

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
MARCH 28, 2012

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan Jack Thomas, Nann Worel

EX OFFICIO:

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington; Francisco Astorga; Kirsten Whetstone, Planner; Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney

=====

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

Chair Wintzer called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present except Commissioners Pettit who was excused and Commissioner Strachan who was expected to arrive.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

March 14, 2012

Commissioner Hontz was unable to find in the minutes where she if someone was present to present to represent the applicant. She thought that was an important question and should be included in the minutes.

Commissioner Hontz referred to page 19, third paragraph, and recalled that Commissioner Strachan had asked who would pay for the trails connection. If her recollection was correct, it was an important component that should be in the minutes.

Commissioner Hontz recalled a clarification of the open space during the meeting because the number the Planning Commission had been given showed open space with five buildings. If that was also on the record, she felt that reference should be included.

Commissioner Hontz preferred to continue approval of the minutes until her comments could be verified with the recording.

MOTION: Commissioner Hontz moved to CONTINUE the minutes of March 14, 2012 to April 11, 2011. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously by those present on March 14, 2012. Commissioner Savage abstained since he was absent from that meeting. Commissioner Strachan was not present for the vote.

PUBLIC INPUT

There were no comments.

STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Eddington reported that a joint meeting with the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission was tentatively scheduled for May 8, 2012. However, Snyderville Basin was still uncertain about that date and it could be changed to early in June, possibly June 12th. Commissioner Savage was unavailable on May 8th, but could attend in June. Director Eddington stated that he would try to maintain the May 8th date; and if not, he would tentatively schedule June 12th. He would keep the Planning Commission updated.

Director Eddington stated that the Planning Commission had requested information on 118 Daly Avenue. The Staff was researching the information and would schedule it for the next work session. Chair Wintzer was willing to wait until the last meeting in April to discuss 118 Daly Avenue if the Quinn's Partnership Annexation was on the April 11th agenda.

Commissioner Savage announced that he would be unable to attend the Planning Commission meetings on May 9th and May 23rd.

Commissioner Thomas reported that he had met with the Staff and the IBI Group on the Quinn's Partnership Annexation as requested at the last meeting

CONTINUATION(S) – Public Hearing and Continue to Date Specified

7700 Marsac Avenue – Subdivision (Application #PL-10-01070)

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing. There was no comment. Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Thomas moved to CONTINUE 7700 Marsac Avenue – Subdivision to April 25, 2012. Commissioner Hontz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

7700 Marsac Avenue – Condominium Conversion (Application #PL-1001071)

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing. There were no comments. Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Savage moved to CONTINUE 7700 Marsac Avenue – Condominium Conversion. Commissioner Hontz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA – DISCUSSION, PUBLIC HEARING & POSSIBLE ACTION

1. 455 Park Avenue – Plat Amendment (Application #PL-12-01478)

Planner Francisco Astorga reviewed the application for the plat amendment at 455 Park Avenue. An existing historic structure was constructed across the existing property line. The structure is a landmark site and it is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The request is to remove the lot line going through the middle of the structure. Planner Astorga referred to Exhibits 38 and 39 in the Staff report.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission review the application, conduct a public hearing, and consider forwarding a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing.

There was no comment.

Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Thomas moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the 455 Park Avenue replat, consistent with the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval as found in the draft ordinance. Commissioner Worel seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 455 Park Avenue – Plat Amendment

1. The property is located at 455 Park Avenue.
2. The property is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) District.
3. The proposed lot is 3,750 square feet in size.
4. The minimum lot size within the HR-1 District is 1,875 square feet.
5. The lot width of the proposed lot is fifty feet (50').
6. The minimum lot width within the HR-1 District is twenty-five feet (25').
7. The square footage of the structure is approximately 2,944.

8. The building footprint is approximately 1,131 square feet.
9. The maximum footprint for a lot this size is 1,519.
10. There are no other violations or non-compliances found on the site.
11. The current use of the property is a single family dwelling.
12. There is a historic structure on the site.
13. The site is currently listed as a Landmark site on Park City's Historic Site Inventory.
14. The site contains a lot line going through the historic structure.
15. No remnant parcels of land are created with this plat amendment.
16. All findings within the Analysis section and the recitals above are incorporated herein as findings of fact.

Conclusions of Law – 455 Park Avenue – Plat Amendment

1. There is good cause for this plat amendment in that the combined lot will remove the lot line going through the historic structure.
2. The plat amendment is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding lot combinations.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed plat amendment.
4. Approval of the plat amendment, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval – 455 Park Avenue – Plat Amendment

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat amendment for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant will record the plat amendment at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year's time, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.
3. A 10' (ten foot) snow storage easement shall be dedicated to Park City across the property's front on Park Avenue.

**2. Quinn's Junction Partnership – Annexation
(Application #PL-12-01473)**

Peter Pilman with the IBI Group handed out revised packets to the Commissioners.

Planner Whetstone reported that a public open house was held the prior evening at the Ice Rink, and some of the issues and comments would be reviewed this evening. The Staff had outlined questions on page 52 of the Staff report for Planning Commission discussion and direction.

Planner Whetstone provided an overview of the proposal and the requested annexation area. The property is located in the southwest quadrant of the Quinn's Junction Planning Area at the intersection of US40 and SR248. The application is for annexation of approximately 30 acres of property, zoning and an MPD approval to construct a movie studio, hotel and associated uses.

