planning

From: Jennifer Franklin <j.marie.franklin@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 11, 2017 9:03 AM
To: planning
Subject: Treasure and Alice Claim comments

planning@parkcity.org

Hello Commissioners,

Thank you for your time and service on this Commission and in this community.

My apologies for not being as present at meetings as others (my work schedule takes me frequently out of town on meeting dates). As I do not tend to stand at the lectern, I'll write.

Two concise and connected comments:

Alice Claim:
I attended the spring meeting when Alice Claim was approved - I am concerned about the multiple statements that the applicant brought "a much improved" application and plan. A "much improved plan" is still not a compliant, nor a good plan for the community or the spirit of the LMC. Such comments give applicants the toe hold to repetitively apply with incremental changes until they get what they want. "Better" is not necessarily good.

Treasure Hill:
Also at this meeting McQuoid, Olch and Doilney spoke about the vision they had as Council at the time of approval in 1986 - a hotel closer to the size of the Holiday Inn/Yarrow/Doubletree.
Please do not allow the "refinements" of Treasure to be deemed as "Better" - they are still not compliant with the intent of approval of 1986.
The current project does not fit in with the current or future community and should be denied, based on many areas of concern - mass, scale, traffic, excavation, landscaping. Personally, I am not willing to allow something to be approved based on fear of litigation by the applicant.

Both:
"Better" or "much improved" is not what we're deciding - the repetition is designed to fatigue the process and therefore triumph by attrition - both of the arguments and of commissioners and public.

Thank you for your time and commitment.

Best,
Jennifer Franklin

555 Deer Valley Drive
Board of Adjustment
PC resident as of 1996