that they choose. Go sell these units in the most profitable manner, regardless of impacts. Ownership has a huge potential impact on traffic and parking. And it's been completely left out of all the analysis to date.

Whether the project is primary residences, as you heard the people who approved it in 1985, or it has affordable housing, which is added to it, it has employee housing, whether they get their way with the conventions center, nightly rentals, timeshares, whatever it is, it's open-ended. And the difference is a massive effect on the volume of traffic and parking that's generated. And the pattern of the traffic. The developers repeatedly referred in the past to timeshares, even though these are not an allowed use in the MPD zone. And the traffic impacts will be substantial if timeshares are later allowed for the developers' extended profit.

So I would say all assumptions in the traffic studies leave out the type of ownership within the MPD. And it's a large and direct impact on traffic volume and patterns. I think that the developer must first declare the type of ownership, or else the traffic studies do not give any meaningful results. That's the first item.

Another item, CUP 6, Internal Pedestrian Circulation. So the Cabriolet, we show the Cabriolet to Main Street. And we talk about what a benefit it is to everybody. But it only helps the project. It's detrimental to the neighborhood. So what are the hours of operation, what are the limits? Do they match the hours of the bus? We talked about 11 o'clock, I heard 2 o'clock, I heard all night during Sundance. What about noise. What about cost to operate. What about light pollution. It will affect whether I could see the stars at night. The benefits are to the project, especially in the evening to bring home people from the bars or to bring people up to their bars. There's no mitigation to the neighborhood. This is a new impact we don't have at this time.

We've heard that the Cabriolet is for skiing. It's not for skiing. You know, if you're a skier and you ski in Old Town, you ski down to the lift, you get on the lift, and you go up. You don't get on a line, take your skis off, jump on this Cabriolet, go back off, get on another line, put your skis back on. You know, it's not a benefit to skiers. We've heard the high-speed quad is a benefit to skiers. It isn't because no one is going to do laps around a high-speed quad because to do there, the way it's set up, you have to go on the drift all the way across, but nobody's going to do that. So, you know, those are, those are fallacies that sound good if you don't know, and you don't live there, and you don't ski there.

The funicular is also described as a tremendous benefit to Old Town

residents and tourists. Well, the only benefit is to Treasure Hill tourists, and no benefit to the neighborhood. I would follow up with what Neals said about people not wanting to take the Cabriolet down to go to Grappa or someplace, or Riverhorse.

I would say, you know, we always leave out the fact that I ski every week. People who come to town they want to go to Snowbird, they want to go to Alta. They don't just ski Park City. We completely leave that out of, out of the traffic study that we talk about.

And by the way, a quick reminder. Just a quick one. On the residential square foot UEs that were originally approved for Treasure, that was 394,000 square feet, okay. Put this in perspective that this isn't going to cause traffic. The Marriott Mountainside is 218,000 square feet. The Marriott Summit Watch is 162,000 square feet. You add those two things together, it's 380,000 square feet, which is less than the original approval of Treasure. Now at almost 1.1 million square feet, we're talking three times the size of the Summit Watch and the Mountainside combined. Yeah, that won't really affect our, our parking or our traffic.

Okay. Next thing. All the CUP items required mitigation of detrimental impacts to the existing neighborhood. Okay. The CUP requires traffic and parking considerations, including capacity of the existing streets in the area, not new streets. This has been consistently left off by the developers in our discussion tonight. The MPD approval in 1985 quote, unquote, "If the pavement of Lowell Ave and Empire Ave south of Manor Way remains inadequate at the time Creole Gulch is developed, then the developer shall essentially reconstruct the entire 4600-foot length of Lowell and Empire south of Manor Way and his or her cost". That's their financial cost, but the actual cost to the neighborhood is borne by the people who live there. "The requirement will be for 10-inches of road base with six inches of new pavement to accommodate massive trucks." And quote, unquote, "That action by the developer would be inconvenient to residents in the City." Okay. Mitigation of that reconstruction is impossible for all the residents. Complete chaos, dirt roads, heavy construction vehicles all day, every day during this road construction all for Treasure Hill's owners benefit and profit. What, what about the neighborhood expense. By the way, the developer estimates in their own estimation is up to 300 heavy trucks per day going up there throughout the construction.

So, as I said, we're kind of leaving off the parking impacts to the neighborhood, but they weren't left off in 2004, 2006, 2009, 2010. I'm going to rattle off a list of previously proposed mitigations to the surrounding neighborhood. Both Empire and Lowell to expand to 37-1/2 feet wide, currently 25' wide. Only allow parking on one side of the street on Lowell and Empire. You need 8' for the parking. It's not. Emergency vehicles require 10-foot travel lanes in each direction. Snow storage requires 6' minimum on one side of the road. Pedestrian access requires 5' minimum on one side of the road. Parking requires 8' minimum on one side of the road. Add those up, I think it's 39 feet. Parking on that one side of the street can only be allowed on half of the roadway length on Lowell and Empire. It doesn't help you if you don't have a garage and you're on the other half. Many homes have no parking and will have to park in front of their neighbors' houses. That's not a mitigation. That's a huge conflict between neighbors. Limiting parking to no more than six continuous parking spaces on Lowell and Empire. Anybody take that serious? Prohibit all parking on Lowell and Empire near the project. City to provide strict parking enforcement during the winter season. This is crucial to the success of the project. Well, the parking enforcement is almost non-existent now. If we're going to do that, what's the additional cost to the City? Same all around the project. Uphill sidewalk to be added to Lowell Avenue. What about property rights, you know? That means the parking is going on the downhill side. And then you need a travel lane next to the sidewalk. That means all the snow will go directly on the sidewalk making it useless. Make Lowell and Empire one-way streets. That's not a mitigation to the neighbors. Add a street light at Empire Avenue and Silver King Drive. That's not a mitigation to the neighbors. Remove snow from Lowell and Empire on a priority basis. Well, it is a priority one street for snow removal and it's currently inadequate. So, what's that cost to Park City and the residents?

These are all things that are left off when we just talk about what's inside the project. We all know it's going to extend quite outside that project. Thanks for your time.

