

## Francisco Astorga

---

**From:** Melissa Band  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 10, 2018 2:36 PM  
**To:** Francisco Astorga  
**Subject:** Fwd: Planning Commission Agenda - Treasure Hill

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Steven A Swanson <[sasarchitect.pc@gmail.com](mailto:sasarchitect.pc@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** January 9, 2018 at 11:44:33 AM MST  
**To:** <[adam.strachan@parkcity.org](mailto:adam.strachan@parkcity.org)>, <[laura.suesser@parkcity.org](mailto:laura.suesser@parkcity.org)>, <[melissa.band@parkcity.org](mailto:melissa.band@parkcity.org)>, <[douglas.thimm@parkcity.org](mailto:douglas.thimm@parkcity.org)>, <[john.phillips@parkcity.org](mailto:john.phillips@parkcity.org)>  
**Subject:** Planning Commission Agenda - Treasure Hill

Dear Chairperson Strachan and Esteemed Commissioners,

On behalf of Thinc, and in the interest of the larger community, I implore the Planning Commission to put in place a reasonable time frame and set of procedural guidelines for the proposed MPD Amendments to the Park City II/ Sweeney Properties Master Plan / Treasure Hill Project.

The negotiating efforts by outside interests both public and private, and the extolled potential benefits with regard to changes to the 30 year-old MPD notwithstanding, the Commission cannot in good faith, abrogate their responsibility to their charge and to the public good in carrying out their duties.

We would be led believe that the process begun decades ago, with its dozen or so iterations, thousands of hours of staff, commission and public's time & millions of taxpayer dollars invested, would be completely revised as to: use, location, size, scale, zoning and ownership in the short space of six weeks. The public is asked to pay for this privilege, rewarding the original applicant, while silent partners in this development are elevated to Original Applicant status, potentially reaping huge benefits by coat-tailing on the original 1986 MPD. You as a Commission, acted reasonably and responsibly to consider carefully the City Attorney's proposal & set aside your findings and decision on the CUP and embark on a new set of applications/ hearings, however,

The following points speak to the need to reign in this process:

1. Time - adequate time in schedule for required redesign options, presentations, public hearings & input, neighborhood meetings, planning staff work and commission review, has not been allowed for.
2. Procedure - under the LMC 15-6 (Master Planned Developments - MPD) it clearly states a new (or implied, substantively amended) MPD must follow the required Applications,

Submittals, Pre-applications, Work Sessions, Public Meetings, Planning Commission Review, Public Hearings, Staff Reports & Findings, Planning Commission reports, findings and actions.

3. Order - Per LMC 15-6-4G, the Development Agreement must follow after the MPD or amended MPD is approved by the Planning Commission. The scheduled votes by Planning Commission & then City Council for a new Development Agreement are clearly in conflict, since adequate time has not been allotted.

4. Land/ use issues - Proposed re-zoning and changes in the development boundaries require separate application, review, public input, approvals and recordation. It's not clear that the mix of large single family ski lots plus the boutique hotel are achievable or even desirable in this location from a development basis. Other options must be allowed/ given time to come forward.

5. Public Trust - The Commission, working diligently with Planning staff over two years has established a good base of trust with the public they help represent. A truncated, unclear process undermines that trust. Agendas with no drawings or information in the packet, what is the public supposed to comment on?

I appreciate your time and consideration, and look forward to sharing these thoughts at Wednesday's meeting.

Sincerely,

Steven A. Swanson  
Park City UT