Planner Whetstone presented slides of the site, showing the proposed trails connection. Chair Wintzer wanted to know who would pay for the trails that were off their property. Planner Whetstone stated that in a typical development, connectivity it is part of the MPD in terms of compliance with the General Plan. She was unsure who would pay for the trails connection in this application. She recommended that the applicant pay for it.

Planner Whetstone stated that at the last meeting the Planning Commission talked about the MPD matrix addressing density, setbacks, open space, parking, building height, site plan and site plan characteristics. She presented the site plan from the March 14th meeting, at which time the Planning Commission made comments regarding the casitas, the building on the far north, access, and the bus turnaround. In response to their comments the applicant had provided a revised site plan with the casitas removed, and defined atrium areas, which is enclosed outdoor space. The revised site plan also showed direct entrance in and a loop area for the bus to come in and out using the same route for inbound and outbound.

Planner Whetstone noted that the Planning Commission had asked for a height analysis, which was included in the Staff report. The applicants had also provided drainage and a detention concept to address concerns raised at the last meeting. The Staff did not have a technical plan to analyze whether or not it was adequate. Regarding parking, Planner Whetstone pointed out that the Planning Commission had the ability with an MPD to identify a parking number. The Staff would provide sufficient information to help the Planning Commission in their parking discussions. She noted that there are 150 underground parking stalls under the hotel. Planner Whetstone indicated the area with 106 stalls designated as secured parking. Other design issues included fencing, lighting, noise, architectural character and materials.

Chair Wintzer clarified that the issues for discussion this evening were design and architectural elements. Planner Whetstone replied that this was correct. The Planning Commission could also comment on the revisions to the site plan. Chair Wintzer noted that the Planning Commission typically talks about General Plan issues first. He explained that they were essentially doing the process backwards to get as much information as possible in the short time frame they were

allotted. However, he wanted the applicant to understand that it still needs to meet the General Plan.

Planner Whetstone noted that Brooks Robinson from the Transportation Department was in attendance to answer questions and address comments from the open house regarding transportation issues. The primary concerns raised during the open house were traffic, circulation, parking and access to the property. She noted that the public turnout was minimal. Aside from Council members, Staff and the IBI Group, only four other people attended.

Brooks Robinson with the Transportation Department clarified that the purpose of the Park and Ride was to help mitigate traffic and parking throughout town. It was not just intended to mitigate traffic on SR248. Chair Wintzer disagreed with Mr. Robinson. He was on the Planning Commission when the City asked the applicant for Montage to build the Park and Ride, and the purpose for the request was to keep cars from coming into Park City. Part of the ploy was to eliminate some of the parking at the Montague and at some of the resorts. Mr. Robinson noted that he was the principle planner on the project and he had been involved in all the discussions regarding the Park and Ride and the Montage. Mr. Robinson stated that there was no FTA requirement because it was not built with federal funds. Therefore, the Park and Ride is available and it is not limited to a specific use. He thought it was important to have that policy discussion.

Mr. Robinson stated that in addition to the Planning Commission's ability to reduce the parking in an MPD; the question was whether to reduce spaces from this proposal and use the Park and Ride. A parking reduction could allow for a better parking layout and more landscaping within the plan.

Director Eddington asked if the Park and Ride was part of the Montage agreement with the reduction of parking there, or whether it was separate. Chair Wintzer replied that it was both. It was partly a reduction in parking and partly to mitigate traffic going through town. Mr. Robinson stated that everything was reduced 25% from the LMC requirements. The amount of density available that came off the annexation of the lands that PCMR leases for skiing did not equal the amount of density that the Montage wanted to add to the Empire Pass Development Agreement. There was a community benefit discussion and the Park and Ride was the community benefit. It offset the deficiency in unit equivalents at the time. Mr. Robinson explained that the discussion was an effort to reduce some of the Montage employee traffic by having the employees park in the Park and Ride. It would be a particular problem once the Montage is in full operation and fully staffed, which has not yet happened. Mr. Robinson stated that out of the 750 parking spaces, 100 spaces were allocated to Montage which are currently not being used.

Commissioner Savage asked if the current owners of the Park City Heights development were represented at the public outreach meeting the prior evening. Planner Whetstone answered no. Commissioner Savage asked if the City had taken any steps to make sure the Park City Heights owners were aware of this proposal. Planner Whetstone replied that she had spoken with Spencer White, a representative for Park City Heights. Commissioner Savage felt it was important to keep Park City Heights informed since that development would be the most impacted by this proposed use.

Craig Hahn, Peter Pilman, Doug Rosecrans and Joe Geroux from IBI Group were present this evening.

Peter Pilman commented on an error in a prior exhibit regarding the open space. He clarified that the calculated numbers were correct, but the colors in the exhibit were wrong. The exhibit had been updated and changed. The revised exhibit was included in the packet.

Mr. Pilman identified the changes made to the plan based on comments from previous meetings. They included a sheet with building heights and sizes. The modeling and visual analysis was updated. The site plan was changed based on past meetings. Site plan exhibits were included in the packet addressing open space, utilities, drainage, parking, fire access and building setbacks. Mr. Pilman stated that a conceptual grading plan focuses on a section adjacent to SR248 as previously discussed. The plan showed the berming and some of the cross sections in more detail.