End of Public Comment

Chair

Strachan: Thank you, John. Anyone else from the public? All right. Seeing no one we'll close the public hearing. Commissioners comments. Who wants to start? How about we start with Commissioner Thimm.

Commissioner

Thimm: Okay, I just have, have a few things here. I agree with Commissioner Joyce with regard to the updated emergency vehicle and fire protection analysis to current Codes, especially with any expansion of area that's being talked about.

So we're, we're talking about parking here, and you know, we have these parking analyses that establish parking numbers for on-site parking. I, I, I think that we need to understand what's happening off-site as well, and what the impact on the neighborhood is. And so I'd like to see that made a part of the parking analysis.

A question for the applicant, is it the intent---we're, we're having a new parking, or a new traffic analysis, and then I heard it mentioned tonight a new parking analysis. Are those coming out together as part of the same document that feed each other in terms of input and that sort of thing? Is that the intent?

Pat

Sweeney: I'm not really sure how Gary Horton plans to present those, but the plan is to address them at the next meeting. One would definitely be an addendum to the parking studies to date, and whether---or the traffic studies to date. Whether or not the parking would be an addendum to that or a separate document, I don't know.

Commissioner

Thimm: Okay. They feed each other. I, I think in term of looking at this and understand the overall impacts, understanding at the same time and how they feed into each other is going to be important. With regard to the parking analysis itself, there's, there's the numbers of 424 that's in this page 25 parking analysis that was arrived at. There were earlier numbers that were talked about, and the 366. Francisco corrected it to 367, I think, in terms of number of stalls in, in the Staff report. When you go back to some of the older parking meetings, you go back to the work session in July of 2009, the Planning Commission, I think, had consensus in encouraging and maybe the word encouraging is not strong enough, but outlining the fact that they would like to see the applicant do what it had to do to reduce the number of parking stalls on-site to 366. So I don't know if that's being carried through. I don't know if that's a part of the parking analysis that's being done. I think that there was, there seemed to be full

consensus at that time, and I would think that we would want to see that and understand how that is being addressed in the parking analysis that's being provided.

The other thing, I know I've mentioned it a couple of times earlier, but the number of parking stalls, whether it's 366 or 424, when you take the numbers there's a value of 222,000 square feet of parking garage area, that works out to, at 424 stalls, to be about 524 square feet per stall, which is fairly inefficient. And I guess the number of stalls and the efficiency or inefficiency are going to speak directly to the, the mass and volume of earth work that is going on, or going down, I guess is one way of thinking about it. And so I, I, I think it would be interesting to understand why it's so inefficient. Now maybe it's all just circulation. I mean, I have no idea exactly why that is. It might be interesting to understand the circulation numbers, the roadways, the red roadways that are, you know, under the buildings and that sort of thing, and understand those if those are different. So I, I guess, since it speaks to volume and since the CUP is going to be about what sort of impact we have on, on this hillside, I think it's important to address efficiency and the number of cars.

The Staff report asks for discussion with regard to parking management and how the applicant proposes to manage it. And I guess the question is posed to the Commission as to whether or not that's a concern. And I would say that definitely is a concern. Having to do with whether or not the parking is contributory I think to people using the site and adding traffic volumes and that sort of thing that are not actually residence or using, or part of the facility, guests of the facility. In answer to the Staff report, I am concerned. I look forward to having that explained.

I think those are most of my notes at this point.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you. Commissioner Campbell.

Commissioner

Campbell: I don't have anything specific. I'm waiting to hear the traffic study report, but I don't have any questions from tonight.

Chair

Strachan: Okay. Commissioner Suesser.

Commissioner

Suesser: In response to the Staff report's specific question, I don't think that, based on what we've heard tonight, that the applicants have clearly demonstrated how they would comply with Finding #4. Finding #4, again, requires that all support commercial uses are oriented to provide convenience services to those residing within the project, and not designed to draw off-site customers to the site. I don't think they've demonstrated that. And I also would like to state that it's also a concern for me that they have not shown how they would manage the parking on-site.

In addition, without knowing the specific uses of the commercial space on the site, we can't determine whether or not it would draw additional traffic, and whether any mitigation measures that are going to be proposed are adequate. We need to know what those commercial uses are going to be to properly evaluate this. If the applicant adds amenities to the project that attracts off-site customers, that's going to increase traffic to the site. And so that has to be taken into consideration.

It seems like we're going in the wrong direction with respect to the number of parking spaces being requested. I think we were at 366 years ago and now we're over 400. Limiting the parking spaces at the project is one way to control, somewhat control the traffic to the site. So I think we need to start addressing bringing down that number rather than adding to it.

I had a question about one of the comments, and maybe Francisco can address this. Is there a plan to narrow Lowell Avenue three feet this summer?

Planner

Astorga: There is a plan to rebuild it. I, I haven't been directly dealing with that in this last month. So, I apologize. I don't have that answer but I can provide that for you next week. It was part of the, how the City Engineer selected the streetscape or the---yeah, the specific street. I forget what that number exactly is, which is part of our 2011 Streets Master Plan, but I can---you requested that back in January, I haven't forgotten that study to be presented. We just wanted to put that all together with the transportation packet. So we can have that information for you during the

next month.

Commissioner

Suesser: And also, there was a comment made by a member of the public that the current traffic on Crescent, for instance, might increase. Or on Empire and Lowell and Crescent potentially would increase 20 times what it currently is. And it would be great to get some sort of sense of how the number of traffic, the number, the increase in that kind of sense. Like is it going to be ten times what it currently is? Because I think that would give the public a good sense of how different the streets would be utilized with this project.

Planner

Astorga: Yeah, we can, we can have that be presented to you. The only thing I want to add is that the master plan does talk about access to the project via Empire and Lowell, not Crescent Tram. So we would have to also work again with the applicant to see how they're mitigating so people do not use Crescent Tram for their main access.

Laura

Suesser: And my last comment is that I agree with some of the public with regard to the Cabriolet as an amenity for Treasure Hill and not necessarily general public, because I think it's actually a negative impact to have the Town Lift diverted or changed to this Cabriolet and diverted to Treasure Hill, and then require skiers to get on and off lifts and lift lines to then take---to get to the top of the mountain from Main Street.

