

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION NOTES  
January 13, 2010**

PRESENT: Chair Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Dick Peek, Adam Strachan, Julia Pettit, Thomas Eddington, Brooks Robinson, Kayla Sintz, Polly Samuels McLean

**WORK SESSION ITEMS**

**North Silver Lake - Conditional Use Permit**  
**(Application #PL-08-00392)**

Planning Director Thomas Eddington reported that the North Silver Lake project had been remanded back to the Planning Commission. On December 9<sup>th</sup> the Commissioners heard from the applicants for the first time since the remand. The applicants had returned this evening with an overview and information update on the project to date. Director Eddington noted that the applicants had prepared a massing model that would be presented this evening. The information in the Staff report reflected the information that was presented by the applicant and addressed the reduction in massing of the North Building.

Chair Wintzer clarified that the discussion should focus only on the North Building and that all other elements of the project remained the same. Director Eddington replied that this was correct.

Doug Clyde, representing the applicant, stated that during the meeting in December the Planning Commission requested to see information that directly compares the previous plan with the currently proposed plan. The requested information was included in the Staff report. Mr. Clyde requested feedback from the Planning Commission after hearing supplement information provided in their presentation this evening.

John Shirley, the project architect, reviewed the model. He stated that it was very schematic, but showed the advantages of splitting the building apart in the new orientation. Mr. Shirley believed the height, mass and scale was more compatible with the three condominiums on the interior of the project. Stepping the facades is more exaggerated on the new scheme, which helps break down the scale. Mr. Shirley remarked that the trees on the model represented three different levels of tree planting; existing trees, new trees and trees that would be added with this new proposal. He pointed out that placing a greater portion of the massing over the street created more open space. In addition, it allowed them to create the porte cochere underneath. It also puts a large portion of the massing behind the homes. Mr. Shirley stated that architecture itself is compatible with the rest of the project. The color and materials would be the same as originally proposed.

Mr. Clyde clarified that the open space calculation had not yet been done; therefore, the number could vary slightly.

The Commissioners left the dias to look at the model.

Mr. Shirley reiterated that the model was a very schematic massing study. The objective this evening was to hear feedback from the Planning Commission before moving forward to the next step.

Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean, noted that the Planning Staff had not had the opportunity to analyze the model presented. The Planning Commission could give their initial reaction with the caveat that they do not have a full Staff analysis. Mr. Clyde stated that they were fully aware of that fact. The presentation this evening was to respond to the comments from the last meeting.

Chair Wintzer requested some type of overlay over the old plan to show how the new plan has moved on the site. He believed the massing was reduced and the building is more interesting. Chair Wintzer thought the design was moving in the right direction.

Commissioner Peek concurred with Commissioner Wintzer. At the last meeting he had mentioned a wildland urban interface report and recalled that Mr. Clyde had indicated that he might have a report for this meeting. Mr. Clyde stated that the report was prepared and submitted to the Building Department and to Planner Cattan for review. They basically agreed with the conclusions and requested that five or six small trees be removed that were up against the building. Mr. Clyde remarked that the direction was consistent with the information that was supplied prior to the approval. The conclusion was that there would be no impact on the visual analysis of the project. Commissioner Peek assumed that future landscape plans would reflect the updated results. Mr. Clyde offered to illustrate it on the landscape plan.

Commissioner Strachan referred to the chart on page 8 of the Staff report, which compared the square footage of the previous and current designs. He wanted to know how those numbers were calculated.

John Shirley pointed out that the numbers are preliminary because they were based on the preliminary massing. He explained how the areas of the different floors were calculated. Mr. Shirley anticipated the numbers would shift slightly as the floor plan is defined.

Commissioner Strachan referred to pages 2 and 3 in the packet and noted that there were discrepancies in the numbers. The numbers on page 3 identify the square footages for the northeast building and the northwest building. The two numbers added together total 52,705 square feet. However on page 2, adding the square footage for those same buildings total 72,927 square feet. Mr. Shirley replied that 52,705 is the above grade square footage. Mr. Shirley stated that the most flexible square footage is below grade, and include the back of house services, kitchen, mechanical, etc., which is underground between the parking structure and the lower level of the building. That is still being refined and he expected to see additional shift in that number.

Commissioner Strachan was concerned with the below grade square footage. He was torn between reducing the above ground square footage and increasing the below grade square footage, and deciding which one was the better of two evils. He asked if there was an architectural way to reduce the amount of square footage both above and below grade.

Mr. Shirley pointed out that the above grade square footage basically concerns the for-sale residential space. The below grade square footage is support facilities. Commissioner Strachan clarified that his only concern with the below grade area is the amount of excavation that would be required. Generally, he felt the reduction in mass was moving in the right direction. Commissioner Strachan applauded their efforts. In the future, as the floor designs are defined, he would like to continue to see the same chart to track the square footage with each iteration of the plan. He was

most interested in always seeing the saleable area line item.

Commissioner Pettit stated that she was not at the last meeting and had not had the opportunity see what direction the applicants received from the City Council. Commissioner Pettit echoed the comments of the other Commissioners. She believed the changes in the massing were significant, particularly from the entry area. Commissioner Pettit was more comfortable with the current design versus the one originally proposed.

Commissioner Hontz stated that the evolution of the building was going in the right direction. She appreciated how the applicants had responded to their comments and questions from the last meeting. Commissioner Hontz concurred with her fellow Commissioners.

Mr. Clyde believed they had sufficient direction to move forward.

The work session was adjourned.