Mr. Pilman noted that security fencing was an issue raised at the last meeting. They prepared a plan with visual images of ideas on how to address the fencing. They also had images of their proposed landscape plan and native approach to landscaping. Mr. Pilman was also prepared to present the architectural zones on the site for the Planning Commission to review and provide input. They had additional 3-D modeling images that provide a different look for the project. Mr. Pilman noted that the slides presentation this evening was identical to the hard copy packet handed out this evening.

Mr. Pilman reviewed the site plan presented two weeks earlier and compared it with the revised site plan to show the changes. Based on comments from the last meeting, the casitas were removed from the plan and the square footage of the casitas went back into the hotel. The Atriums were identified in the revised plan. A major issue was relocating Building 7A from the corner. Mr. Pilman explained that the building that was adjacent to Building 8 on the corner was pulled back against the sound stage and it now touches Building 7. Moving the structure visual helps the corner at the edge of the site.

Mr. Pilman referred to the transit discussion in terms of bus access in and out of the site. He stated that adding a bus loop adjacent to Buildings 4, 5 and 7 appeared to be a good location. It would provide good access into the studio side, as well as on the public side. The buses would come in, turn around, and go back out the main entry. Mr. Pilman indicated a turnaround down by Building 2, which could be used for shuttle drop-off. The turnarounds responded to some of the circulation discussions.

Mr. Pilman presented the exhibit that breaks the buildings down, labels them, and identifies the square foot uses for each building and the proposed building height. The tallest building was 60' on the pad 7 site. They were working on site grading to lower that height. The building heights were compliant with the buildings in the 150' setback zone. 70% of the buildings are 40 feet and 38% are 38 feet. He thought the exhibit helped answer their questions regarding the size of the uses and their locations.

Mr. Pilman reviewed the massing study. The image on page 6 was the updated model. It was massing, not architectural design, and the intent was to represent the building heights. Mr. Pilman indicated the corridor treatment along SR248, where they could see the berm and the landscaping, and the green roofs on buildings in that zone. Mr. Pilman presented an image showing Park City Heights in the background. He had sections of potential areas where green roofs could also work to help break up building mass and reduce impacts.

Commissioner Worel asked if the back lot is between the sound stage and Highway 40. Mr. Pilman answered yes. After the last meeting, he and Mr. Rosecrans went to California and met with the studio executives and the hotel management to address questions regarding hours of operation, use, fencing, lighting, and parking. He took a picture from their window of trailers and equipment that was parked in the studio lot. Mr. Pilman remarked that for this project, the trailers would probably go between the sound stage and Highway 40. He believed it would result in a parking reduction. It is currently shown as striped parking, however, one trailer would take six to ten parking stalls.

Commissioner Worel asked if they could build things on the back lot for filming purposes. Mr. Pilman replied that temporary scenery would be possible.

Mr. Pilman presented a view looking back towards the highway. He believed it reinforced the discussion on clustering and tightening up the buildings.

Commissioner Hontz noted that the site plan on page 3 showed an atrium connecting Building 1A and 1E. Another atrium was shown connecting Buildings 3, 4 and 5. She could see what might be an atrium on page 8, but she could not see that same representation for the other buildings. Mr. Pilman replied that they were envisioning some type of glass roof and the connection was either left off for clarity or just not added in. It could be shaded as some type of roof structure linking those buildings. Commissioner Thomas noted that it was indicated as a 28' high glass roof, and he asked if the wall would be open. Mr. Pilman replied that it could be open walls. Commissioner Thomas understood that a wall structure, even if it is a glass structure, qualifies as enclosed square footage. He asked if that was part of the agreement.

Commissioner Hontz could see three atriums. Per the annexation agreement, only one atrium is allowed. Mr. Pilman pointed out that the model did not show the glass piece over the retail area.

Mr. Pilman reviewed the visual impacts from specific vantage points. He presented the open space calculation and exhibit. The green showed the open space calculated to the property line, which was 38.5%. Two other calculations showed it to the top of the cut slope and to the edge of the pavement at 55.4% and 65.9%. Mr. Pilman clarified that the top one was strict adherence to the property line. The other one followed through on the discussion that the parcel used to be 50 acres and UDOT took 20 acres for the road. UDOT told the landowner that the piece that was left would be used for buffering and greenscape as a buffer for their site. That was the reason for doing the calculations that comes past the property line and to the edge of the perceived slope where the property begins to drop off. Chair Wintzer asked if UDOT compensated the landowner when they took the land. Mr. Pilman answered no. Mr. Rosecrans explained that UDOT took the position that

it was going to be commercial space and the value they got from the new interchange would more than offset the change in use.

Mr. Pilman presented a slide showing the water and sewer plan. They met with Scott Adams with the Park City Fire Service District and blue dots represented the fire hydrant locations requested by Mr. Adams. Another exhibit showed the bio-swales and the detention basins. Chair Wintzer understood that the calculations had not been done to know if it was adequate. Planner Whetstone clarified that the Staff had not done the analysis.

Mr. Rosecrans stated that they met with Matt Cassel and the calculations were for a 100 year detention. There is enough volume in those places, but they were still trying to figure out how the water would get there.

Mr. Pilman reviewed the parking scenarios for the site. The triangular secured area of parking would be flex parking that could be opened up for public events. Mr. Pilman presented the fire protection access that was reviewed and accepted by Scott Adams.

Mr. Pilman stated that they had met the 25' minimum setback for all buildings and it exceeds that in some places. They would continue to work on the plan for the next meeting and begin to add in the measurements.