That's all I have.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you. Commissioner Joyce?

Commissioner

Joyce: So I'm kind of torn here. Part of me knows that we are doing so much work in the City, it's been a priority for the past couple of years, to reduce the amount of traffic. And, therefore, anything that we can do to get cars off the road, get people using mass transit. So the inclination there would be to work on the planned parking numbers and as Commissioner Suesser was saying, try to reduce those numbers and get back to something lower than that.

The problem we have there where I'm kind of torn is the impact on the neighborhoods. And by neighborhood I mean both the commercial district and the residential environment. If you look---I was kind of trying to figure out what they did for traffic mitigation and stuff, going back and looking at some of the stuff for the Montage. And the Montage is, is kind of a nice way to look at it is its completely different, because if you under park the Montage and they don't have enough parking for their guests and their employees and everything, it suddenly becomes blatantly obvious and mostly impacts them. All of a sudden they'd have guests parking out on Highway 224 or Marsac, whatever it is out there. And there's no neighbors to be impacted. It would be probably UDOT and the City that would be upset with them more than anything else. Here we've got something that's, that's really the polar opposite of that, which is this is a big facility that's tucked right into the middle of a historic neighborhood that is already under pressure. I mean, we've heard it, we've seen it. I mean, Lowell, Empire. People parking on Park Avenue that aren't supposed to because they get kind of nudged around in China Bridge when they were parking there. It's employees going to work. We've already got all that going on, and this has the possibility of, of just overwhelming that area completely.

So, I think it really comes back to the, to the question Francisco asked and that my fellow Commissioners have asked, which is we need to talk about different management plans than we have seen before. Because this is really a unique property. And to me there were really two things, one---well, three things, I'm sorry. One, we talked about support commercial. You already know that I have a question of how can you go beyond the 19 UEs that you were approved in the Master Plan, but you've got a plan for 52,000 UEs, excuse me, 52,000 square feet to be particular, of, of commercial. 52,000 square feet of commercial is a lot for a place that keeps saying, hey, we're here to be a bed base for, for Main Street, and we're just doing the kinds of things---in fact the examples you give of a ski rental shop and, you know, we're selling knick-knacks in a coffee store and that kind of thing. You know, I'm not in the retail business, but I walk into a lot of those places and see, you know, 400 square feet here, a 1,000 square feet there. I can't begin to contemplate the parking requirements for 52,000 square feet of commercial without knowing a lot more about what you're seeing that being. And it hits employee parking and it certainly hits guest parking. And there's just example after example here in town. I mean, the one I bring up just because it's very firsthand to me is, is Hotel Park City, where they have a restaurant that they draw

locals to. They have conferences in their conference facilities that they do local kind of day conferences where it's people from Salt Lake and people from Oakley and Kamas and Park City, that all drive one per car and come up there and park. And then they have a golf course there, which is the City's golf course. But it overwhelms the parking, and what happens, it flows out into the neighborhoods. It flows out. You'll see people parked out on 224 where they're not supposed to be. That's what happens when you get something where they say, oh, this is for local use, and it's not. And every, I mean just open the Park Record and see the ads for come up to our spa at, you know, the Montage, at St. Regis. Come have dinner up here. Here's locals' coupons for all this. It's very clearly places that were designed as part of the structures to be serving the people who are there, and they're going out of their way to draw people in.

And so a couple things. You've got 52,000 square feet of commercial. We have to know not, not specifics, because I know you don't, you don't even have somebody ready to build, but we have to know a lot more about what would go in there and what kind of employee draw that would be, and what kind of parking requirements that would be.

Second thing is meeting space. You guys put in 16,000 square feet of meeting space. So, again, I don't believe that you will only have meetings that will be of people living at the hotel facilities. I mean, I just, I just don't. Business is business. You want to fill the space. 16,000 square feet. Again, I'm not in the, the hotel design business, but I went on to a nice little website called hotelplanner.com and just threw in things where you could say, I want 100 people and I want it in classroom style. How much space does that take? And it said it takes about 2400 square feet for 100 people. I said, well, what if it's banquet space. They have the nice little 6' foot banquet round tables and stuff. And it said, well, that takes 1200 square feet. That's for 100 people. You---I don't need to get into, you know, this site. I can't justify the numbers they're creating here. But, I mean, I can look and go well this is, you know, 16,000 square feet is 80 by 200. That's a big room or a bunch of medium size room. That's a lot of meeting space. And so it's hard for me to believe that that has no traffic impact. And that's our current plan, is that has zero traffic impact where you could literally put hundreds and hundreds of people into 16,000 square feet.

And the last one somebody mentioned along the way, but it's a concern of mine because we've seen it with the Silver Star development, which is you

suddenly become a little miniature skier base, whether you want to or not. If you have a high-speed quad that gets up on to the mountain and it's a 100 foot walk from me parking at the top of Lowell, people are going to do that, because that's a lot more convenient, especially when the parking lots get full.

And so my big concern is, I need to see management plans that address all these things. So again, three things. The 50,000 square feet of commercial, 16,000 square feet of meeting space, and a new kind of virtual ski base. And so when we talk about things like employees and employee parking, the idea of that, oh, it will be off-site and we'll have, you know, some sort of controlled parking, valet, whatever it is that, that keeps people from going in, that's not all I'm worried about. I'm worried about the employee who chooses not to use the park out at Richardson Flat and take the bus in. He's the one who goes and wants to park on Park Avenue or China Bridge or whatever it is, and park there and walk up and take that nice Cabriolet that's going up now. And so he's not going to get to your on-site parking enforcement kind of thing that says we won't let employees park in our garage. It's a bigger problem than that. And so everything we've heard so far, I know we haven't gotten deep into it. But you guys have presented a little bit of kind of management ideas to us of, of, you know, how to control employees; and yes, we need off-site employee parking of some form. But the fact that you guys are tucked into a neighborhood, the fact that you're tucked into the Main Street business district, you're going to have to go beyond this to, to, to address these parking issues. And if you---for what it's worth, I mean, I mentioned this back when we were talking about space. I said, yes, you guys, you can justify 16,000 square feet of meeting space based on the 5% numbers that the LMC does, but you have to mitigate it. Here's an example where I'm telling, you, yep, I, I agree with you. You can do 16,000 square feet of meeting space, now mitigate it. And that's everything from, you know, it's additional excavation, it's additional employees, and it's certainly a lot of extra parking somewhere along the way that doesn't exist today.

