

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
DECEMBER 20, 2017

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

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

EX OFFICIO: Planning Director, Bruce Erickson; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Anne Laurent, Community Development Director

=====

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

Chair Strachan called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director Bruce Erickson reported that Planner Francisco Astorga was not able to attend this meeting; however, he should be back for the next meeting.

Director Erickson announced that joint meetings with the City Council were scheduled and noticed for December 21, 2017 and January 4, 2018. The meeting on December 21st is a work session. City Attorney Mark Harrington stated that the work session was scheduled from 4:00-6:00 p.m. He recognized that possibly that not all of the Commissions would be able to attend.

Director Erickson disclosed that Tom Fey had come to his office and offered public comment on Treasure Hill. Mr. Fey had said he would submit his comments in writing, but Director Erickson wanted it on the record.

Director Erickson remarked that he had the blue tickets for the parking garage. He explained the procedure for free parking to attend the Planning Commission meetings. The pay station is outside the front door and at every elevator station in China Bridge. The north parking lot is a little different. The cards are not being accepted because there is no gate. Anyone parked in the north lot should pay for parking and the City will find a way to reimburse those costs. The City Hall business parking stalls are still free parking. The procedure for free parking also applies to the public who parked in the China Bridge parking garage for public business.

Commissioner Suesser stated that she was leaving town and would not be able to attend the meeting on December 21st.

Chair Strachan stated that he might only be able to attend the December 21st meeting for an hour or so.

Commissioner Thimm stated that he would do his best to get there by 4:00, but he might be late.

Director Erickson noted that it was a work session and they would see primarily the same presentation as this evening. The advantage would be to hear the City Council's comments.

WORK SESSION

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

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

Chair

Strachan: The only item on the agenda tonight is Work Session on Treasure Hill. I don't know who's going to be leading the charge, but I'll just leave it to you guys. We have no agenda. We have no expectations, so we'll just kind of go from, go from here.

Director

Erickson: I'll replace Planner Astorga with a quick introduction.

Chair

Strachan: Okay.

Director

Erickson: Just quickly. The applicant, Park City II, LLC will present early concepts for a reduced project on a portion of the Treasure Hill site. The project area was originally approximately 125 acres at the time of the '86 MPD approval. After the land was dedicated to the City for open space, there was approximately 60 acres, of which the 11 acres of currently zoned Estate MPD land exists.

We're moving forward on some things to review. The early concepts. In general, we're looking for sort of fatal flaws. Things that are not going to work. Hard stops. Especially those hard stops that the Planning Commission would suggest won't work tonight. And things that are just no, no go. No good idea. We're working on the road access and the fire access. And as we get through those we'll work on height reductions.

The agenda kind of lays out an outline of the things that we'd like you to talk to us about this evening. And that's where we're going. The applicant will do the presentation. They've got some sketches of some potential access routes, and they'll show you a couple of alternatives that were used to drive the numbers that were talked about at the last meeting. Thank you.

It's Craig Call for the applicant, Park City II.

Craig
Call:

Yes, thank you. So what I have on the screen is a photo of those 125 acres that Mr. Erickson mentioned. This, of course, was the---this is a concept that was before the Planning Commission 30 years ago looking at that entire area, and what area of it would be the least worst place for impact. So the area surrounded in red was chosen as the area to focus the density for the Treasure Project at that time.

By the way, please interrupt me at any point. I'm happy to make it a conversation instead of a dialogue. I mean, a soliloquy.

So, what we're looking at now is first of all, what are the, what are the optimal places again. You see a dotted line across the center of that, of that area. All the area north of that dotted line remains in private ownership. The area south, as I understand it, is in the City's ownership within holdings, as you would expect. And that's just a general characterization.

So, as we've looked we've talked about different options. And it looks like we probably need to deal with that red line. If we want less concentration we may want to look at the MPD Zone assigned within the red line, and what size it is. But we are here as Bruce said, looking for a fatal flaw. Looking at early concepts and whether there's any hard stops that we need to be aware of. So we have been making some progress. I don't mean to make light of a tragedy, but it occurred to me yesterday, as I was hearing of the horrible situation on I-5 between Seattle and Portland. And

the phrase they used that the transportation safety guys will be looking at is what they call situational awareness. Was the crew on that train aware of the situation? And again, not wanting to make light but we---that's kind of what we're doing here. We're trying to find out if, if the people who are to be steering the railroad are aware of the situation. So we appreciate any, I appreciate any insight you can give. And although I sit here alone, I certainly have resources and helpers that will try to answer questions once we know what they are. So tonight's about the questions and we'll figure out how to get the answers.

It is, it is not a surprise to anyone, and no one is comfortable necessarily with the time frame we're under. The good news, however, is that you've had such an extended time to review and discuss that nobody is more aware of, of some of the issues we need to talk about, so that we can make sure we are on track and moving at a reasonable speed as we, as we proceed.

So let me then turn to some discussion of the, of where we are and what happens next. This you've certainly seen many times before. This is a 3D characterization of the approval that is the subject of the other application that's pending. And the---if, if you look at the concept that we're, that we have joined in working out, it's certainly not our proposal alone, we're talking about 25% of the density. But this drawing shows, ironically, four different sections to a 400,000 square foot project of, you know, more than 900,000; 800,000 gross. And you can see a quarter of that is still a significant building. And that's just the point the visual makes. So, we want to be deliberate and careful and thoughtful and reasonable. But still we have a challenge to make sure that fits on the landscape as well as it can.

So, we basically did some drop-dead analysis on some access points. The proposal is 100,000 square foot net hotel; some gross square footage that we certainly hope to join all the players in defining with specificity. We do not want to thrash over questions of what means what and what's included and what's not. The good news is, with 30 years of hindsight, some of the questions we know the answer are the ones that the Planning Commission has struggled to answer over the last 18 months. I mean we, we want some of the questions about, you know, where should the access be and what's included and what's not to be answered on a policy basis by those who are in charge of it. We prefer not to have a judge answer those questions because we think we're better at it. You certainly

have an interest in the community that exceeds what a judge would have. Anyway, I digress.

So we made three options that basically look at first the siting of a hotel, and then how you might put some custom building lots around it. So here's Option A. And what this does is take that, that dense, the density associated with the hotel, which I think everybody agrees is somewhat south of 250,000 square feet, and puts it in a location which is very convenient to Lowell Avenue.

And we can kind of look at all three of these and then come back and talk about the pros and cons; but I'll give you some of the stream of consciousness that we've had. By the way, let me step back a bit. You can see where Lowell and Empire are with the loop. And then from that loop the original designer who did this a week ago took a road across the ski run, went over toward the tram---the lift alignment, and made it switchback. And then proceeded west along up the side of the Creole ski run and thus provided room for maybe, it looks like ten housing sites. Then cuts back across the ski run to an area where the---there's, there's an area of some practicality. You can see the contour lines are a little less steep there, where a person could build a larger building. All of the previous concepts, including the Woodruff design and the Design 17.2 or whatever you call it, have put a lot of concentration of density there because for some reason it's the most practical. Then the road continues, has a switchback, ends in a cul-de-sac with an array of lots coming off of it. In the conversations we've had with the City Engineer, the Fire Marshall, Building Inspector, the Staff, they suggested that this needs a second access. So the red dotted line was superimposed over this earlier sketch indicating a reasonable alignment for return road. So basically, the road would go in a loop. From the cul-de-sac it would cross the ski run yet a third time, come back along the top of the---of whatever is built below the inbound road and the outbound road, and goes down the terrain, makes a switchback and back to the original alignment out of Lowell. And you'll see that road system pretty well consistent through the options.

So let's move through the options. Again, we can come back and talk about that. By the way, there's a, there's a straight dotted line just to the right of the hotel site. That's a power line and nobody's moving that. So that's a constraint that is only slightly more permanent than the terrain, the mountain itself.

Moving right along. The next drawing, we call Option B. What we would do in this case is go where another bunch of density was concentrated on the previous plans. And this concept would, would kind of step up the mountain, if you will. So we'd have a base footprint, and then the buildings would, they would rise up along the mountain. There would be no area behind the building. The building would be built directly against the earth. Because we would do that, one of the things we've had to analyze with this option is the fact that it's only a single-loaded room arrangement. And that has some significant inefficiencies. And it also has some, creates some difficulty with height.

But let me look at, show you the third option and then we'll come back and talk about the height of the buildings.

So this is Option 3. Now this is outside the current MPD zone. And we, we ended up here in this alternative in part, because as you see, the contour lines are farther apart. Now it is by no means flat. And one of the things we've offered to the City---and they've been very helpful with. We've taken the original Auto Cad files that show the contour lines and provided them to the City. The City has the software and the expertise to at least double-check what we're coming up with in terms of how much cut, how much fill, what kind of excavation will be required. And so that, that is a process over the next few weeks that we'll certainly---again it's a roadblock analysis. It's a fatal flow. What we want to find out is, are there some scenarios for the location of the buildings that actually will fit so that we can proceed to look forward to a resolution short of the full buildout. One of the ironies of this is, you would think that half the density and a quarter of the concentration of that density would actually be easier under the regulations. But as, as you know better than I do, if you have one large project that accesses off a road, then you don't really have a cul-de-sac issue. You know, everything's right there. It's got two exits. One down Lowell and one down Empire. But once you start running roads inside, even private roads, then all of a sudden you're raising issues in the fire code with not even a quarter, a half of the density, that you didn't raise when you had the full concentration.

So, let me kind of wrap this up. I've talked longer than I need to. In this proposal the footprint of the hotel, it was estimated by the designer to be about 50,000 square feet. So again, I don't---we talked about numbers for, for square footage. And this building would need to be multiple stories high to include all the space, as you'd expect.

Commissioner

Thimm: Is that---

Craig

Call: Yes, sir.