Mr. Pilman reviewed the concept grading plan. He presented the fencing diagram. There were three types of fence. The perimeter security fence that secures the studio compound was identified in red. Other than where the security gates are called out inside the village, the fence can be seen through. Its primary purpose is to stop people from entering the zone. Mr. Pilman stated that the thought was to have a security fence around that zone, and then do visual fencing elements more common to Park City in front. The elements would serve no purpose, but it would be a visual distraction.

Chair Wintzer asked about the height of the security fence and the level of security. Mr. Pilman replied that the discussion was for a 6' to 9' security fence. Razor wire on top would not be necessary because cameras would monitor the fence. The purpose is to provide a barrier to keep people out. Mr. Pilman stated that there was visual concern for the fences on the inside of the project. The sound stages and studios are concerned about people taking pictures of the activities occurring. Because they have to control the release of information, it is important to keep people far enough back from the sets. Those fences would be 9' tall and more solid. It would have a security gate with a guard. They are looking at ideas for screening the visual effects with landscaping or architectural elements. Mr. Pilman remarked that temporary fencing could be added around the lawn area for an event where they would need to control access. It would not be permanent fencing.

Chair Wintzer asked what type of events they were anticipating. Mr. Pilman replied that the lawn area is considered a multi-purpose, multi-function zone. A stage is proposed on the backside so there could be performances. It could be used in conjunction with the hotel for group events, weddings or reunions. Chair Wintzer wanted to know what would govern the number of people who could attend an event. Mr. Pilman was unsure how that would be controlled.

City Attorney Mark Harrington pointed out that each event would need to apply for a special events permit or obtain a permanent CUP for a facility. Chair Wintzer clarified that the approval would not permit events. If the applicant has space for events, they would need to follow the City permit process.

Commissioner Worel asked if a guard house would be built to control the gates. Mr. Pilman indicated the center gate, which would be the guard house location. It is considered the primary entrance in and out of the studio compound. The other gates would be operated from that guard house or manually operated. Chair Wintzer was concerned about traffic backup as employees come into the gate. Mr. Pilman explained that the main access at the signaled intersection is seen as the primary entrance. The gate with the guard house is the primary entrance into the studio site. Therefore, all the employees would come in that gate, which is well inside the site.

Mr. Pilman presented images of fencing ideas for discussion. He also presented landscaping strategies that included evergreen trees, native grasses, and turf grass. The idea is to do natural environment landscaping. Another exhibit was a color-coded diagram breaking the project into zones and the uses and elements proposed in each zone. Mr. Pilman presented an exhibit of neighboring buildings across the street that was referenced in the guidelines. He also presented various images for the Planning Commission to provide feedback.

Commissioner Worel asked if heated walkways were being considered. Mr. Pilman stated that it had not been discussed and he was unsure if it would be necessary. Most of the hotel projects in Park City have heated driveways and drop-off areas. He noted that the auto court for the proposed hotel is tucked underneath the building and sheltered.

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing.

Sally Warren stated that with this project they were talking location, location, location. She asked the Planning Commission to consider light, lights, lights. She lives at Silver Cloud and that is their view 24/7. In terms of control, she questioned how the hotel would be restricted to no lights at night. In addition, the grounds and buildings would need to be lighted 24/7 for security reasons. Ms. Warren wanted to know why all the parking could not be underground. She spoke with someone who was associated with the studio and found that there were several things that no one else knows or was at least not being discussed. For instance, Structure 7 is the studio and she was told that needs to be larger than what is shown and that the building would be maxed out in size. If that happens, there would not be enough turnaround space for the semis. That was only one example of many other things they do not know about. Mr. Warren suggested that the City get an unbiased consultant that could take note of what goes on at the studio. She noted that the studio in California is surrounded by other studios and industrial buildings. The studio being proposed is out in acreage and the size and scale is out of proportion with the surrounding area. Ms. Warren requested that the City do their due diligence and seen an unbiased opinion and accurate information. Ms. Warren remarked that the back parking lot could be used for multi-purpose and she was told that it could also be used for pyrotechnics, which occur at all hours of the day and night. The noise and activity affects other people and it goes to the point of wildlife and the horses at the National Ability Center.

Ms Warren asked the Commissioners if they would want that type of activity in their backyards. She urged the Planning Commission not to make a hasty decision before they have the opportunity for more education and information.

Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Thomas referred to page 3 of the packet, and was bothered by the glass roof that connects buildings 3, 4 and 5 because it appears to increase the footprint of those buildings. He was concerned that the next step would be to add doors, which would be enclosed square footage. Commissioner Thomas assumed that was not part of the development agreement. He was comfortable with Atrium 1F because it was in context with the building. However, it is glass and its reflectivity would be seen from SR248.

Chair Wintzer stated that he lives above one of the buildings in town that has huge skylights, and a lot of light pollution comes out of the buildings during the winter from 4:30 until the lights go off at night. If the proposed connection is enclosed glass space, he asked if the lights would come outside of that space if the building is well lit. That needed to be addressed in response to Commissioner Thomas' concern and public comment.

Commissioner Hontz stated that because the agreements state that only one atrium is allowed, she did not support the two atriums, particularly the larger one in terms of enclosing that space. Commissioner Hontz echoed Commissioner Thomas and Chair Wintzer. However, if the parking could be significantly reduced on each end, she might consider the atrium. Commissioner Thomas concurred.

Commissioner Worel asked if there was validity to what Ms. Warren heard about there not being enough turning space for the semis.