So, when you guys come back to us with that, I think the only way that we can get to protecting the neighborhoods, making sure you guys have adequate space, is to have a management plan that's different than what we traditionally see from, from local hotel complexes. I think you guys have a much more complicated issue to deal with. And, you know, Godspeed. Come back to us with something great.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you. Commissioner Band?

Commissioner

Band: Thank you. So I agree with you, Commissioner Joyce. My biggest concern about parking actually is not overparking, but underparking. I think I would rather see more parking than less just because if it bleeds out into the neighbors that's not going to be something that we can fix.

When we're talking about ownership, one of the things mentioned in here is time interval ownership. That kind of makes a big difference whether we're talking timeshare or residence club. And the reason I bring it up, the Deer Valley Club and Chateaux residences in Silver Lake Deer Valley--I happen to work in the hotel of the Chateaux, so I know a little more about it. Both of those ownership opportunities have airport shuttles. So literally, I don't think there is rarely, rarely a guest who comes to the Deer Valley Club or the Chateaux residences that brings their own car. Now in a development like this, if you have an entire section of it that nobody is coming and going and bring a car except for on the shuttles that are provided, I think that would make a big difference.

Also, I'm really curious, and it's not our job to make your, your project viable. But when we're talking about all this commercial space, which we've had a lot of talk about tonight, what I'm trying to understand is how you're going to make it pencil. Again, I work in Silver Lake Village. There's no sundry store up there. There's no coffee shop year-round. It's something that the residents really want but nobody does it because it doesn't pencil. So we're looking at a big development here that could, and certainly will in mud season, sit empty at least partially. So how you're going to feel with---your, your commercial space with shops and tenants, because I'm assuming you're not going to subsidize it. You're not going to run all of that yourself. How you're going to fill that commercial space with people who are going to make a living without drawing outside customers. That's a head scratcher for me.

And then I also am worried about the conference space. That is a ton of conference space. Again, Chateaux, Stein Eriksen, we do a lot of conferences and it does generate a ton of traffic. Not everybody wants to stay at Stein Eriksen. It's beautiful but it's expensive. So not only do we

have local conference traffic, we have people coming from other less expensive accommodations, and that generates a pretty substantial amount of traffic. And we have a ton of parking at the Chateaux. It's a big revenue generator, but cars are going in and out all day long. All day long on Royal Street. And it gets tight. So, those are my thoughts.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you.

Commissioner

Phillips: Well, I think I pretty much agree with everything that's been said up to this point. Don't really have a lot to add. I am---I, I, you know, in my mind I keep going back and forth on the parking. You know, less parking, and then it, you know, it, it impacts the neighborhoods. Too much parking, then you got too much traffic. It's tough, you know. So I'm not sure. It will be interesting to see these studies. But I also agree, without knowing the uses and the intensity of the uses, it's hard to, you know, really know what the traffic is going to be like.

I'm, I'm very concerned, you know, about the unintended consequences of certain things happening. And putting a high-speed quad, I use Town Lift. That's my access to the mountain. Sometimes I complain because it almost takes longer to get up there, but at this point I feel like that is one deterrent on why people don't park on Park Avenue right now, because it's not really an advantage. Although, I do see a lot of people using Park Avenue right there as an access, especially when the Resort's full. I'm very concerned about what will happen as the Resort, you know, I'm sure they have plans to bring in more customers, and the impacts of the overflow parking on that lower Main Street District. And maybe that's something the City needs to start thinking about too, you know. I mean, maybe, maybe that all needs to become paid parking at a certain point.

But, yeah, I think, I think, you know, if anything, the most important thing for me coming out of this meeting is the use of the space and traffic because they, they, they go hand in hand. And right now the use is vague. And so, you know, I'd have to apply the worst case scenario rule when I'm looking at that if that's all we're going to get.

So, that's pretty much it for me.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you. Yeah, I don't have much to add. I think I'll keep my gun powder dry until we get some of the numbers from your traffic guys. But the concerns that you've heard from the other Commissioners I share, particularly the concerns about the vagaries of use in both the commercial and the residential. The structure of ownership and the format of ownership do drive the intensity of traffic. And so those have to be made clear to us, and how you're going to mitigate them.

All right. Any more comments? Okay, we'll move on the agenda with a motion to continue.

MOTION: Commissioner Thimm moved to CONTINUE the Treasure Hill Conditional Use Permit until April 12, 2017. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

2. **40 & 46 Silver Strike Trail - Eighth Supplemental Plat for Constructed Units The Belles at Empire Pass, Condominium Plat Amending Units 13 & 14. (Application PL-17-03459)**

Commissioner Phillips recused himself and left the room.

Planner Astorga reviewed the application for the Eighth Supplemental Plat for constructed units, the Belles at Empire Pass, amending units 13 and 14. A condition of approval requires replatting once these have been built. Planner Astorga reported that there would only be one left after these.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council based on the Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the draft ordinance.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the Eighth Supplemental Plat for Units 13 and 14, based on the

Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in the draft ordinance. Commissioner Band seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Finding of Fact – 40 & 46 Silver Strike Trail

