

## planning

---

**From:** JVC <jvcllc@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 13, 2017 9:49 AM  
**To:** planning  
**Subject:** Treasure Hill Project

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing this email to express my opinion as a concerned citizen of Park City/Old Town for over 15 years.

The recently announced deal by Mayor Jack Thomas and Mayor-elect Andy Beerman this morning is not a well thought out decision. For them to request the planning commission (and citizens) not vote on this project after all the time and energy put into this with less than 24 hours to understand the details of this deal is not reasonable.

To state the obvious, this deal does not address the fundamental problems that have been identified through the evaluation process of Treasure Hill over the last few years. All the concerns of traffic, noise, pollution, logistics, environmental, etc., will still exist with the new proposed deal.

As importantly, there is no clarity on what kind of homes or hotel can be built (i.e. are these 18 ten thousand square feet homes and a 1000 room hotel, or something larger??). Does the applicant still required to go through the approval process to obtain a CUP, or does this deal include the issuance of the CUP to Park City II LLC? If so, then I am strongly against this proposal because it lacks needed details to properly consider and approve or not. It is more lacking in detail than the information provided by the Sweeney's during the planning commission meetings; I didn't think this was possible but somehow the Mayor and Mayor-elect accomplished this.

It sounds like Thomas/Beerman are either biased in favor of the Sweeney's, or the Sweeney's just out-negotiated them. The city pays them \$6mm and if the \$24mm bond isn't approved they keep the \$6mm in exchange for the Sweeney's to reduce the size of the project from 1 million square feet to 900,000 square feet? This is horribly asymmetric at best.

If the city is willing to spend \$6mm for something so ridiculous with the odds of a crap shoot, then I suggest the city budget the \$6mm to continue to fight the Sweeney's and Park City LLC against the entire project. Otherwise, increase the bond issuance and purchase all of the land, then designate it as land that cannot be developed (similar to Bonanza Flats). I would happily vote in favor of a \$60mm bond to accomplish this but I would not be in favor of a \$24mm bond with so many unknowns.

Lastly, as an owner of properties in Old Town who is going through the process to build a modest size home for my wife and I to live in, the moral hazard of allowing this development to move forward and ignore the standards that home owners are held to is tremendous. This will result in a class action lawsuit against the city, which I'd happily participate given the unfairness and inconsistencies.

In summary, this proposal lacks details needed, does nothing to address the concerns that will still be created regardless of the size of the project and sounds like a great deal for the Sweeney's while meeting criteria of a terrible one for the citizens of Park City.

There are many more concerns but I'll leave it here for now. I plan to attend the planning commission meeting tonight to voice my opposition.

I have always been happy with our local government and understand this project is unprecedented. But I tend to agree with Roger Armstrong's basic view that the more the city/county allows these special projects to be approved, the city is setting a very dangerous precedent going forward.

Regards,

Bryan & Danielle Whang  
1010 Woodside Ave/1011 Park Ave