Commissioner

Thimm: 50,000 square feet footprint for each of the three options?

Craig

Call: No.

Commissioner

Thimm: Oh, just for this one?

Craig

Call: That's for this one. Thank you. Thank you for clarifying that. So if we go back to Option B, that's only a 21,000 square foot footprint. And that's one of the reasons why when we look at the Woodruff plan or the others, we see very imposing structures. And ironically as it worked out, not by anyone's design, you can see what the constraints are with that. You've got the ski resort---or the ski run, the need for access across the floor of the area, and the steep mountain. This appears to be about as, as large a footprint as you can practically put there. Again, I'm just quoting the designers. This footprint is almost the same, is about the same size. And if you can read that number it says 21,900 square feet. So again, whatever the number is north of 200 or south of 300,000 square feet, that is a very imposing structure.

So, again, we haven't given up on this. We're saying, in fact we're encouraged. We think there are ways to do this that meet a lot of goals that are not met by the existing proposal that the, that the Commission was considering until a couple of weeks ago. So, so far so good, but we need to have some input. We need your thoughts on what we ought to be looking for. And of course, ultimately we need the Planning Commission's consent that the proposal we are recommending---and together we work with together to come up with is something the voters ought to have a right to look at.

Commissioner

Joyce: Can, can you do me a favor and just---I've kind of gone back and looked at this one again. Can you just step through the three again and just spend 30 seconds on each one just so I can look again?

Craig

Call: Sure. So here's Exhibit A. Not Exhibit A. I'm sorry, I've gone all this time pretending not to be a lawyer and I just ended up doing that. So, this is Plan A. Access off of Lowell Avenue directly. Very efficient. Plan B. Step up the mountainside. Easily access---this is one that's easiest to access the slopes and, you know, has a lot of skier interface. And then we've got Plan C, which is on a piece of ground. The thing that we are told by our designers is that if this structure is built, or even though it's imposing, it really won't be noticeable visibly from much of town except maybe the Aerie. That, you know, people will be able to look across the valley and see it. But don't hold me to anything. But this is also the least imposing physically on the, on the town, the townscape and other.

Commissioner

Suesser: And that one is 50,000 square feet.

Craig

Call: Yes.

Commissioner

Phillips: But that usually equates to lower heights as well, too. Correct?

Community
Development Director
Anne

Laurent: Correct. So just to give you a little perspective. I mean, when you talk about 20-something thousand you're talking 10 stories. When you're talking 50,000 you're talking 5 stories. Now the reason that doesn't necessarily know all the details is because you've got to deal with slope, and that doesn't include parking. And we haven't done the---any kind of massing or any kind of excavation study. So that's still in process.

Commissioner

Phillips: Well, and judging by the contour lines it looks more flat up there as well.

Anne

Laurent: It is flatter up there, but it's not flat. Right?

Commissioner

Phillips: Yeah, it's not flat. But you can tell that it's the least steep.

Commissioner

Thimm: The contours are further apart certainly.

Craig

Call: I think I could climb it. I couldn't climb the mountainside slope.

Anne

Laurent: And I just wanted to explain a little bit more about the access conversation because this, you can see it's a line on a drawing; it's not a designed road. And it is in the process of being analyzed. But the, the idea is that the fire code says you can go so far with a cul-de-sac. One way in, one way out. And so---but a lot of the communities, if you look elsewhere in the community, if you do a loop then you can do a cul-de-sac off the loop because there's a second way out. And so that's the concept here, is that by creating a loop, then you are able to get to a few of these areas that might offer some opportunities that other---that you can't get to unless you come up with a different road design. So, I don't know if you have any questions about that. It, it could be one-way, it could be two-way. But that's the other way to do it. The advantages of one way is you minimize how much cut into the hillside you have to do because your road is a bit narrower. But I didn't know if you had any technical questions as to why we were looking at a loop or anything like that.

Commissioner

Joyce: Is the assumption still that we're looking at underground parking for---

Craig

Call: Interestingly enough, the MPD, the 1986 MPD requires it.

Commissioner

Joyce: Yeah.

Craig

Call: And we certainly can---I mean, we're open. But that looks like, again, the way that they---I think the reason the MPD requires that is because it

would supposedly would have less impact on the terrain. But it's a trade-off with height. No question.

Commissioner

Joyce: Yeah. Okay. And, and I don't want to get into what all the little buildings are and everything, but there's four odd little ones here that weren't on the other ones. What were those?

Craig

Call: They designed road cabins on those, or you know, some kind of satellite buildings that would take advantage of the terrain.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay.

Craig

Call: I think they're incidental to the mass of the building because they're just not that big.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay.

Commissioner

Thimm: So as, as we go through this process over the next month is there going to be---I presume there's going to be an understanding of, you know, what's happening to the land. And from a grading standpoint you mentioned, think it was concept B, that actually the building becomes a retaining wall.

Craig

Call: Yes.

Commissioner

Thimm: On, on its west side. But a lot of discussion has been what are we doing to the ground. And I presume as we go through this and head towards a conclusion that we will know something about the grading and what's happening with the land, then?

Craig

Call: Yes, Commissioner. In fact, the---it appears that there are some threshold issues that we want to make sure we have a handle on,

because we perceive them also to be of great concern to everyone. One of them is the road system and adequate access. One of them is the appearance, the height, and the massing of the buildings. Another one is the excavation and the material that comes from excavation. The size of it and then what happens to it. And so we understand those will be very significant factors, and part of an analysis that really has to be---we have to push a long ways and make sure we have good answers to those before anybody is ready to ask the public to vote. But we are ready to state now that there will be no fill under this plan on the Creole ski run. We may have fill available to our neighbor, the ski resort, to see if they want to use it on some of their graded areas of their slopes. But there could easily be need to fill on site, but it will not be put on the Creole ski run.

Director
Erickson:

So just, just for clarification sake. As we go forward as the Planning Staff, we're taking the direction pretty seriously from the Planning Commission to not discard the work over the last 15 months. And we have all the charts and paperwork and everything that you were concerned about; especially with the issues of excavation and the cliffscape. So, we will have an understanding relative to how it applies to the existing MPD and how it applies to all 15 of the conditional use permit criteria and the mitigation strategies. So all of that information will be coming forward. It may have boxes around it, but it's a lot different. So, I think what I'm trying to say is we're looking for the least damaging practicable alternative. That's the best way I know how to say it, even though that's pretty jargony. What's the least damaging thing you can do to accomplish what is agreed to in the MPD? Make the cliffscape go away, drop the excavation volumes by half, or a third, or two-thirds or whatever. So we're measuring the effect of a cut of density in half, and potentially a quarter of the concentration against the impacts of the previous project, to see if the mitigation is consistent with our Land Management Code. That's, that the analysis strategy for the Staff. And so you're going to see that information coming forward. Hope that helps. That's how we're doing it.

Anne
Laurent:

And, and I do want to clarify. Craig mentioned it on, on Plan C. A, B, C. But all of the plans either cross over the 11-acre boundary either---C was with the hotel, but on A and B it was with the home sites. So I just want to make that clear.

Commissioner

Joyce: And, and what I couldn't tell was, is that a matter of kind of shifting where it was, or is that---I mean did we go from 11 acres to 20? Or did we go from 11 to 13, but you know, it's a different 13 than the 11 kind of thing. I mean how, do we have any kind of scope on, on how big these are?

Anne

Laurent: It's really a factor of laying out---getting the access so that the home sites can be laid out under certain criteria. And then, and then seeing where, where things can be placed based on that access. It's just trying to be efficient. It's just trying to be efficient. But it is, it's a trade-off of less density within that 11 acres, but that your boundary goes outside of it.

Mark

Harrington: We, we don't have exact measurements yet from the roughing, but we will certainly have that figure for you. We're trying to capture as much give and get on, on the boundary as a swap as possible by just seeing how the road is going to---the second access makes that hard.

Commissioner

Joyce: Yeah.

Mark

Harrington: So it's unlikely to be an even swap. So you will---

Commissioner

Joyce: No, that's fine. I just didn't know whether we were looking at 15 or 40 or, you know, just kind of orders of magnitude sort of things.

Anne

Laurent: We don't have any hard numbers on that yet.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay.

Mark

Harrington: Because we did explore the south potential for an access; and, and that is both length-wise and pragmatically because of ownership changes, very difficult to do at this point. So you will be capturing some area, and whether that's a total swap or just area that was going to be developed under the old plan that's now open, we'll have that for you in January.

Commissioner
Joyce: Okay.

Commissioner
Campbell: Mark, just to be clear from a legal standpoint. All three of these versions would require an opening of the entire MPD; and it's not just version C.

Mark
Harrington: Well, and again, because we would be approach---it would be a hybrid. We are, we want to be very transparent that we're approaching this as a settlement agreement. And the process question is going to unfold in the next three weeks as well. And whether it's---I would, I would say, I would say all three options necessitate a legislative rezone in addition to the settlement or the, or the subsequent subdivision process. And whether that's as part of the amended Master Planned Development or a reopening is something we're still working through. And until we know what it is, we'll evaluate that in terms of how substantive it is. But we are approaching this as a settlement with an amendment to the development agreement in it; and not a reapplication starting from new. We're being very transparent with that.

Commissioner
Campbell: So there isn't a fourth option that would keep everything inside the boundaries of the original MPD?