1. The property, Units 13 and 14 of the Amended, Consolidated, and Restated Condominium Plat of The Belles at Empire Pass and associated common area, are located at 40 and 46 Silver Strike Trail. The property is located on portions of Lot 1 of the Silver Strike subdivision and is within Pod A of the Flagstaff Mountain Development, in an area known as the Village at Empire Pass.
2. The property is located within the RD –MPD zoning district and is subject to the Flagstaff Mountain Development Agreement and Village of Empire Pass MPD.
3. The City Council approved the Flagstaff Mountain Development Agreement and Annexation Resolution 99-30 on June 24, 1999. The Development Agreement is the equivalent of a Large-Scale Master Plan. The Development Agreement sets forth maximum densities, location of densities, and developer-offered amenities.
4. On July 28, 2004, the Planning Commission approved a Master Planned Development (MPD) for the Village at Empire Pass, aka Pod A. The MPD identified the area of the proposed condominium plat as the location for 18 PUD –style detached single family homes and duplexes.
5. On June 29, 2006, the City Council approved the Silver Strike Subdivision creating two lots of record. Units 13 and 14 are located on a portion of Lot 1 of the Silver Strike Subdivision.
6. On August 17, 2007, the City Council approved 4 units on Lot 2 as the Christopher Homes at Empire Pass Phase I condominium plat. The plat was recorded at Summit County on October 3, 2007.
7. On November 29, 2007, the City Council approved the first amended Christopher Homes at Empire Pass Phase II condominium plat creating an additional 4 units on Lot 2. The plat was recorded at Summit County on February 20, 2008.
8. On April 23, 2008, the City Council approved two (2) more condominium units on Lot 1 of the Silver Strike subdivision as Christopher Homes at Empire Pass Phase III condominium plat. The plat was recorded at Summit County on December 1, 2008.

9. On August 28, 2008, the City Council approved the Christopher Homes at Empire Pass Phase IV plat for eight additional condominium units on Lots 1 and 2, specifically units 5/6, 7/8, 13/14, and 17/18 in duplex configurations. The plat was recorded at Summit County on November 19, 2008.

10. March 24, 2011, the City Council approved the Amended, Consolidated, and Restated Condominium Plat of The Belles at Empire Pass amending, consolidating, and restating the previously recorded Christopher Homes at Empire Pass condominium plats Phases I, II, III, and IV. Also on March 24, 2011, the City Council approved the First Supplemental Plat for Constructed Units 1, 2, and 12 of the Belles at Empire Pass Condominiums. These plats were recorded November 28, 2011.

11. On June 28, 2012, the City Council approved the Second Supplemental Plat for Constructed Unit 9. This plat was recorded on November 20, 2012.

12. On May 9, 2013, the City Council approved the Third Supplemental Plat for Constructed Unit 4 and the Fourth Supplemental Plat for Constructed Units 5 and 6. These plats were recorded on October 28, 2013.

13. On February 6, 2014, the City Council approved the Fifth Supplemental Plat for Constructed Units 10 and 11.

14. On April 3, 2014, the City Council approved the Sixth Supplemental Plat for Constructed Units 7, 8, and 17. On December 11, 2014, the City Council approved an amendment to the Sixth Supplemental Plat.

15. On July 30, 2015, the City Council approved the Seventh Supplemental Plat for Constructed Units 15 and 16.

16. On February 1, 2017 the Planning Department received a complete application for the Eighth (8th) Supplemental Plat for Constructed Units 13 and 14.

17. The purpose of the supplemental plat is to describe and document the as-built conditions and the UE calculations for all constructed units at the Belles Condominiums prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy and to identify private, limited common and common area for this unit.

18. The supplemental plat complies with the conditions of approval of the underlying plats, namely the Silver Strike subdivision plat and the Amended, Consolidated, and Restated Condominium plat of The Belles at Empire Pass. The plat is consistent

with the development pattern envisioned by the Village at Empire Pass MPD, including the 14 Technical Reports of the MPD and the Flagstaff Development Agreement.

19. Units 13 and 14 are located on a portion of Lot 1 of the Silver Strike subdivision plat.

20. The approved maximum house size is 5,000 square feet of Gross Floor Area, as defined by the LMC. Gross Floor Area exempts basement areas below final grade and 600 square feet of garage area.

21. Unit 13 contains 4,199.8 sf. of Gross Floor Area plus a 495 sf. garage area and accounts for 2.099 UEs based on the Total Floor area of 4,199.8 sf. (does not include garage area).

22. Unit 14 contains 4,127.3 sf. of Gross Floor Area plus a 507 sf. garage area and accounts for 2.063 UEs based on the Total Floor area of 4,127.3 sf. (does not include garage area).

23. Unit 13 and 14 do not include a basement area.

24. The fourteen (14) units platted to date (Units 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 17) utilize 37.833 Unit Equivalents (UE). Adding Units 13 and 14 brings the current total to 41.99 UE.

25. The Flagstaff Development Agreement requires calculation of unit equivalents (UE) for all Belles units, in addition to the maximum house size. The UE formula includes all interior square footage "calculated from the inside surfaces of the interior boundary wall of each completed unit, excluding all structural walls and components, as well as all shafts, ducts, flues, pipes, conduits and the wall enclosing such facilities. Unit Equivalent floor area includes all basement areas. Also excluded from the UE square footage are garage space up to 600 square feet per unit and all space designated as non-habitable on this plat." Within the Flagstaff Development Agreement one residential unit equivalent equals 2,000 sf.

26. As conditioned, this supplemental plat is consistent with the approved Flagstaff Development Agreement, the Village at Empire Pass MPD, and the conditions of approval of the Silver Strike Subdivision.

27. The findings in the analysis section are incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law – 40 & 46 Silver Strike Trail

1. There is Good Cause for this supplemental plat as it memorializes the as-built conditions for Units 13 and 14.
2. The supplemental plat is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding condominium plats.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed supplemental plat.
4. Approval of the supplemental plat, subject to the conditions of approval stated below, will not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval – 40 & 46 Silver Strike Trail

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form of the supplemental plat for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant will present the final signed mylar plat to the City, for City signatures and recordation at Summit County, within one year of the date of City Council approval, or this approval will be considered void; unless an extension request is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.
3. All conditions of approval of the Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development, the Silver Strike Subdivision plat, and the Amended, Consolidated, and Restated Condominium Plat of The Belles at Empire Pass shall continue to apply.
4. As a condition precedent to issuance of a final certificate of occupancy for Units 13 and 14, this supplemental plat shall be recorded at Summit County.
5. A note shall be added to the plat prior to recordation stating the following, “At the time of resurfacing of Silver Strike Trail, the Master Association shall be responsible to adjust wastewater manholes to grade according to Snyderville Basin Water Reclamation District Standards”.
6. The unit sizes and UEs shall be reflected on the plat.