Mr. Pilman stated that the studio reviewed the plan when they were in California and they were comfortable with it. All the turns have a 30 foot radius on them. Commissioner Thomas trusted the IBI Group to know the required turning radius for a semi and their ability to design it properly.

Chair Wintzer referred to page 5. On the plan in the previous packet he had colored in the roof heights. He remarked that the more recent plans were better with more detail, however, he requested more definition on the roofing plan with the heights identified. Building 1A showed a lower triangular roof on the interior court and Building 1E showed a lower roof. He would like those different roofs pulled out in some manner to make sure the roof in between 7 and 7A is lower than the other roofs and it comes back up. Chair Wintzer wanted something that the Planning Staff could look at to identify unexpected changes to the roof heights.

Joe Geroux clarified that they were trying to keep things simple and clear, but they were willing to provide requested information or detail.

Commissioner Thomas stated that the Staff and applicant talked about softening the edge of Building 7 along the south side with trellis elements. He asked if they were still contemplating that

idea. Mr. Pilman noted that the trellis elements were visible on page 8, coming out of the top of the landscape. Commissioner Thomas believed it helped soften the visual impact of that building from Highway 40.

Commissioner Thomas asked if they were contemplating a parking lot full of trailers. He was told that trailer parking would occur in some zones. Commissioner Thomas was concerned about the Walmart effect. Mr. Pilman stated that the drive aisle is quite wide and there is enough room for the truck to pull into the doors. The trellis element on the other side helps screen the building from Highway 40.

Commissioner Savage asked if there was capacity for further berming or visual blocking in the green zone, to address the issue of Highway 40 being substantially above the level of the parking lot. Mr. Rosecrans indicated a 25' area suitable for additional berming, but it is on UDOT property. They would talk to UDOT about using that land.

Director Eddington thought there may be some opportunity to bring another trellis out closer to Highway 40 to have a repetitive element, and incorporate that into potential landscaping for the parking lot. The building is 50-60 feet tall and he was unsure if one trellis would be sufficient screening. Another trellis would also help screen the parked trailers. Commissioner Worel asked if the stars' trailers would be on the right-hand side of that trellis.

Mr. Pilman agreed that the trellis on the outside edge of the property would help screen the parking area. However, the concern was that it would visually build a wall as well, which calls attention a couple hundred feet further out from the building. He suggested that there may be a balance that could help screen the parking without being so dominant. Commissioner Thomas referred to the large parking area south of Building 7 and suggested that if there was a way to subdivide that parking with another row of trellis, it would de-mass the parking and soften the look. Mr. Rosecrans offered to look at his suggestion from a landscape and trellis point of view.

Commissioner Savage understood that the roof heights of the atrium are 28 feet, and that the space was open on each side. Therefore, the surrounding buildings were either 28' or 40' depending on where you look. Commissioner Savage believed the issue associated with how offensive the lighting from an atrium might be, would be dependent on the heights of the atrium versus the surrounding buildings. He suggested that a partial solution might be to lower the roof heights to 20 feet. The difference would be minimal from the inside, but it could make a significant difference from the outside in terms of how well the light is blocked from the adjacent buildings and visibility from view corridors.

Commissioner Worel asked if Atrium A has glass walls all the way around. Mr. Pilman answered yes. She wanted to know why it would not count as square feet if it was enclosed. Commissioner Thomas explained that one atrium is allowed as part of the agreement.

City Attorney Harrington understood from the comments that the atrium needs to meet the requirements of the Annexation Agreement, but the Planning Commission was not willing to consider anything beyond the specifications in the agreement. He pointed out that their thinking followed the Staff recommendation. Mr. Harrington stated that the plan exceeds the agreement

because one atrium was limited to be between two buildings and not three. To answer the question regarding square footage, Mr. Harrington explained that the trigger is habitable space. It cannot be habitable space as defined by the Land Management Code and applicable to any project. That would be reviewed with the final design. Mr. Harrington stated that the concept was to allow connectivity between two buildings that could double as an exterior year-round capability. Commissioner Thomas clarified that from a building permit point of view, that space would be delineated as non-habitable. It would be identified in the plans and Code enforced.

Commissioner Savage stated that if the atrium was something the applicant wanted to do, he personally was open to the idea of considering two atriums if it is consistent with whatever else the Planning Commissions wants incorporated into the plan. Commissioner Thomas understood that in terms of this particular process, the Planning Commission may not see delineated elevations.

Director Eddington asked if the Planning Commission wanted to see a prototype buildings and story boards to get an idea of materials and how they work together. He believed they had a good understanding of the hotel ownership and how it might play out, but not so much with the other buildings. He suggested a prototype of one building because doing it for all the buildings might be too overwhelming considering the time constraint.

Commissioner Worel was concerned about the size of the guard booth and asked if it was so small that the square footage was insignificant. Mr. Pilman replied that the guard booth was approximately 5 'x 10'.

Director Eddington referred to page 6 and asked if Building 8 was the only green roof building. Mr. Pilman stated that there was a green roof on Building 8 and a green roof element on Building 6, which is the sound effect stage. The roof on the stage would also be a green roof.