Mark
Harrington: I think Craig did meet with the THINC attorney and I think that they did have some input about a southern option to look, to look at an option using more of that southern area that I just referred to on this side. And so again, we're willing to look at all those options. But given what we're hearing from the Engineer and the Fire Marshal at this point, we're having trouble seeing how you can get two accesses within the 11 acres that, that handles the 18 lots and the hotel location without putting, you know, a 12 story hotel right in the middle and things circling around it. So, we can certainly look at that more seriously, but we think---

Commissioner

Campbell: I wasn't advocating for it. I was just was asking kind of your opinion of---or your Staff is okay with the fact that we're going almost certainly down the road of changing that---

Mark

Harrington: Well, again, we're not, the Planning Staff isn't saying okay yet. They're doing fatal flaw analysis based on fire code and site suitability; and saying what are the best options. If we were doing this exercise in 1986, what would we have looked at to do this the best way. And they're not confining themselves to that hard boundary or the 100-foot setback. So they started within that, and then the first barrier was the 100-foot setback in the 11 acres as well. And if you want to eliminate the cliffscapes, which is a primary goal, and replace them with, you know, retaining walls for the road, but are certainly not anything hopefully like the cliffscape, you're looking at a much lower impacted site. But you do get pushed into that north boundary out of necessity if you want to tuck the hotel away. And I think the, I think the designer put those buildings in because we even went as far as look at a Sundance Resort like type plan. If you can centralize a parking and a massing at your central hotel location, and then disperse some of the stuff behind it. I think that's what he was thinking when he did that as, as the Sundance Resort has those units up above the main lodge that you don't see from the main base, but has, you know, a little bit of a hybrid with some seasonal, limited access to parking for the individual units, but most of it is surface central. It's not apples to apples, but the concept is something we wanted to at least look at because obviously the parking, the underground parking does drive a lot of your height and massing if it has to be, you know, directly underneath the hotel.

Chair

Strachan: Mark, explain for me again the two access point dilemma. Like on this drawing, where are the two access points here? Maybe, Craig, you can point to it. What are the two access points you're required to have?

Craig

Call: Certainly. And I've, I've hung around people who understand the fire code for a long time, but I was very appreciative and impressed with Dave Thacker and, and his knowledge and experience here. So, what happens is that at the point you leave Lowell Avenue you're on one access point. You travel to the left. A little to the, the south there. And then you hit a two-access point loop.

Chair

Strachan: I see. So the red line and the first, at the first loop there, those are the two access points?

Craig

Call: Yes.

Chair

Strachan: The road drawn and then the red line.

Craig

Call: So that creates a loop. And then at the very top where the red line intersects the road, you again have another cul-de-sac. And that is---this is something, of course, for the fire officials to weigh. Does that comply with the Code, you know, going beyond that?

Commissioner

Phillips: Is, is the red line, is that like kind of a gated, like just for an emergency access? Or is that kind of---is it going to be a road that people can choose to use either/or?

Craig

Call: The, the plan is now it could be a two-way road just like the other one. And yet you may, again, have some thoughts on that. One way to do this is a one-way loop, which would be much less convenient but narrower; or it could be two-ways. But the good news about it is all of it will be easily accessible my emergency vehicles to move anywhere in the, in the project.

Anne

Laurent: Yeah, and just to answer. It could be gated. That is an option depending how the final design works out. It still would have to be paved and maintained.

Commissioner

Phillips: Yeah.

Anne

Laurent: So, I'm not sure which is the best thing. And the other thing we're exploring is taking the one way all the way down to Lowell and Empire, so it's almost like a one-way in/one-way out; primarily so you have the two-way all the way down to the main access. So we're exploring that.

[Inaudible.]

Anne

Laurent: I'm sorry? The greatest [inaudible]. So we're not sure how that exploration is going to result in cuts and fills and all that. So we've got some work to do ahead of us.

Commissioner

Campbell: How, how big are the home site lots? They all look like they're roughly the same size.

Craig

Call: Roughly. Like we know we didn't scale those out. They're certainly more than 8,000 square feet. But you know, the scale here is a little deceptive. You can see there's 50,000 square feet in that footprint. So, these homes, you know, some of the home sites might be, you know, well over 15,000 square feet or. They're not acres and acres by any means. But they are custom homes lots, which was part of the, the---walking out of the negotiation, the kind of incredible work the Mayor did and, and the coming together, was that concept with some basic constraints. You know, there would be a 100,000 square foot boutique hotel. There would be 18 custom homes sites. And the ski access, the lift, you know, the possible future ski circulation would be preserved. Those are the, those are the things that are the reason that brings Park City II to the table. And we're very pleased to be here.

Commissioner

Phillips: I do like the smaller lots off of Lowell.

Craig

Call: Uh-huh. And please consider this. A tentative, hypothetical, maybe sometime, you never know, sketch concept. Okay.

Commissioner

Phillips: Yeah.

Craig

Call: I mean it's just as, it's just winging it. You know, a designer did a great job, but it's just a concept.

Commissioner

Suesser: There's no change to the Town Lift being contemplated with these three options?

Craig

Call: We would love to see improvements to the Town Lift. We'd love to see, you know, we'd love to see all of the improvements that might have been contemplated for the full buildout. But I'm not one who can tell you the economics of this project could, could support the kind of cost the other project can support. But we, we'd, of course, love to see improvements to the skiing experience throughout the, the whole system.

Mark

Harrington: But to answer your question, no. The existing Town Lift would stay as it, unless the resort operator or the property owner reach an additional agreement.

Craig

Call: If, if I could jump in for just a second. You'll notice by the side of that Town Lift alignment, some squares. Those are the historic towers preserved. Every one of them. Just in case you were wondering.

Commissioner

Phillips: And the previous application was going to eliminate how many? At least one.

Craig

Call: I don't know that.

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay.

Director

Erickson: Yes, the Staff, the Staff analysis, depending on what the State regulations said, somewhere between one and four.

Commissioner

Suesser: Does this, do these options contemplate any type of people mover between the project and Main Street?

Craig

Call: We would love, again, to see that.

Commissioner

Suesser: Okay.

Craig

Call: But, but we would not be in the same position that the larger project would be to help finesse it. And, you know, straight up and honest, there are trade-offs here. And the---we, of course, as partners with the previous application were eager to provide some of that, but in this case the critical mass is not there to look at that in the same way.

Commissioner

Suesser: Okay.

Chair

Strachan: Do we have a problem at all with that red line road going through the lots, and then across the ski run? Yeah, I mean, you or Anne or whoever.

Anne

Laurent: Well, so, so yeah. I mean, we would just have an easement for that if that's how the lots end up being laid out. I think you might see the lots adjust, I would think, once you actually change that dotted line into a road.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah.

Commissioner

Band: Yeah, I don't think the economics of selling a lot with a road in the middle of it are terribly---

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay, so---and do you anticipate us being involved in any way in the building---like pad locations on, I mean, on those lots. Or I guess we just work with setbacks, I suppose.

Craig
Call:

The lots would all have to be approved through a subdivision process. Absolutely. By the way, again, what we did is we---this, this concept was drawn. And for better or for worse you're seeing the process in its organic, you know, moving along as it moved along. So, the, the lots were drawn there, and then we asked the engineer, okay, what's the best alignment for a road. The one, the one advantage is if you have a road up top there's an option that you can build the house instead of off the bottom road, you could build it below the top road. And when you do that you help, you help screen the top road from the valley. You know, from the town.

Director
Erickson:

So there was, just to be clear, the original concepts that were processed through the Staff, there was a hard stop on fire access that this, this wasn't going to work because they didn't have two ways in and out, and they exceeded the length that the Fire Marshal was willing to accept. So, as a result of that hard stop the applicant brought back a potential new road alignment but did not modify the lots at this point because it's---

Commissioner
Band:

Okay, that makes sense.

Director
Erickson.

It's still a little bit---too, too many moving parts for us to get it all tuned up, but that's how that happened. It went to a hard stop. They backed up and said, okay, here's a couple ways you can handle. And, and honestly, Commissioners, as you're thinking about it between now and tomorrow and your holidays, it's really easy to drive through town and see similar situations to what's being proposed in, in this. There's a lot more---these concepts are much more similar to what you see through the town. Whether you're, whether you're in the area, or whether you're in North Silver Lake, or whether you're in Empire Pass.

Commissioner
Phillips:

Okay, so could you---by, by the meeting tomorrow, is there any way we could get the, the original MPD boundary, building boundary kind of dashed in on here. Because it kind of---we've done site visits and that will get---

Director

Erickson: I think, I think that the red line is---the little tiny red line is the building area boundary.

Commissioner

Phillips: Oh, okay. I see it.

Director

Erickson: I'm sorry. We're graphically challenged tonight.

Commissioner

Phillips: All right. Thanks Bruce.

Craig

Call: It's interesting that the road is within the area of disturbance, except for the bridge between crossing the Town Lift alignment. So it's less far up the hill for a road cut than the, the highest building in the Woodruff plan, which looking is quite startling in the way it impacted at the top of its---you know, where it encountered the mountain at the top.

Mark

Harrington: So said another way, the only reason I think Staff was willing to look at this alternative was because a very first glance, at even a high level, it seemed less impact than one-quarter of Woodruff. And so that's why the Staff was willing to explore it going north of the existing boundary. And that may be hard to conceptualize at this point with this rough drawing, but we, we do encourage you to at least keep an open mind towards it because, you know, this, this seems to be a little more in line with a tucking---not a tucking, necessarily, but the least visible massing. It's going to have different trade-offs, and you may end up with one of the other options, but you---I encourage you to keep an open mind towards it as we try and flesh things out.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, and I understand that everything is very preliminary at this point. I think, though, we would like to give you as much, kind of indication, what you're not, what isn't a hard stop. And I don't think, at least myself, that if the plan has to go north of the original MPD development boundary, if the plan itself makes sense and has low impacts and fits the [inaudible] and fits the land, that boundary line to me isn't something that I'm, you know,

completely unwilling to, to explore moving. But I don't know how the rest of you guys feel.

Commissioner

Suesser: I don't have a problem with it.

Commissioner

Band: I agree with that.

Commissioner

Thimm: I'm absolutely willing to consider it.