Commissioner Phillips returned to the meeting.

3. 1251 Kearns Boulevard – Amended Yard Subdivision, Plat Amendment to split the property into two (2) lots of record and Right-of-Way dedication for Homestake Road and Munchkin Drive. (Application PL-16-03346)

Planner Astorga reviewed the application for 1251 Kearns Boulevard, the First Amended Yard Subdivision. He reviewed an Exhibit on Page 68 of the Staff report, which entails subdividing the current one lot subdivision that occurred in 2009. The proposed subdivision also includes significant road dedication for both Homestake Road expansion and also a future extension to Munchkin road. He reported that the City was in the process of purchasing Lot 1 towards the rear of the property.

Planner Astorga stated that currently the sites house three businesses; a restaurant and an event center. Most of the parking for Lot 2 is adjacent towards the east of the property. He counted 104 parking spaces when he did his field inspection, and he only counted parking spaces that were striped and spaces that were not used for snow banks or snow storage. Planner Astorga calculated that both restaurants require exactly 104 parking spaces.

Planner Astorga remarked that the difficult is the event space. Per the square footage that was analyzed, the property is short 35 parking space. Under the current Real Estate Purchase Contract (REPC) that the property owner has with the City, the applicant has an option of leasing on a temporary basis x-number of parking stalls on the current Lot 2. The rear of the property has an approved use for a commercial parking lot. The Staff identifies this as a temporary solution, and once the future property owner, in this case the City, starts building and replacing the current asphalt, the temporary parking lease for the event center would not be renewed. The owner would not be able to utilize that specific event center unless an idea or concept is formulated, accepted and approved. While the property owner can amend that specific conditional use permit as it was approved in 2009, the Staff finds it appropriate to move forward with the temporary nature of it.

Planner Astorga stated that different ideas had been discussed from the temporary solution to the worst case scenario, which would be for the applicant to forego the use and demolish the back end of the property.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing, discuss the parking situation, condition the approval, and forward a recommendation to the City Council.

Rory Murphy was present to represent Mark Fischer, the property owner, stated that the event center at this time is primarily used for two weeks during Sundance. The last few years it has also been used by the Latino community for weddings and parties. Mr. Murphy stated that the event space cannot be used without proper parking, and the arrangement was to work with the City while that space was still open and use the spaces for parking. If the Planning Commission finds that to be onerous to impose, the owner would not object. The primary concern are the three restaurants.

Mr. Murphy stated that his count of 122 spaces included the space behind the Recycle Center than sheds snow and gets snow pushed to it. Planner Astorga informed him that when they are covered with snow they cannot be counted. Mr. Murphy believed that was a fair assessment. He pointed out that they needed 104 parking spaces and they have 104 spaces, which was a lucky coincidence.

Commissioner Phillips asked if the new road right-of-way dedications are required or whether they were above and beyond what is required. Director Erickson replied that it was consistent with the Transportation Master Plan and the General Plan for the roadway system. Commissioner Phillips clarified that it was required. Director Erickson answered yes.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

Chair Strachan appreciated the temporary solution to solve this problem. As Bonanza gets developed he believed they would need to do more of those agreements. It will not be easy and requires flexibility from both the developer and the City. Chair Strachan stated that he personally was not opposed to the temporary solution.

Commissioner Joyce thought it was a good idea. However, if 35 spaces are needed he wanted to know why the agreement with the City was to lease 30 spaces. He did not believe that would fix the problem. Planner Astorga stated that when the City signed the original REPC, which has been amended once already, they did not realize that the deficiency was 35 spaces. The deficiency was not found until he wrote the Staff report. The REPC will be amended once again to show that they have the number of parking spaces needed for that specific event or use. Planner Astorga reported that the property owner was working with Jonathan Weidenhamer to amend the REPC once again to have an agreement to lease whatever number they need.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that this was the first time she heard about altering the REPC. She remarked that there was another contractual way that the City could provide parking even after the transaction takes place.

Director Erickson clarified that the condition of approval was corrected in identifying 35 parking spaces. Planner Astorga stated that it was correct based on the existing square footage of the event space.

Commissioner Joyce pointed out that one finding says 35 spaces are needed and that it will be fixed in Finding #34 by getting 30 spaces. He thought there were conflicts within the Findings. Planner Astorga agreed, and suggested that they strike "30" out of the Finding. He revised the Finding to read, "The contractual purchase agreement with Park City allows the applicant to lease spaces from the City."

Commissioner Joyce was comfortable with that revision.

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the First Amended Yard Subdivision, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval found in the draft ordinance and as amended. Commissioner Suesser seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Rory Murphy commended Planner Astorga for his efforts and hard work to help resolve this issue.

Findings of Facts – 1251 Kearns Boulevard

1. The property is located at 1251 Kearns Boulevard.
2. The property is in the GC District with FPZ Overlay.
3. The property was platted as Parcel 1 of the Yard Subdivision in 2011 and the site currently contains 4.6 acres.
4. The site contains one (1) existing building on the north end and a parking lot on the south end of the site.
5. The existing building houses two (2) restaurants/bars, allowed uses in the GC District, i.e., Blind Dog Restaurant & Sushi, the Boneyard Saloon & Wine Dive).