Chair Wintzer clarified that the green roof on Building 6 was the little brown roof on the lower side. Mr. Pilman replied that there would be a green roof piece on that section because the other roof is up higher. Chair Wintzer asked about 1C. Mr. Pilman stated that it would be another green roof that is sloped back to mitigate the impacts. Director Eddington asked if there was any reason to look at a green roof on 7A. It was not part of the SR248 architectural zone, but as a buffer to the studio. Mr. Pilman replied that 7, 7A and 7B are the three elements of Building 7. In looking at the 3-D massing on page 6, 7A was the closest and that piece should mitigate the impact of the main box of Building 7. He noted that 7B was the smaller two-story element that runs along the front as well, and also helps to break up the massing. Director Eddington asked if 7A should be a green roof because it is close to the property line and to the Highway 40 right-of-way. Mr. Geroux was unsure if the roof would be visible from the highway. Commissioner Thomas concurred with Director Eddington and thought it would be worthwhile to consider. Mr. Geroux offered to do that study.

Commissioner Hontz referred to page 28 and asked for the linear feet of fence. Mr. Pilman did not have that number and offered to provide that calculation. Commissioner Hontz asked Mr. Pilman to include the square feet and acres of parking. In her opinion, the acreage of parking appeared to be the same as the open space. Commissioner Hontz recalled from the last meeting that over 900 parking stalls were proposed; as opposed to the 1,000 plus showing this evening. Mr. Pilman

replied that the number of parking stall had not increased. Regardless of which number was accurate, Commissioner Hontz thought there was too much surface parking. She noted that when the hospital across the street wanted that amount of parking, it had to be structured or garaged. She believed that could also be accomplished for this proposal. Commissioner Hontz pointed out that per the agreements, the Planning Commission did not have to approve that much parking or fencing. She personally dislikes parking and fencing equally, and she was not in favor of the 9-foot wildlife fence along the perimeter of the property. If there was a definite need for the amount of fencing proposed, it needed to be stated; otherwise, she would prefer a smaller secure area and less fencing.

Commissioner Hontz commented on the parked trailers and the amount of generators, pollution and noise that would be generated on this site. Commissioner Hontz was still concerned about the three ingress and egress points. If this moves forward, she would recommend conditions for restricting how those were utilized. She concurred with Chair Wintzer's concern about traffic backup into the site at the first entry coming off Highway 40 and out of SR248. She found it completely unacceptable.

Chair Wintzer felt it was important to see a parking plan showing the exit/entrance from each entrance point so they can understand left and right turns and traffic patterns. That is the fastest way out of town and he was concerned about impacts from people making left and right turns in the wrong places.

Commissioner Thomas favored the security fence shown on the upper left of page 29. It was simple, clean and minimalist. The other fences were too overpowering and would draw more attention. Chair Wintzer concurred.

Commissioner Hontz thought the picture Commissioner Thomas referred to was a nice picture and she questioned whether it would look that nice in reality. Commissioner Thomas stated that the picture was the fence going into Whistler and he has personally seen it. Commissioner Strachan has also seen the fence in person and he thought the photo was shorter than 9-feet. Commissioner Strachan thought the fence could be similar to the fence that was installed two years ago on I-80 going up Parley's to keep the deer off the road. Mr. Rosecrans stated that the fence up I-80 was the standard 8-feet required by UDOT for fencing along highways.

Chair Wintzer requested that the IBI Group or the applicant remove some of the pictures and only include what the Planning Commission was willing to consider for review. Chair Wintzer also expressed an interest in having a wood fence in front of the taller fence. Mr. Pilman referred to page 28 and noted that the yellow squiggly lines were wood fences that would help distract from the security fencing.

Director Eddington asked if the Planning Commission wanted to address the issue of too much parking. He suggested that there may be an opportunity for a parking reduction with the ability to phase in additional parking if necessary. Commissioner Thomas was interested in looking at a parking reduction.

Commissioner Hontz believed the comments from the Planning Commission and the public at the last meeting was enough to indicate their objection to the amount of parking. She was surprised that the applicant had not taken that direction.

Director Eddington asked if the Planning Commission wanted the Staff to work with the applicant on reducing a percentage of the parking on the perimeter and move forward from there. Commissioner Strachan believed the applicant was required to mitigate the parking per the settlement agreement. He thought the parking should be cut by at least a third. If they lobby the State for an underground parking structure and it is approved, but they already put in the parking fields, they would be stuck with it and it would defeat their lobbying efforts. Commissioner Strachan recommended that they limit the applicant to very little parking at the outset to give them an incentive to lobby in good faith for underground parking. If that fails, they could come back and request additional parking.

Chair Wintzer thought it was difficult to do a parking plan without a program of the buildings. Director Eddington summarized that the Planning Commission wanted to see a phasing plan for the buildings, a reduction in parking with the applicant aggressively pursuing a parking structure, and that additional parking could be added if there is no parking structure.

Commissioner Hontz clarified that if the settlement agreement specified a certain number of spaces, she did not want to give a false expectations that additional parking would be granted for no reason. There would need to be another give for the City besides structured parking.

Planner Whetstone reviewed a sheet handed out at the last meeting that talks about the buildings, square footage and uses. It was not included in the current packet, but for the next meeting the Staff would include a planning review of the LMC, with a recommendation on reducing the parking.

Chair Wintzer noted that the Planning Commission had previously discussed that the LMC parking requirements were on the heavy side and they should relook at the requirement for a possible reduction. For this proposal, he suggested a plan with a parking reduction, and another drawing showing future parking if needed, with the burden on the applicant to demonstrate a needed at that time. Director Eddington stated that the Staff would work with the applicant on a parking reduction.