Commissioner

Joyce: I would even take it a step further, which is, you know, obvious---that's kind of why I was asking, because I just couldn't judge whether you were going from 11 acres to 40 or something. I think at that point it becomes more of an issue. But I would offer that, you know, if the answer is there's something that---say just completely hypothetically that this plan is drawn on a 13-acre footprint and there was something you could do to add some space around the hotel that would allow it to have a, a bigger building footprint and build it lower as a result of that, to me that's a trade-off I would really like to see. Because the, the big scary one for me up on the side of that hill is height. And you know, so the difference between a four or five-story building and a seven, eight, nine, ten-story building is huge. And if the answer is we went from 11 acres to 15 or 16, but as a result of that we were able to keep that building down low and less---not physically low but less height and less visible, you know, that, that to me is a, is a good trade-off. I mean, I, I'm sure there was a lot of thought that went to the 11-acre building area boundary, but at this point it's like if we're trying to fix this, you know, I think we should be very flexible with it.

And I like, I mean, we've kind of hung on this, this Option C. But one of the big constraints that I think the 17.2 plan that we saw that they worked to---given, given how much mass they had to fit into that space and still keep 70% open space, they tried to keep things smaller around, around the houses that are there. And so when you put up the, the Plan A, that immediately just kind of was the alarm that went off in my head, is you've got a small footprint, it's going to be a tall building. And it's right next to the neighborhoods. And it's going to be very visible as you drive up Lowell and Empire. You know so it's like kind of all the bad things of losing the setbacks and putting the biggest, tallest thing right next to the

neighborhood. And so I really like the fact that when you go---by the time you get to Plan C we were pushing the big tall building away from the neighborhoods and up the hill a ways, and, and then spreading it out a little bit, hopefully to keep it shorter. So I like all of those directions. And I would encourage if you could find a way to do that even a little more, it would be appreciated.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, and obviously, I mean, that comes at the expense of having to maybe put in more roads or reconfigure the roads; make them two-way or one-way, but to me that's a trade-off worth making. I, I tend to agree. I mean not having a large hotel staring right down the barrel of some 25' x 75' lot homes is probably a good thing.

Commissioner

Band: Yeah. What kind, do we know what the grading is on these roads, yet, or are we too far away from that?

Anne

Laurent: We know that they have to be not to exceed 10%.

Commissioner

Band: Right.

Anne

Laurent: And then the driveways into the homes can't exceed 14. So that, that we know. So we're going to---what we don't know is what the cuts are going to be and how bad it's going to get, especially at some of the switchbacks. And that's the analysis we're running.

Commissioner

Phillips: Can you put it on B and just leave it there so we can just kind of look at it, too?

Commissioner

Suesser: With Option C, with the larger hotel, the 51,000 square foot footprint hotel, would we be decreasing the home sizes or losing some of the home sites in that scenario?

Craig

Call: No. The 18 homes sites are preserved in all the plans as part of the first arrangement. And they, they remain approximate---you know, they're all meant to be custom home sites.

Commissioner

Band: The hotels are---all three of the hotels are the same size. It's just the footprint we're talking about.

Craig

Call: Exactly.

Commissioner

Band: Okay.

Commissioner

Thimm: But we'd be going to like a 5-story hotel or something in a 50,000 square foot footprint. Right?

Craig

Call: Yes.

Commissioner

Phillips: The other thing---

Craig

Call: I mean, very broad, general.

Commissioner

Band: Yeah. Uh-huh.

Commissioner

Phillips: The other thing that stands out to me is A and B. Both of them appear that the hotel will be very visible coming up Lowell. And I like, one of the things I like about C is obviously moving that away. So, when you're driving up that street when you get near the end you're looking more at homes. And also, the way that it transitions from homes, smaller lots right up front to the larger lots to the hotel, seems like a good transition.

Commissioner

Campbell: And can you help me with the math for a minute, because we keep hearing that the deal is 100,000 square foot boutique hotel. But then when we see the 50,000 square foot footprint you just said that would be five stories tall. So that doesn't sound like 100,000 square feet.

Commissioner

Phillips: Well, plus all of the other---

Anne

Laurent: The 100,000 is just the equivalent, the UE equivalent square footage. It's not a gross square footage.

Commissioner

Campbell: I understand that. But everything we've seen as back of house that everybody's afraid of that is 15% or 20% or 30%. But now you're talking 100% of that.

Anne

Laurent: Yeah, we, we haven't got to that analysis yet. We're really focused tonight on location and we're hoping to get to that point by January.

Commissioner

Campbell: But if it's 120,000 square feet or if it's 200,000 square feet, that is a pretty good impact on, on what---I, I guess I'm asking is should we be looking at that at the same time?

Anne

Laurent: I think the answer is, there's going to be---we are going to be looking at the gross square footage and the massing. And there's the gross square footage of the hotel itself and what has to happen to make 100,000 UEs work and successful. And what we're also doing is benchmarking a lot of other projects so that you can see more detail, hopefully, about what's proposed here against what else is out there in terms of a boutique hotel. And that's how we're going to judge that. And then it's, then it's calculating all the parking. And we don't actually have enough information. We've certainly given Craig kind of how it's calculated based on number of room and then uses percentage, number of per square footage of the other uses, but we don't have all that detail yet. But parking is going to be a piece of that massing, too.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay, just remember. If you just take the, the 17.2 plan and just take the---even back to 1985/86 the parking has always been somewhere around a quarter million square feet. And so if you just say hey, we're going to cut that by four, you know, then you're, you're still at 65,000 or whatever, you know. And so, so you take your 100, add 30%, then add parking underground; now you're at 200 before we even have any other discussion at all.

Commissioner

Campbell: If the parking is below grade then you still---then you're going to put the two or three-story building above grade.

Commissioner

Joyce: Yeah, I don't think, I don't think they've---

Chair

Strachan: But I don't think it's just going to be a straight numbers game. I mean, that's what they're telling you. They're, they're saying that they, you know, it's not going to be just work the math and then we're going to build it. They're saying we're going to come up with a gross. The gross may have less, it may have more parking, it may have smaller amount of floors, it may have more amount of floors. So I agree that we ought to look at them both simultaneously, but I don't think the assumption should be that if they've got this amount of UEs they're going to have this amount of gross square footage from just---automatically.

Commissioner

Thimm: So, so the 100,000 square feet is straight residential UEs. That's doesn't take into account the support commercial, the lobby space that has been identified in the Fact Sheet.

Commissioner

Campbell: I understand that but I feel like that's, that's the biggest gray area that we've had trouble getting our arms around from the beginning.

Chair

Strachan: And I think it's still gray for them, and, and that's why, you know, we don't have a plan here that talks about that yet. So.

Commissioner

Suesser: But, but at the last meeting we talked about it being between 15-25% on top of the 100,000. But now it sounds like it's actually quite a bit more.

Chair

Strachan: I think that's right.

Commissioner

Phillips: Doug, you provided us a number that you were kind of---that you had in your head, which was near 250.

Commissioner

Thimm: You know, the one thing that I probably should have clarified when I gave you the numbers is that did not include parking at all.

Commissioner

Suesser: Yeah. No, you did mention that.

Commissioner

Thimm: Oh, I did mention that?

Commissioner

Suesser: Uh-huh.

Commissioner

Thimm: Okay. So it wasn't a direct comparison, maybe, to some of the square footages that we were considering, you know, with the 17.2 plan or 2009 plan. But there are, even within the numbers, there, there is some amount of circulation and that sort of thing that is incumbent with the hotel. There's certain back of house areas that are not mentioned anywhere in the fact sheet that, you know, we have to come to grips with I, I think if this is going to be a successful hotel enterprise that supports 100,000 square feet of residential area.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah. And you know, we may be getting ahead of ourselves by starting to talk about, you know, what may, what the baseline math may result in. I mean, until we see some plan that has that math borne out, I wouldn't want to constrain Staff and say you can't do this. You just can't.

Commissioner

Suesser: Well, but Adam, we're starting---we're talking about buying down 50% of the density of the, of the project. So we are talking about the math. Right? We are talking about the numbers.

Commissioner

Phillips: And we're---

Mark

Harrington: But we bought 50% of the UEs.

Commissioner

Suesser: Right.

Mark

Harrington: And so that is done. That math is done. And so the good news is---you're absolutely right. We know this, this is where the concern is and that--- and, and, but this isn't a definition concern. This wasn't a mistake. And it's not ill-defined in the prior Code. This---

Commissioner

Campbell: If you guys are still negotiating with it, then we're happy to step out of the way.

Mark

Harrington: Well, it's not even negotiating. It is a function of the design. And I think we're just saying don't set premature expectations either way. We're not trying to set any on you by saying---in the placement. And we don't want any coming back. We're just trying to play it straight up saying this is the best location for those UEs if, if they're going to be a stacked, essentially run commercial hotel. And we know the massing is going to have at least the 200-ish frame. I think the good news is it's a factor of four about what the disagreements at their worst are going to be. You're, we are dealing with a disagreement divided by four. So it's much less, it's much easier to perhaps solve---

Chair

Strachan: A quarter of the contention.

Mark

Harrington: Right. A quarter. And, and it really comes down to the---and, and a large part of these things, and I think for those of you who were around for the last round of amendments and accessory is, it's going to be part efficiency analysis, and part in terms of whether the design is efficient and isn't just adding space for the sake of volume and want versus need. And so of that does reduce trips if its programmed the right way. And, of course, we don't have that information and that's where Staff struggled in the prior round. But we know that that's a primary concern and that there's a big fear that somehow we're letting the developer get away with something on, on that areas.