6. The existing building also houses an event center, approved through a Conditional Use Permit in June 2009 as an indoor entertainment facility.
7. The half portion of the site to the south is used as a commercial parking lot, approved through a Conditional Use Permit in June 2009.
8. Currently the entire site has enough room to accommodate approximately 339 parking spaces.
9. The proposed Plat Amendment creates two (2) lots of record from the existing one-lot subdivision and dedicates ROW to the City for future Homestake Road expansion and Munchkin Drive extension.
10. The proposal consists of creating a new lot towards the north end where the existing building sits, containing 2.31 acres, to be platted as Lot 1.
11. The proposal consists of creating a new lot towards the south end where the parking lot is located, containing 1.86 acres, to be platted as Lot 2.
12. The proposal consists of a ROW dedication to Park City Municipal Corporation of 0.43 acres consisting of the western twenty feet (20') of the site along the entire length of Homestake Road for future road expansion and the ROW dedication of Munchkin Drive for future extension as the City is acquiring the land to extend Munchkin Drive from the east connecting it to Homestake Road.
13. Both lots are partially located in a FEMA Flood Zone X.
14. All development activity must comply with the following minimum setback yards:
 - a. Front – Twenty feet (20').
 - b. Rear – Ten feet (10').
 - c. Side – Ten feet (10').
 - d. FPZ – Thirty feet (30'), from Kearns Boulevard only.
15. The existing building complies with the minimum required setbacks in the district.
16. The GC District does not have a maximum or minimum area, width, or depth standard.
17. The site currently complies with the frontage of a public ROW requirement and the proposal does not affect this existing compliance.

18. The existing building is in compliance with this maximum building height.
19. Snyderville Basin Water Reclamation District (SBWRD) reviewed the proposed Plat Amendment that allowed them to evaluate their requirements for approval of the plat.
20. The requirement for a Line Extension Agreement (LEA) with SBWRD to extend the public wastewater system to the property will be deferred until the submittal of a subsequent subdivision plat for Lot 2 or submittal of plans for a construction project on Lot 2.
21. In response to the Public Utilities Department's review of the proposal, the PCMC Department of Public Utilities provided comments regarding fire flow and water system pressure, water infrastructure master planning, notice of storm drainage considerations, and off-site easements.
22. The applicant submitted documents on February 09, 2017 regarding parking.
23. Significant amount of parking located on the rear lot would no longer be part of the same property.
24. On February 15, 2017, the Planning Department inspected the site and counted all stripped/available parking spaces located on the north end, proposed Lot 1, consisting of a total of 104 parking spaces.
25. The restaurants found onsite consisting of the Blind Dog Restaurant & Sushi and the Boneyard Saloon & Wine Dive have a total net leasable floor area of 10,338 square feet, which triggers a total of 104 parking spaces.
26. The parking ratio of a standard restaurant and bar is 1 space for every 100 sf. of net leasable area, including kitchen areas.
27. The Event Center has a floor area of 6,887 square feet, which triggers a total of 35 parking spaces.
28. The parking ratio of an indoor entertainment facility is 5 spaces per 1,000 sf. of floor area.
29. The proposed Plat Amendment creates a non-compliance of required on-site parking spaces for the event center.

30. LMC § 5-3-2 Requirement indicates that required parking must be on-site unless the Planning Commission allows such parking on adjacent or nearby deed restricted lots.

31. The adjacent property that Park City is purchasing has historically been the parking area for the event space.

32. The event space can no longer be accommodated without an arrangement with the soon-to-be City property owner.

33. The applicant has primarily been concerned with the existing restaurants and their parking requirements.

34. The contractual purchase agreement with Park City Municipal Corporation allows for the applicant to lease spaces from the City for a rolling 90 days at a time in the back triangle parcel the City is purchasing.

35. The Planning Commission can allow off-site parking on adjacent property.

36. The Planning Department finds this a good temporary solution to allow the applicant to use the event space with the utilized option of allowing the applicant to lease spaces.

37. Should the property owner not be able to lease the needed parking spaces from the property owner of proposed Lot 2, the event center would not be able to operate.

38. All findings within the Analysis section and the recitals above are incorporated herein as findings of fact.

Conclusions of Law – 1251 Kearns Boulevard

1. There is Good Cause for this Plat Amendment.

2. The Plat Amendment is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding Subdivisions.

3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed Plat Amendment.

4. Approval of the Plat Amendment, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval – 1251 Kearns Boulevard

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant will record the plat at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one (1) years' time, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.
3. The requirement for a Line Extension Agreement with Snyderville Basin Water Reclamation District to extend the public wastewater system to the property will be deferred until the submittal of a subsequent subdivision plat for Lot 2 or submittal of plans for a construction project on Lot 2. The applicant shall be responsible for coordinating with Snyderville Basin Water Reclamation District as to the exact language needed to be placed on this plat as a note.
4. The applicant shall work with the property owner of Lot 2 to ensure parking of the missing parking spaces in order for the event center on Lot 1 to operate. Should the applicant fail to obtain a lease of the required parking for the event center for whatever reason, the applicant shall cease to operate the event center.
5. Ten foot (10') wide public snow storage easements shall be provided along the Homestake and Munchkin frontages for both lots.
6. Modified 13-D sprinklers will be required for new construction by the Chief Building Official at the time of review of the building permit submittal and shall be noted on the final Mylar prior to recordation.

4. **7545 & 7585 Sterling Drive - Request for Approval of a Plat Amendment for Lot C & D of The Cottages – A re-subdivision of Silver Lake Knoll No. 2 Parcel E & F Subdivision, to move the lot line between lots C & D so the existing garage is fully on Lot D's property. (Application PL-17-0344)**

Planner Makena Hawley reviewed the application to amend Lot C and D of the Cottages at 7545 and 7585 Sterling Drive. She explained that the lot line would be moved slightly to make sure that the garage is fully on 7545 Sterling Drive. The applicants have been utilizing it this way with a grant of easement since 2006. All of the built environment will be on one lot, and the other lot will be completely vacant.

Planner Hawley stated that the only issue is that it would take away the building pad from the previous plats. However, the Staff believes it is a good idea because the building pad was put on the original plat, and then it was moved over to the other plat even though the building was not built within that pad. Through research of Minutes and Staff reports, the Staff could find no reason why the building pad was on certain lots, and there was no reason to keep it.

Chair Strachan asked if that was standardized with the other plats in the area. Planner Hawley was unsure whether one of the other plats had been completed with a building pad on it. She assumed the Staff would do the same thing for other plats because there was no research to prove why the building pads were there. She pointed out that the building pads do not match the built environment.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the plat amendment for Lots C and D, located at 7545 & 7585 Sterling Drive, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the draft ordinance. Commissioner Band seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 7545 & 7585 Sterling Drive

1. The property is located at 7545 & 7585 Sterling Drive in the Residential Development (RD) District.
2. The subject property consists of Lot C and Lot D of The Cottages – A resubdivision of Silver Lake Knoll No. 2 Parcel E & F Subdivision approved by the City Council and recorded at Summit County on October 10, 1986.
3. Both lots are subject to the Deer Valley MPD.
4. The proposal complies with the allowed uses in the RD District.
5. Lots C and D are owned by the Cases.