Commissioner Thomas referred to the diagrams of the zones on page 33 and presumed they would begin to attach vernaculars to each of the zones. He requested more specificity to the sketches on page 36. Commissioner Thomas liked the image sketches on page 35, however, he was concerned that the stainless steel reflective element would not work for this community.

Chair Wintzer stated that typically movie studio sets are cheap industrial looking buildings. He felt that was the area where they needed to pay the most attention. It is the largest building and would not want to see a 60-foot stucco building with no breaks. He believed that would be the hardest area to make look good within their budget. Commissioner Strachan pointed out that if the studio ever leaves, the town would not want to be left with 375,000 square feet of cheap looking buildings.

Chair Wintzer noted that due to the imposed time frame, the next meeting would be the last meeting on this proposal. He suggested that they concentrate on the studio area and let the Staff deal with the

other areas and the hotel. He asked the IBI Group to come back at the next meeting with ideas for the studio area. The Commissioners concurred. Chair Wintzer wanted to see the buildings, building materials, massing and a wall section.

Commissioner Thomas stated that based on his meetings with the applicant he believed they were going in the right direction, but it was now time to delineate and hold that accountable to the project.

Mr. Pilman thought they were scheduled to meet with the Planning Commission on April 11th and 25th. Director Eddington replied that they could meet on April 25th if they needed that time. Planner Whetstone stated that the Staff plans to come back with a draft ordinance on April 25th with the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Savage commented on existing buildings in the area and how they relate in size to the building in the proposed project. As an example, he asked the Staff to place an overlay of the hospital on the site plan to visually show how the building sizes compare.

Commissioner Hontz referred to pages 36, 37 and 38 and stated that she liked the contemporary feel, the materials, and the design elements shown on those pages. She would like to see more usage of materials that rust or are already rusted. However she cautioned them on how and where to use those materials because sometimes it can look dirty rather than authentic. An example was photo #6 on page 38.

Chair Wintzer referred to page 37, photo 6, and recommended not using corrugated tin as an element on a building that size. Commissioner Thomas thought there could be a way to break down those elevations with a delineation of materials.

Commissioner Savage stated that as he studied the plans and looked at the images, a principle concern was more about what it looks like from the periphery of the project rather than from the inside. He agreed that the view corridor perspectives were particularly important. Commissioner Savage encouraged the applicant to do whatever they could to help the Planning Commission feel comfortable that the view would actually be what the architectural features look like. The better he understands, the more comfortable he would feel about the game plan. Commissioner Savage reiterated his earlier comment regarding a heightened level of sensitivity for reaching out to Park City Heights. Even if Park City Heights is not actively involved, he thought it would be appropriate for them to see view corridors based upon the view from within the Park City Heights development. Commissioner Savage encouraged a heavy emphasis on the landscaping plan. He looks at landscaping from three perspectives; 1) the density of the plantings; 2) size of the plantings; and 3) whether it seems plush or desert like. He noted that the area is very dry and native plants are ugly grass and sagebrush. He believed that berming could provide a buffer that would eliminate many of the negative aspects associated with such a large complex. Commissioner Savage particularly emphasized a landscape buffer as screening from the I-40 corridor. Commissioner Savage supported the comment from Sally Warren to meet with a consultant to talk about real activities within a film studio and a logistical overview of the nature of the commerce that would take place at the development over a 12 month period. Following that, it would be interesting to relate the spread sheet reviewed at the last meeting to the operational plan and take a fresh look at the parking to determine the correct number of spaces.

Commissioner Savage stated that he did not attend the last meeting, but he thought the IBI Group had made tremendous progress compared to where they were at the first meeting. He appreciated their intentions and the effort to work hand in glove with what goes on in the Quinn's Junction area.

Mr. Pilman remarked that Raleigh Studios, would be the best group to respond to the questions regarding logistics, since they would be operating the facility. He could ask them to attend a meeting or submit an explanation in writing. Commissioner Strachan thought it would be better if they could attend a meeting to answer questions. Chair Wintzer preferred to have the City get an outside party involved rather than someone from the studio trying to sell their project.

Commissioner Thomas referred to page 38, photo #3. He and Commissioner Hontz liked the feel and how the elevation was broken up. They would like to see that on the large scale building.

Mr. Pilman responded to questions raised this evening. In term of light, his understanding was that Raleigh would like to provide as minimal lighting as the Code would require, particularly for the parking areas. They were comfortable turning off the lights when areas are not being used. They would work with the City on providing the minimal amount of lighting allowed.

Chair Wintzer favored whatever they could do to reduce the lighting.

Mr. Pilman stated that the intention is to comply with the dark sky policy. Nothing would shine up and everything would be screened and cut off. Low lighting levels was their preference.

Mr. Pilman commented on the sound issue. He confirmed with the operators of the hotel and events that they would comply with Park City's 10:00 p.m. noise ordinance. In most cases events would close down earlier than 10:00 p.m.

Regarding the parking, Mr. Pilman explained that due to time constraints, they parking plan showed all the contemplated parking. If they can work with the City and obtain State funding, the idea is to reduce the on-site, at-grade parking and replace it with structured parking.

Planner Whetstone referred to page 51 and the question of whether the Planning Commission was interested in assigning a Commissioner to be liaison during the administrative CUP review process. The role of the liaison would be to provide communication between the Staff and the Planning Commission. Chair Wintzer supported the idea of a liaison. He would like two people to be the liaison and suggested Commissioner Thomas because of his architectural knowledge and Commissioner Hontz because of her planning skills. Commissioners Thomas and Hontz accepted the position of liaisons.