So we fully expect to have that discussion review in January. Have maximums. The applicant is willing to set those maximums. We just want to have the program kind of---and designers an opportunity to look at it site specifically first and then. But we've worked closely with the Mayor and Planning Staff to come up with a single methodology by which we think will simplify and really identify for you guys, with Commissioner Thimm's input last time, to really identify and match the Land Management Code terms so we don't misuse the term back of house. Because some people use back of house for everything, some use it for parking and accessory, some use for accessory and support commercial. We're going to use one sheet for this process so that you can exactly target the areas that you have concern about, and, and make a decision.

So we know that discussion is coming. We're just begging a little bit of patience so that we can get some site suitability done first and then focus on that.

Director

Erickson: But just to carry on that just a little bit more. One of the things we've done is, is we're working to disconnect the retail that's being asked for from any particular location in the site. So if it was deemed to be a better mitigation to put some of the retail at the Mid-station and have that lift system work like it's supposed to, that's a possibility to consider. We've also tried to disconnect some of the way the parking calculation is made so that if you have less of a need for full-on retail or full-on restaurant, maybe those parking numbers go down and reduce the height, bulk and mass of the buildings. So those disconnects are important for us at this stage, and that's probably why we're not getting a real solid answer for you this evening. But we're trying to look at every possible option. In, in the 17.2

there was no way to disconnect anything. They were just there. And so that was driving a lot of the height, bulk and mass. Also, remember that the parking garage in 17.2 was partially driven by the underground fire apparatus access. So all of those things come into play as we're moving forward.

Commissioner

Joyce: And I would offer. It sounds like they're going to bring us more when they get to the point where they actually have a proposal for kind of how the space would get used. But if you go back and look at that Exhibit W that we spent what felt like months on, there were not only some big hotels like the St. Regis and the Montage, but there was the Yarrow and the Sky Lodge and things like that in there. And that's just a good reminder of some of the ones that you're probably familiar with, and you've been in and you, you kind of know what it feels like. And if you go look at those numbers it kind of gives you an interesting perspective. I would, I would offer that everybody ought to go take a quick pass at that one page.

Commissioner

Band: Steve has it right in front of him right now.

Commissioner

Joyce: Yeah, I carry it with me.

Director

Erickson: We, we do too.

Commissioner

Joyce: That and my color math.

Commissioner

Thimm: But as, as we go through this path the idea is, I think what we're looking for, is to have actual definition of all the ancillary space that we're talking about. And so we're not 30 years from now sitting around here with our grandchildren sitting around here talking about this again. We want, you know, real clarity in terms of not a fact sheet, but a list of approved areas. Something like that, I think, is what we'd be looking for.

Chair

Strachan: The agenda asks us to provide some mitigation priorities. And, you know, it's kind of, at least for me it's a little bit hard now to figure out what the mitigation priorities may end up being when we, you know, get a more finalized plan. Or until we get a more finalized plan. But, you know, the mitigation that we'll need to look at, I think, right off the bat is what about the excavation associated with those roads. And what about the retaining associated with those roads. And, you know, how is that excavation material going to be transported, and under what circumstances and so forth. I mean, those are obvious. You've probably already thought about those, but those come to mind.

I think the other---as Bruce said, you know, the other criteria in the CUP are always going to be something we're going to look at.

Commissioner

Joyce: I think the one that we---I, I think that when Staff brought us the ones on some of the traffic mitigation of, you know, proposed things about hours both in the construction phase and the, the ongoing phase once it's built at. I think Staff already had some good things lined up for that that probably fit.

The one that I never saw answered anywhere either by City Staff, and I asked our engineers this, and it's not part of the traffic analysis, was road capacity of Lowell. And so we kept asking about the thing that everybody sees there, which is the road simply can't---it's not an intersection issue, which is what all the traffic modeling was. But it was what's the daily capacity of the road, and what's the daily capacity of the road in the winter, and what's the volume anticipated on that road. And it looked like all those numbers were there in the model and we just never got to see anybody from either the City or the applicant stand up and say, you know, our model projects, you know, 2800 cars per day and the road is capable of. And, and every time we saw any kind of partial numbers it looked really bad. And then just the experience that you have looks bad when you just drive up there and look at what's there today.

So I, I realize that we're talking about scaling it down, but I still don't know how to say that's okay.

Anne

Laurent: Yeah, I'll do my best to bring that back. My understanding speaking to the City Engineer is it was really, it was more a matter of how the applicant's engineer was characterizing it versus how the City Engineer would have characterized it; but that the end results and findings were the same so it really wasn't worth a big fight. But it really was more how it was portrayed. And the City Engineer certainly assured us that we were well within the capacity. But I'll bring that back and have him---

Commissioner

Joyce: So, I don't want to go into the detail tonight, but I'll give you my quick thing, which is they told us that the road capacity of an Old Town road in summer was 2500 cars per day. And during the winter it's clearly something less than 2500. Although we heard a couple of times, oh yeah, there's actually something about that in the traffic bible, whatever. No one would ever tell us it's 30% reduction, 50% reduction. We never heard a number. And when I took on Empire simply the two hours, peak morning and peak afternoon, they added up---especially once you looked out to 2030 they added up to like 1900 cars per---for those two hours.

Anne

Laurent: Right. And, and the---

Commissioner

Joyce: And so I'm sitting here going wait. I don't---

Anne

Laurent: The City Engineer disagrees with that. I, I get that that analysis is accurate from what was presented, and so I'll just bring him back and try to explain that. I don't think we're going to have a new traffic analysis by January, but I can certainly ask him to readdress what he doesn't---disagrees with that.

Commissioner

Joyce: If the answer is he's happy with it, if he can come back and explain to us with English in a way that reflects something that we saw in those numbers.

Anne

Laurent: Sure.

Commissioner

Joyce: Because when you look at the numbers it's clearly broken. Even without the project it's broken. And it's broken given just a couple hours out of the day. And so, and no one ever addressed that very well. And so I think, I think we still have to get an answer to that because we were stuck on that. I think we---at least I personally got good resolution for most of the things we were looking for of intersection issues and the modeling that was done for that. And yeah, we know some are going to fail but the applicant has said they will contribute their portion and that. So I think we were on a good track with that. But the road capacity I still, I don't get.

Commissioner

Suesser: And I'd just like to know broadly if we're going to be contemplating using Empire and Lowell for this project, or if it's going to be predominantly Lowell for the construction. Just, just what, what is the plan. And also phasing, you know. Is everything going to be built approximately the same time, or is the hotel going up first and then the homes later. That kind of stuff.

Commissioner

Phillips: The homes would probably be individually sold lots, I would assume. Just kind of like the King's Crown project.

Craig

Call: Yes, as far as I expect. I mean, I hate to slam the door shut on anyone wanting to build several, but that's---the general expectation so far preliminarily is that they'd be subdivided and then sold to individual lot owners to build what they build within the guidelines allowed. The underlying zoning, of course, has significant guidelines on house and how they're built, and how big they are and that sort of thing.

Commissioner

Joyce: So what would happen with the zoning? I don't understand that. If, I mean, because what we have now is Estate MPD. But obviously if we're changing the zoning and moving things around, does it, does it keep the, the rules and regulations of Estate? Is that what we would be applying to this? Or how does that work?

Mark

Harrington: That's what we have to work through with, with the ultimate site placement. But we would expect to retain the overall MPD overlay. But at a minimum there's, there's an ROS line within the MPD that would have to move.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay.

Commissioner

Suesser: Was fire access contemplated going out to Upper Norfolk or to King Road across the---

Anne

Laurent: Yes. We looked at both of those routes, and one of them has to go climb another 100 feet or something to get up to King Road, which is really difficult. The other one would cut off a bunch of current ski in/ski out. And also there's a couple parcels that have been sold privately that are in the way as well. So, we think it's fairly problematic.

Commissioner

Phillips: And the original MPD was explicit to not allow access that way as well. So you're opening up a whole other can of worms there. Yeah.

Commissioner

Suesser: I was just asking if it was explored and what the reasons were.

Commissioner

Band: I mean I think if we've got a good solution we can probably if---

Director

Erickson: The answer is yes. We did explore it. The constraints on spreading the development across the face of that mountain, across City-owned open space pretty much, pretty much put a hard stop on that one. Plus, we didn't want to do any additional impacts to King Road or upper Daly or upper Norfolk. So, we were---

Commissioner

Suesser: Understood.

Director

Erickson: That's what happened.

Commissioner

Suesser: Uh-huh.

Anne

Laurent: The other practical design thing that is important is that the distance---that didn't help with the distance of the cul-de-sac, because that only went to the south. So as soon as you branched off that and went up Creole any distance, you were still limiting how far you could go.

Commissioner

Suesser: I see.

Commissioner

Thimm: Yeah, as Adam said, following this agenda we're to discuss mitigation priorities and questions. Currently we've been talking about concerns about overall building area, mass, bulk and scale of, of what is going in. What is happening to the land from a grading standpoint; not only where we're building buildings, but also where we're building roads because creating those switchbacks and dealing with the contours is going to have an impact.

The relationship of the proposed development to the area of disturbance is something I think we'd be very interested in. Traffic was already mentioned. We haven't talked a lot about parking, but actually a real parking analysis that shows that the right amount of parking would be proposed and would not impact forever adjacent areas of the City.

Those, those are the main things that come to mind for me.

Commissioner

Joyce: I think they fixed the parking. If you put the hotel up high on the hill.

Commissioner

Joyce: No one's going to want to park down in the neighborhoods and walk up. And so, when you had a lift then it was one thing. But if you had to walk up that curvy road, it's not going to happen.

Commissioner

Thimm: Oh, I, I agree with that. We are looking at three concepts. If we're weighing in on them, the larger footprint building that's nestled into Creole Gulch, just based upon the lens of everything we've looked through that has gotten us here over the last year and a half seems to answer a lot of questions as far as I can see looking at these preliminary concepts. Are these going to be made available to the Commission and the public in the next days?