6. Lot D is currently occupied by the Cases' existing residence and Lot C is essentially vacant. Approximately half of the garage and a parking pad associated with the house on Lot D are currently located on Lot C.

7. It is the desire of the owners to move the lot line so that all structures are entirely on Lot D to meet the side yard setback of 12 feet for the RD zone.

8. The subject property consists of Lots C and D of The Cottages – A re-subdivision of Silver Lake Knoll No. 2 Parcel E & F Subdivision.

9. Currently Lot D contains an existing single family home and double car garage that crosses the common property line, with parking pads on either side of a zero front yard setback.

10. Both structures were constructed in 1996.

11. In 1983 from Silver Lake Knoll Cottages Phase 1 was approved as a Planned Unit Development and contained 7 lots total. The garages and driveways were identified as common area and the buildable pad was placed on the plat with zero front yard setbacks to the road. This plat was vacated by Ordinance 86-10 in 1986.

12. In 1985, the Silver Lake Knoll Cottages Phase II was approved as a Planned Unit Development and contained 10 lots total. The garages and driveways were identified as common area and the buildable pad was placed on the plat with zero front yard setbacks to the road. This plat was vacated by Ordinance 86-4 in 1986.

13. The Cottages – A re-subdivision of Silver Lake Knoll No. 2 Parcel E & F Subdivision was approved in 1986. It is an 11 single family lots as a combination of the Silver Lake Knoll Cottages Phase I and Phase II.

14. A Planning Department's setback recommendation to allow zero setbacks from the front lot line to the garages was approved by the City Council on April 24, 1986.

15. The plat Silver Lake Knoll Cottages Phase II calls out "Existing Building Pads" on only lots A, B, D, and F. These building pads reflect 4 of the 7 private lot building pads from the Phase 1 P.U.D. but not what currently exists as built. No minutes were found that reflect the reasons behind placing the "Existing Building Pads"

on the newest plat. After additional research, it was found the pads were intended to indicate where buildings were currently located but that setbacks still apply. No further resources were found as to why the building pads were placed on only 4 lots.

16. The “Existing Building Pad” from The Cottages – A re-subdivision of Silver Lake Knoll No. 2 Parcel E & F Subdivision are not necessary, the lot would be sufficient to follow the normal zone setbacks regulations.

17. In 2006, an easement was granted from Lot C to Lot D to “use, maintain, repair, and replace the garage structures and landscaping”. This easement will become moot after this plat amendment is recorded.

18. On January 26, 2017, the Planning Department received a complete Plat Amendment application for the Cottages – Amending Lots C & D.

19. The plat amendment will effectively locate the existing garage fully onto Lot D with 12 feet of side yard setbacks to the property line meeting the minimum requirement for the RD zone.

20. This plat amendment eliminates the need for the grant of easement, eliminates the legal non-complying structure in terms of side yard setbacks and leaves Lot C with no existing structures on the lot.

21. The existing garage will maintain the 5 foot setback from the front property line and will be located entirely upon Lot D.

22. Lot D will go from approx. 23,721 sq. ft. to 27,635 sq. ft. of lot area.

23. Lot C will go from approx. 35,807 sq. ft. to 31,895 sq. ft. of lot area.

24. The property was posted and notice was mailed to property owners within 300 feet on February 15, 2017.

25. Legal notice was also published in the Park Record according to requirements of the Land Management Code on February 18, 2017.

26. All findings within the Analysis section and the recitals above are incorporated herein as findings of fact.

Conclusions of Law – 7545 & 7585 Sterling Drive

1. The Plat Amendment is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding condominium record of survey plats.
2. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed Plat Amendment.
3. Approval of the Plat Amendment, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.
4. The plat is consistent with the provisions of the Deer Valley MPD.

Conditions of Approval – 7545 & 7585 Sterling Drive

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant will record the plat at Summit County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year's time, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.
3. All conditions of approval of The Cottages – A re-subdivision of Silver Lake Knoll No. 2 Parcel E & F Subdivision shall continue to apply.
4. The easement on Lot C shall be removed.
5. **Park City Heights Master Planned Development (MPD)- Ratification of Amended Development Agreement regarding Exhibit G - Design Guidelines. (Application PL-13-02009)**

Planner Kirsten Whetstone reviewed the request to ratify the Park City Height Master Planned Development Agreement, Exhibit G, which are the Park City Heights Design Guidelines. This came to the Planning Commission in August, and at that time the Commissioners requested to see all the changes previously approved in redline, all the changes that were being proposed, and a clean version. The applicant had provided those exhibits and they were reviewed by Staff and included in the Staff report as a separate attachment.

Planner Whetstone stated that once the Planning Commission takes action to ratify the Amended Development Agreement, Exhibit G, it would be recorded at Summit County. The Design Guidelines will provide proper guidance in development of the different sizes of lots and different housing types at Park City Heights.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Joyce read from page 9 of the Guidelines, "Garages shall be a maximum of 24' wide. Garage doors must be placed either ten feet from the property line or a minimum of 18' from the property line". He asked if that was correct as written, that it was either 10' or at least 18'. Planner Whetstone clarified that he was reading from the clean version of the Guidelines.

Spencer White, representing the applicant, explained that 10' does not allow for a car to park in the driveway. Eighteen feet allows for a car in the driveway. If there was any number in between, people would try to squeeze a small car in the driveway. Mr. White stated that they could not get any closer than 10' for any structure, but if it is not on the property line, it must be 18' feet back to allow for a car to be completely off the road. He clarified that it either has to be 10' or a minimum of 18'.

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to RATIFY the revised Exhibit G, Park City Heights Design Guidelines of the recorded Amended Park City Heights MPD Development Agreement. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Park City Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: _____