The Planning Commission discussed timing and whether they would need to further discuss this item on April 25th. City Attorney Harrington stated that the Staff envisioned the meeting on April 11th to be more of a work session where the Planning Commission could formulate their recommendation to the City Council instead of just reacting to the Staff findings. They would also have the opportunity to review the story boards and additional requested information from the

applicant. The meeting on April 25th would be their last meeting and he would like it to be for public hearing and action.

Director Eddington summarized that on April 11th they would focus on some design, but primarily on recommendation, conditions, findings, etc.

Chair Wintzer understood that they were working under a different General Plan than the current General Plan. He asked the Staff to make sure every Commissioner had a copy of the prior General Plan. City Attorney Harrington clarified that the settlement agreement dealt with the prior General Plan, but the current LMC applies. He recognized that it was confusing as to how the two documents link. Mr. Harrington noted that the General Plan had not changed since 2004. Chair Wintzer asked if they were using the current LMC and the current General Plan. Mr. Harrington answered yes, with the exception of one change that was made to the map in April 2011 regarding the commercial receiving zone. There have been no other changes to the General Plan.

Commissioner Worel was unable to find language in the LMC that addressed temporary structures. If they intent to build sets on the back lot, she wanted to know the check and balance for that activity. City Attorney Harrington stated that if it was in conjunction with filming, the City would handle that through the filming permit process or special event process. Otherwise, it would be regulated through the Building Code. There were also CUP regulations depending on the activity. Mr. Harrington noted that there are processes in place for temporary events, but he would not be able to delineate them without knowing the activity. Most are governed by LMC provisions. He stated that trailers, generators and noise would be part of the permitted use and not addressed in the LMC, however, the Planning Commission could address those issues with the approval. He believed the program information from the studio would help with those issues.

Commissioner Worel clarified that she was more concerned with structures that might be built. Mr. Harrington replied that the LMC and Building Code regulations address temporary structures.

Commissioner Thomas stated that he previously pushed towards the notion of having pre-wire for trailer hookups. He was now unsure if that was a sustainable choice and thought they may be better off with generators. Chair Wintzer remarked that in the long run, running generators is more expensive that putting in a temporary box and plugging in 20 trailers. Power is also quieter than generators.

Commissioner Thomas stated that the lighting code in the LMC is old and archaic, and they would like to see a lot less lighting that what the LMC suggests. In his experience, lighting and parking have been overwhelming and over sold.

Director Eddington summarized that the Staff would work with the applicant to address a number of design concerns raised this evening and bring back prototypes. The Planning Commission concurred that the studio was more important than the hotel and they would come back with that design information. They would also try to bring back general conditions and findings for discussion. Director Eddington stated that the first half of the meeting on April 11th should focus on design and the second half would look at findings and conditions.

Chair Wintzer wanted sufficient time for the General Plan discussion, because the General Plan is the issue that decides whether or not this project comes into the City.

Commissioner Savage understood that the Planning Commission was engaged in a process to try to provide the applicant with as much input as possible on what would be the best possible MPD under the circumstances. The Planning Commission would then have a separate discussion about General Plan compliance and whether or not they could forward a favorable recommendation to annex. Commissioner Savage remarked that whether they forward a positive or negative recommendation to annex, the City Council still has the authority to make the annexation decision independent of their recommendation. He was told that this was correct. Commissioner Savage stated that should the City Council choose to go forward with the annexation even with a negative recommendation from the Planning Commission, they would at least be well-served by all the good work the Planning Commission did in preparation for that process. Commissioner Savage agreed that the General Plan and the annexation decision were important, but where they could make the best contribution was in their work on the design.

Commissioner Strachan believed it was important for the City Council to be as informed about the General Plan discussion as they were the design discussion. In his view, the General Plan discussion was more important than the design discussion. If the Planning Commission spends a lot of time on design with an unmet assumption that it was not allowed by the General Plan but the City Council can do what they want, he would not want the City Council to vote on its own without input from the Planning Commission regarding the General Plan.

Commissioner Hontz stated that like Commissioner Strachan, she had wanted to start with the General Plan discussion at the first meeting. One issue is that the applicant or the applicant's representative has not attended any of the meetings. It was made clear from the very beginning that the Planning Commission needed to limit their comments and discussion points to things that IBI could take back to the applicant, and that it was outside their representation to be discussing other things. She did not want to waste her time talking to IBI about the number one thing that should be talked about in terms of the role of the Planning Commission. She preferred to wait until the end and spend the entire time talking about what this really means.

Commissioner Strachan stated that the audience is not the applicant. The applicant's intention is manifested in the settlement agreement. He believed the applicant would probably give short shrift to their discussion about the General Plan. It is the City Council that needs to hear it. Commissioner Hontz agreed.

Director Eddington stated that the next meeting would be allocated into three parts; design, findings and conditions, and General Plan. Commissioner Strachan thought the meeting on April 11th should be design and General Plan only. The findings and conditions should take their form on April 25th based on their General Plan discussion. Planner Whetstone stated that the Staff analysis of the General Plan would be provided for discussion at the next meeting.

Commissioner Savage requested the Staff report as early as possible.

Planning Commission Meeting
March 28, 2012
Page 20

Chair Wintzer thanked Sally Warren for attending the public hearing. He is disheartened by how little public input they get. She provided good comments and came with a good attitude. He encouraged her to bring her neighbors next time.

The Park City Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: _____