Anne

Laurent: All right. So, Craig has given us a copy of his presentation and we'll post it to our website. And we can email it. So I still have it in [inaudible], so no, we're not going to email it, but we'll send you a link.

Commissioner

Phillips: And we can come in to get copies of these maps in the morning, I would assume.

Anne

Laurent: Sure, we can make some prints for you.

Commissioner

Suesser: Was, was access to Northstar considered for the emergency access route. I'm sure it was but I was wondering what that conversation was but I was wondering what that conversation was.

Director

Erickson: Yeah, it's between, it's between King's Crown and the project. It was brought up in rough conceptual conversations with some other out of the box solutions. And that road is on Crescent Tram and there's a couple other issues with it. So we elected to try and stay on our own site.

Commissioner

Campbell: I don't think a fire truck could make that switchback at the bottom of Northstar, anyway.

Director

Erickson: Probably not.

Chair

Strachan: Is Northstar a public road.

Director
Erickson: No.

Chair
Strachan: I don't think it is.

Commissioner
Suesser: Just, it's a paved road. I was just wondering if it was considered as an option. Because that emergency access road looks like a real problem going through the lots. It doesn't look like it's---

Director
Erickson: Ultimately, I think it won't go through the lots.

Commissioner
Suesser: No.

Director
Erickson: Like I say, it was just---when we, when we stopped the process going forward because we weren't getting proper fire access, they came back with a solution without adjusting the drawings.

Commissioner
Suesser: Okay.

Chair
Strachan: All right. Any other questions, comments?

Commissioner
Campbell: I just have one just to make sure that I'm clear on the process. And this is for either Mark or Anne. Can you give us a little bit of guidance about what you want for us tonight to make sure we're not slowing up the process?

Mark
Harrington: Yeah, no. I think those comments are super helpful. I don't think we need anything more tonight. It was more, just again, high level picture. As you think of this, just as Commissioner Suesser was throwing out ideas, you know, in the next week if you get things like that feel free to

send them to Bruce and Anne if you have other ideas. I think this is more input based as we look to refine and make we're not completely missing the boat in terms of your expectations and the community's expectations. Trying to work with a difficult site, admittedly, still. I mean, this isn't, this isn't---

Chair
Strachan: Texas.

Mark
Harrington: Not Texas.

Commissioner
Joyce: Or Prospector.

Commissioner
Phillips: Well, I, I appreciate you guys coming and doing this tonight because now when I'm driving from one place to another and I'm trying to have something to fill my mind with, I can at least start to kind of conceptualize this. And I agree with Commissioner Thimm's comments a few moments ago wholeheartedly.

Chair
Strachan: Great. It sounds like generally headed in the right direction. Don't see any full stops at this point. Still looking for more specifics, as I'm sure you guys are too. So we will stay tuned.

We will---it's agendized for public input, so we'll open that up. Anyone from the public wishing to speak on this item please come forward.

Public comments

George
Garvin: Hello, my name is George Garvin. I currently am a resident of Hideout but have lived in the Park City area for 12 years. And Park City is pretty much the center of my life. So I feel like I'm part of the community even though technically I'm outside of the City limits. And I'd like to commend both sides for addressing the issues of massing and square footage and land usage, because the issue really has been to avoid a monstrosity on the hill. And this seems to be a very constructive approach. The one thing that I think might be helpful also as a guiding principle, besides identifying

square footage, height, and all of the volumetrics, that would be the principle of integrating the architecture with the landscape. Because I think that one of the things that all of the people that were concerned with this project and objected to, many aspects of it, was that it completely destroyed the landscape basically. And one of the things we really like in Park City is looking at that beautiful hill.

So one of the things besides integrating it into the landscape as a principle that we might consider is---a very practical one is ski in/ski out because that does directly integrate, at least in our community, landscape with architecture. To some degree the Canyons with their single-family homes attempted to do just that. You can argue that perhaps the size of the buildings of the single-family homes may be bigger than would be ideal if you wanted to have it inconspicuous. But in an attempt to accomplish what this agreement attempts to do, ski in/ski out may be a very good principle. But in any case, the basic point that I'm making is integrating the architecture with the landscape. Thank you.

Chair

Strachan: Thanks.

Annie Lewis

Garda: I'm Annie Lewis Garda, and I'm very pleased to see the process moving along. I feel enthusiastic about it. I have a couple of questions. One is where roads cross ski runs, what happens? Is this with tunnels or bridges? And what are the implications for excavation and movement of soil when that happens? And in B, do I understand correctly that that building would be stepping up the hill so we wouldn't be seeing, you know, a single-standing building; but instead would be going up the hill?

Chair

Strachan: I mean, to the extent that you can answer. You may not know, but.

Craig

Call: So to, the answer to the first question is that anything we do that affects the ski run comes through a City conditional use permit process and is part of an independent review. But the plan is bridges, I would think. Partly just because of the elevations. The way we understand the ski runs

work is typically as the ski run comes down, of course, it's groomed and graded. And it's often lower than the surrounding area as it comes, you know, comes through the mountain. So our out of the chute guess is that a bridge is more likely to be the solution than a tunnel. But we obviously cannot run vehicles across an area that's a ski run.

Annie Lewis

Garda: That's why I wondered about what the process would be.

Craig

Call: Sure. It can't be done. And then the excavations and such, we just have to, you know, that will be part of the calculation of what has to be done.

As far as the building stepping up the mountain, the thing is what you're seeing is the building instead of the mountain. In other words, it's stepping up. And if you look at Option B here, there will be a very appearing building on the mountain. I don't mean to---if you look at this again, those buildings step up the mountain.

Annie Lewis

Garda: Right.

Craig

Call: But they're very large.

Annie Lewis

Garda: Well, one or two of them do, as opposed to---

Craig

Call: Yeah, that's right. Thanks.

Neals

Vernagaard: Sorry, I got a long name. Neals Vernagaard 822 Lowell. First, Craig, thanks for the change, the change in the tone and tenor of the meeting. What fresh air. I'll make it real brief. For my A is a non-starter, so just give up on that one now. Ten floors looking right in my bedroom window. Not going to work. C, if you can make it work, approaches what I consider is a win/win.

What I've not heard any conversation about though, yet, is what's going to be allowed to be in the building, because to me that helps define what

square footage needs to be. And I think, I would hope the Commission and the public would have a lot of input into what you're contemplating to be allowed in there. If it's just bedrooms and a small restaurant, and hallways and a lobby, that's one thing. But I've also heard about, you know, the Park City Institute and everybody wanting to be able to do all these things in this building; and that all needs to be defined real quickly. So, thank you.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you.

Brian

Van Heck: Hi. I'm Brian Van Hecke with THINC. And Craig, you started your presentation by showing the Woodruff drawing. I don't know if you want to bring that back up.

Craig

Call: Did you want me to?

Brian

Van Hecke: Sure. Why not. So again, that's from 1986. And I know that's what we're all reference from and I know we're kind of somewhat excited about a much smaller potential development. But I just want to remind everybody this was before mitigating, of course. That this may have been what the density called for back then, but the requirement, of course, is to mitigate all 15 CUP. So, that's still---whether it's this or what is currently being proposed, we still have 15 CUP criteria obviously that we need to address.

And even in this revised negotiated, potential project it's still a massive development. I mean, this is still a significantly large massive proposed project on a landmark Treasure Hill, you know, sitting right above Historic Old Town. I know we all know that. I'm just trying to state the obvious here to keep us all on track here, I guess.

So again, we're looking at 100,000 square foot hotel. As you guys have been saying, you need to specify back of house. What exactly is back of house. Commercial, parking, you know, those are things that we'll still need to understand. And just make sure we allow proper review and a proper timeline.

And, and one question I have is, you know, who is the lead architect at this point? Who is the lead design person that's coming up with this stuff? Is there somebody involved. Has somebody been, you know, contracted with?

Craig

Call: May I answer that?

Chair

Strachan: You don't have to. You can if you want.

Craig

Call: Well, we, we want to have enough options open that we can pick the right person. We certainly haven't made a final decision, in part because we're not---the, the last proposal was of full buildout and this one isn't.

Brian

Van Hecke: Right.

Craig

Call: We're looking at the concept and whether or not this is a better solution with some constraints than what we have now. But you may have noticed the lack of the extensive drawing and analysis that's been done on the old, on the 17.2 plan; and there's no way we can generate that. So we really have not had the need to, to lock in an architect for full buildout. We've relied on the expertise that's been available and it's been very helpful.

Brian

Van Hecke: And I know we have a lot of experts in this room and City Council, our City Planning and the, the Planning Staff. I just question whether or not---how, how much detail do we all need here to make the right decision. Is it just massing and showing some boxes and things like that, or do we all need a little more concrete idea in terms of the plan, design, how many stories. These, these things are critical components of the impacts that will or will not be, be made. And we're trying to condense this all into a very short timeframe. So, I'm not a planning expert, but I would think the applicant---or we would benefit if the applicant did have somebody on their side who is a design expert helping present concepts so that we have a clearer idea of what is being thought of. A question.

And I know we had three options presented; A, B, C. I would ask maybe if we could put some names to those, you know. I know A is kind of the ones facing Lowell. B is the step up. And C is sort of this quote, hidden concept, which requires a lot more square footage, at least on, on the surface. But I was wondering if we could clearly define Option A, B and C so we all know what we're talking about.

One other comment. I just want to make sure that whatever is being considered does not include meeting space. This is---Steve, you were talking about traffic and safety and the concerns about what can Lowell and Empire really handle. Meeting space again was never contemplated as far as the 1986 MPD was concerned. And given the build out of Old Town and the current state of the City and these narrow roads, I would just be very adamant that meeting space does not belong up there, and would jeopardize the feasibility of this project as proposed.

So lots of questions. As was raised, I'd like to understand what the lot sizes are. Make sure we understand the maximum house size that can be built up there on these lots. It was nice to hear that there would be no changes to the Town Lift. I'm in agreement with that.

And then as it relates to---a couple other points I want to make out. I know we're focused on Treasure Hill right now. I brought it up before, what's going to happen at the base of the Park City Mountain Resort. I'd like to understand that. If somebody within the City could provide us, the public, with information as far as the density that is currently zoned for those empty parking lots. Could we get that information because it does have an impact? You know, these roads can only handle so much. Whatever is potentially built up on Treasure Hill, and then subsequently at the base of the Park City Mountain Resort, they're all trying to share the same roads. So I actually do think we need to understand what is contemplated and what is zoned for at the base of the Park City Mountain Resort, just so we are planning properly based on all this potential buildout that we're faced in the next coming years.

And then as it relates to going back to some of the CUP criteria, I think we as THINC have raised significant concerns about the soils up there, the water, excavation, traffic safety. And those remain. So, you know, we never got answers. You know, whether it's a quarter, a half or whatever, those are still real issues that have to be addressed and have to be understood as far as protecting the water table, the soil toxicities, etc.

And given those things are out there, I would just question who's going to finance this thing. You know, if these, if these things are unanswered, who's going to really finance this thing. I don't know. I mean, just again, it's a question. And, and I guess a concern.

So, and regardless, I would think that this would require a new MPD, as I think I've kind of heard. And I know we're trying to get answers and I appreciate the tone. I do. I mean, I appreciate this, this framework of a discussion. But, you know, it's---I, I think that this size of a project with this sensitivity, historic Old Town Park City deserves, deserves a proper due process. Thank you.

Steve

Swanson:

Thank you. I'm Steve Swanson and I met with, with another THINC member, Arnie Rusten, this morning to just go over this. And we, we took an hour or so and just brought, you know, with his experience as a, as a civil, heavy civil engineer; his project experience, my, my experience here in Park City. You know, really tried to drill in a little deeper on some of the issues that we saw, given that we're kind of getting a new start on this. And we appreciate the option to---or the opportunity to see new ideas. So real quickly. If we're asked to weigh in, of course, we have to. It's just habit now.

So, call this planning and design principles, because I think principles are important. And a couple---one of the other gentlemen touched on that. It's, you know, you really have to think about this. Yes, there's legal, there are safety, health safety and welfare issues that, that drive our decisions on this. There's the, there's the, the land and so on. But then there's the parts that are a little bit more esoteric, but just as important, that drive good development.

So with that preface. A couple of things we---I'll just go down through these. I've made a few redactions due to what's been presented, so it will be shorter. And I believe, if we could bring up one the schemes, either A, B or C. Maybe even C. Now it's hard for me to see. But one thing we came up with, at that transition where it goes from Lowell to Empire and makes that turn, and then depending on where you enter the site, we thought first of all allow the entry road to climb. You know, gain some---don't try and drill in and, and go down deep for this deep parking. So it seems like a lot of these schemes kind of go that direction. Establish a residential scale and create---if you're going to use part of that access

from Lowell, a transition zone if you will, that puts a couple of the residential lots adjacent to and accessed off Lowell, to create a sort of a transition boundary. You know, one of the problematic things was always this building mass that jutted out and was so tall. So massive. And also, the fact that it mostly looks like roads now in most, most of these proposals. So---and then conform with the LMC, of course, and other residential units south of the Town Lift. And it looks like we have a few in there. So, that's kind of along the lines of what we talked about.

My personal feeling is without the big development that was, that we're kind of moving away from, the Sweeney project, there may not need to be a lift transfer on the site. I certainly support the idea of keeping the same alignment of, of the Town Lift. I think that makes sense. We're not creating any new cuts through the tree canopy. That's good. Improved skier access to the Town Lift. I think that might be supported by some of the THINC members; but we would want to look at that carefully. Some of those earlier versions had 100-foot wide runs. I'm not sure that that's called for, so that would need to be looked at. And then limit excavation and method of excavation. Certainly, I think with this that's certainly possible. We talked a little bit about the size and scale of the buildings. I think they can be three stories above parking. And it seems like I could support something like this. They should conform to the hillside and be, and be harmonious with the site, certainly. But it's still a big hotel. Okay. So I think---and I, I'm not certain exactly, I haven't researched it, but the thought occurred to me that this might be on some, somewhat near the scale of the Stein Residences. I know there was 100-plus units there. So if anybody wants to just imagine, you know, that, that could be a good way to compare or get a sense of, you know, what, what we're looking at here. But we'll still wait for the applicant, of course.

Then, so, you know, we talked about what's reasonable. Well, you can't really put a number to it. But if we could get it to a 100,000 cubic yards instead of 750,000 I think that would be great. A 100 to 150,000 cubic yards excavated without, with methods other than blasting, I think that would be something that we would really like to consider. Means other than blasting should be employed to do the excavation. And then try to retain the bulk of that material in and around the site. And I, I applaud the, the applicant; noting that there may not be filling of Creole Gulch. I think that's a---we, we'd really like to avoid that. A hotel and so on. It's possible you could get skier access above and behind these, some of these units. I like the idea of skier access to these. The 18 single-family

custom residential homes that, that---those in and of themselves are going to be a big impact. If it's possible, the thought came that we might want to consider a phased sort of roll out of those. Because to contemplate all of that kind of coming online simultaneously, that's going to be a, just a major impact on that, on that site with all the other construction.

Ski through. There were some other notes here. Actually, one thing we, we discussed was a, was a skiing where the hotel would be pulled to the side of Creole Gulch to the, to the south side of it, similar to A. And then we actually thought part of it could go on the other side. Maybe those connect across. However, the road probably obviates that; the road issue and the fire access.

So to me, to kind of wrap up. And we had---the other thought I had was if we were to have those buildings down low, closer to the neighborhood, then perhaps there, there was the possibility that there could be provided a public amenity in the form of some kind of park or plaza. I'm not sure that this really doesn't obviate that. But it's maybe something to consider. Something that gives back, something at that lower margin, to the neighborhood, a bit to the community. You know, that's probably worth investigating still. And buildings, you know, can be created. We don't have to create the Marriott model for these, for this hotel now. And that's good. The, the volume is brought down; the total scale, the square footage. And then the use, I think, can be really sort of thought about and more in terms of the, the, the hotel use, which is a specific use and doesn't have to solve every problem on the site. And I think that offers great benefits.

And then I had something in here. Build, build a dedicated fire station, if you need it. I'm not sure that's required. But, you know, we were looking for, we were really trying to think out of the box. And I think in some respects if we all can kind of adopt that attitude, and the applicant certainly seems open to it, and really think of this as something that's going to---because we still have the public buy-in. And they're by no means convinced on this money issue and having to come up with this kind of money. So we really want to be thinking about this as a public---if there's anything that we can offer as a public amenity that's going to really get us over that hurdle of public opinion, I think that's going to be very valuable. So anyway. Thank you.

John

Stafsholt: John Stafsholt, 633 Woodside. First want to say it's really good to see you here and you're not just the silent Park City II, LLC person. And I got here late so I apologize. I came a long, long way today. Planned to be here at 5:15. I didn't have the time zone changes in mind.

Anyway, looking at this. I missed a bit at the beginning, so sorry about that. Along the Town Lift are you looking at keeping the Cabriolet or taking it. Taking it out? If you don't mind?

Craig

Call: We, we would love to see the Cabriolet built. This project doesn't have critical mass to have that occur alone with the project. But we, we favor that kind of improvement for skiing.

John

Stafsholt: Okay. So that, is that still up in the air or is it---

Craig

Call: It's not by any means no, no full stop there.

John

Stafsholt: Okay. All right. Second thing, looking at the layout and the roads and stuff, the way it looks to be drawn, it looks like they're above-ground roads. Is that correct?

Craig

Call: Yes. These, these roads are drawn to be above ground.

John

Stafsholt: With bridges over for the ski runs where it's required.

Craig

Call: That's our first impression is bridges would be the choice, yes.

John

Stafsholt: Right. Okay. And if, that particular drawing doesn't seem, maybe I'm looking at it wrong, but it doesn't seem to follow the building envelope. Are we looking at expanding that?

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, so we've been over a ton of this.

John

Stafsholt: All right, I'm sorry.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, yeah.

John

Stafsholt: All right. Okay. That's good. I usually am here on time.

Chair

Strachan: I know you are. And I would read the minutes. I mean, I don't mean to cut you off but---

John

Stafsholt: That's fine. No problem.

Chair

Strachan: All these other people sat through it too, so---

John

Stafsholt: I apologize.

Chair

Strachan: No worry, no worry. There's nothing else you had? Those were your questions?

John

Stafsholt: Well, I'm trying to---

Chair

Strachan: I realize. You're like us. We're just trying to get our heads around it.

John

Stafsholt: I'm trying to digest it.

Chair

Strachan: Okay.

John
Stafsholt: So if I can digest it.

Chair
Strachan: Check the minutes out and I think you'll---

John
Stafsholt: I will.

Chair
Strachan: Yeah, I think you'll be a leg up after you do that.

Commissioner
Phillips: I was just going to say thanks for racing to get here, John. And I wish you were here earlier, but, yeah, you know, I can see frustration in you. And we certainly appreciate you getting up and, you know, giving us your input.

Arnie
Rusten: Arnie Rusten. I'm at 1058 Lowell Avenue. And I, I just want to, you know, looking at this here, you know it's showing this dashed red line, you know, as, as a road through these building lots and everything else. To me it's like---I can't get this to add up. The Fire Marshal is obviously concerned with access all the way up in, in an emergency situation. And, and yet because we have these roads and, you know, we have this dashed red line which is going to be a road. And I'm looking at that and I don't see how it works at all.

What I want to ask, and actually there was some good explanations given. But to me, if I'm putting myself in the Fire Marshal's shoes, and being given some of this information relative to what Lowell and what Empire is capable of handling, I don't know if that red dash line would put me to sleep if I were in his shoes from any kind of fire access. Because to me Lowell and Empire, that's really where this problem lies. And I think that, you know, we're looking here at---say for a, for something that's 24/7 365; I really want to go back and ask, you know, have we, have we really explored an alternative access point, such as up from Park, up 8th and Norfolk. There's a lot we can do relative to a cut and cover access that---yes, it, it's extensive, but to me that would really, that would really put me at ease if I were to sit here and say what am I as the Fire Marshal in this town going to see relative to me having to do with a significant emergency

up on that hillside. And, and I guess I'm going to just ask. Could you please dig a little deeper into that as to what you can and could do going up that route. I, I recognize coming down from King Road is, is a big undertaking, bigger, and so on. But I'm, I'm really not quite there yet with us feeling that we have shaken the tree thoroughly relative to that. So if I can ask you to just don't give up totally on that. Take a closer. That would be---

Chair

Strachan: I think we're all doing that, so.

Arnie

Rusten: Thank you.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah. I've had an urgent request by one of the Planning Commissioners that we take a bathroom break. So let's take five. Those are rare that I get urgent requests like that. So when I get one, I've got to take it. So we'll take five and we'll be back. Thanks.

Break

Chair

Strachan: All right, let's call the meeting back to order. We'll continue on with public comment and try to keep things on track as best we can. All right. Please, yes. Come up. sign in. I apologize for interrupting.

Katherine

Fagen: Thank you. Just two, two quick comments.

Commissioner

Suesser: What's your name?

Katherine

Fagen: I'm sorry. Katherine Fagen, and I did sign in. I'm so glad to hear that the Town Lift is going to be saved. So my comment goes to just two, two big goals that everybody in Park City has; which are to try to reduce car traffic, and try to improve affordable housing. And that's what my comments are about to those ends. I'm just thinking, especially since Option 3 or C, whatever, seems to be getting a lot of positive feedback, but it is quite a way up the hill. It would be wonderful if a bus or shuttle

service would be contemplated to get up so the people up there wouldn't always feel like they have to drive their car in and out. And to that end, would something like that be factored into whatever road design you might need to be doing on that. That's one comment.

And I really have minimal understanding of Park City's resolution on the affordable housing requirements or recommendations in development projects. So I didn't know, is this project considered to be subject to that resolution; and if so, just looking at the design, would some of those smaller single home lots maybe those would be perfect to fulfill that obligation for affordable housing.

And also, the other question would be in the hotel. Now that the hotel part of the project is a lot smaller than it used to be, what is the plan for the developer to mitigate the employee housing; because I think that's part of the same resolution.

So those are my comments. Thank you very much. Totally appreciate this Planning Commission. Makes me proud to live in Park City because of what you do.

Chair
Strachan: Thank you.

Anne
Laurent: I'm happy to answer. Clarify. And I guess some people in the audience didn't realize. I'm Anne Laurent, Community Development Director. I actually work for the City; not Park City II. But we are talking about the project together and collaborating.

The affordable housing resolution that applied to this project at the time of submission was 17-99. And we anticipate affordable housing applying in some manner. We don't have enough of the detail and we have not run through the numbers. But yes, employee housing specifically will apply.

Chair
Strachan: Okay. Thank you.

Mark

Sletten: Hello, I'm Mark Sletten. While I live in Park Meadows I've had an office at the Park City Mountain Resort for over 20 years now; and I've watched in various different winters where we've had massive snow amount and light snow amounts. The issues of traffic on both Empire and Lowell---and frankly I have to tell you, I always thought that we would find some magic bullet in a health and safety issue that could put this whole thing to bed, and that pristine hillside would stay pretty much as it was; as opposed to some big, very big building being built there. But I propose that there's something worse than a big building being built there, and that's a big building that fails being built there. And to get into a hotel or a condo hotel of that magnitude, I really believe that things like restaurants---and I hate to say it, but back of house and meeting space has to be there or it will likely fail. It might fail at the financing stage, which would be great because if no lender gives the developer the money to build the, the vertical it stays pristine. But to the extent they give them the money to build the vertical and then the condo hotel can't be sold or the hotel can't be rented, it very likely will be a failure. Because in today's market place in Park City, without meeting and conference space and without a great restaurant it will not be successful.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you. All right. Anyone else from the public wishing to speak on this item? All right.

End of public comments

Commissioner

Joyce: Just one, one last little thing that I had forgot. I made a note that I didn't read. One last little thing. Just, when we were looking at the mines and adits, a lot of the space that you're drawing through roads and everything go right through Creole Mine and the Creole adit. And I just want to make sure that you're at least paying attention to that, because at some point we need to see those on the map and, and what the mitigation is. But I'm sure that's part of it. But it's right in the middle of where you're putting everything.

Commissioner

Band: And the toxic soils are substantial. And the tests came back substantial.

Commissioner

Suesser: You did say that there would be no regrading on the ski hill with the excavated material.

Craig

Call: Thank you. I really appreciate the chance to clarify because I misstated. What I mean is on the upper Creole outside the areas of disturbance.

Commissioner

Suesser: Okay.

Craig

Call: Outside the MPD zone. We see no reason to take excess material up there. But as Creole passes through the project, I mean, absolutely, will require using the material that's available and trying to reach an optimal grade through there, while preserving ski access if that proves to be the, you know, the important factor we believe it is.

Commissioner

Suesser: And decreasing the amount of waste being hauled off site.

Craig

Call: Oh absolutely. I mean, the most expensive thing you can do with waste is haul it off.

Commissioner

Suesser: Uh-huh.

Craig

Call: Although your point is well made. You know, there might be some soils there that absolutely must be mitigated. I mean, that's just the story. That's the world in which we live. And as it should be.

Chair

Strachan: Great. Anything further? All right.

Commissioner

Phillips: Yeah, one thing that I, I wanted to point out that I like about this; as much as, you know, we point out the things that we're concerned about. One of

the things that I really particularly like about all three of these designs in the road alignment and the access, and how it lines up with Lowell; which I think is a more natural flow. And it also prevents the lights from shining on all the neighbor's homes. So, I'm a big fan of where that access is located.

Chair

Strachan: Great. Normally I would be rushing to ask for a motion to adjourn, but it occurs to me that this might be my last Planning Commission with Jack here as Mayor. I just want to take a minute to say thanks, Jack, we've had a long run together, and there will be---the good news is more camping trips between---with you and I on them.

Mayor

Thomas: There will indeed.

Chair

Strachan: The bad news is that we won't be together doing much government stuff anymore. But thanks. And please tell us, give us some wonderful wisdom to take with us.

Mayor

Thomas: I don't know if I can muster anything up at this hour, but you know, something may stumble out of this. What I wanted to say, honestly, is and simply, thank you. You know, because I know what it's like to be sitting where you are. I know that you do a lot of the heavy lifting in this community with regard to real projects, real issues, all of the criteria for evaluation projects whether it's an MPD or a CUP. And I know that you give a tremendous amount of your time and that that impacts your lives. Adam, I know you've got a couple children that you, you are away from. I know that you're all away from your, your families. And you make this unbelievable contribution of your time and commitment at the expense of your families and your loved ones. And so I want to say thank you for that, and that's for them. And also, that it's not---I know you don't do it for the money. Okay. And I know you don't do it for, for the attention; nor for your egos. I mean, I think you do this for your love of the community and your, your passion for the community, and your willingness to serve. And I think that says a lot to each one of you. Each---your character, your essence. And our entire City Council is very grateful for the hard work. We don't get that many opportunities to really share how we feel. And

this is my moment to just elaborate and say you're awesome. And thank you.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you, Jack. You will be sorely missed. No doubt about it.

Mayor

Thomas: And you won't have to deal with---one more evening. One more evening.

Commissioner

Band: Adam's wishing he could say that.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, yeah. All right. With that---

Commissioner

Phillips: This, this also could very well be the very last meeting that we are all sitting at this table together, so for all of us as well, we're going to be missing it sounds like some people tomorrow. Steve's leaving. And so I would like to just tell all of you that it's been an honor to be part of this particular team.

Chair

Strachan: Well, I appreciate that. I wouldn't say that it will be the last time that we're all sitting here. I got a bad feeling about that, but---

Commissioner

Phillips: I said it could be. It could be. And I would hate to not have the opportunity.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah. But I do appreciate what you said, regardless of whether it is our last meeting or not.

Commissioner

Suesser: Steve, when do we lose you?

Commissioner

Joyce: This is it.

Commissioner

Band: This is his last meeting.

Commissioner

Suesser: Is it?

Chair

Strachan: Yeah.

Commissioner

Joyce: This is it.

Chair

Strachan: Well, wherever the road takes us, we will definitely not drop the ball in terms of this project. And we appreciate, I think, as a Board everybody's time and effort. And to center the attention on just this Board as giving a lot of time I don't think is fair. I mean, we've got Anne and Mark here who have probably been throwing in huge hour days. And the public whose looked at this thing and their spending their time meeting on their own time. So with all that work we will hope for the best outcome possible.

Shall we entertain a motion to adjourn?

Commissioner

Joyce: Don't we have to continue.

Commissioner

Band: Yeah, I was going to say, do we need to continue.

Chair

Strachan: It's just a work session.

Commissioner

Joyce: Oh, we're not doing---so moved.

Commissioner

Band: Second.

Chair

Strachan: We have a motion and a second. All in favor.

All: Aye.

Chair

Strachan: All right. Is anybody going out tonight. A majority of the Planning Commission may be going to Flanagan's. No official business will be discussed. The public is encouraged to attend. Thank you.

The Park City Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:35 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: _____

APPROVED