

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
AUGUST 9, 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; Francisco Astorga, Planner; Hannah Tyler, Planner; Anya Grahn, Planner; Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney, Jody Burnett, Outside Counsel

=====

REGULAR MEETING

**ROLL CALL**

Chair Strachan called the meeting to order at 5:40 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present.

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

July 26, 2017

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to APPROVE the Minutes of June 26, 2017 as written. Commissioner Thimm seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Chair Strachan abstained.

**PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no comments.

**STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES**

There were no comments, reports or disclosures.

**CONTINUATIONS (Public Hearing and Continue to date specified.)**

1. 2428 Iron Mountain Drive- the applicant is proposing to adjust the building pad on Lot 22 of the Iron Canyon Subdivision. The building pad is currently 4,000 square feet modifying to 5,500 sq. ft. (Application PL-17-03574)

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to CONTINUE 2428 Iron Mountain Drive to a date uncertain. Commissioner Suesser seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

## **REGULAR AGENDA - DISCUSSION/PUBLIC HEARINGS/ POSSIBLE ACTION**

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

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

Chair

Strachan: Francisco, what are we going to do tonight?

Planner

Astorga: We are going to present our work plan as outlined in the Staff report, go over some key items, and then allow the applicant to make their presentation.

Chair

Strachan: Great.

Planner

Astorga: As indicated in the Staff report, we also need to have a public hearing for this.

Chair

Strachan: Of course. Yeah. And just from the applicant, how long do you guys think your presentation will take?

Dave

Bennion: Probably 30 to 40.

Chair

Strachan: Okay.

Dave

Bennion: Maybe even a little bit less.

Chair

Strachan: All right. Sounds good.

Planner

Astorga: We, we will go for three minutes.

Chair

Strachan: Okay, counting.

Planner

Astorga: Let's go. So, we received the, I guess I'm calling it the final updated transportation plan as outlined on Page 57. We did, we did receive it in different forms with the appendix, without it. And we did our best to try to review it for, for this meeting as it came in on July 21<sup>st</sup>. All of the traffic studies have been updated on our website. Also hyperlinked on pages 56 and 57 of the Staff report. And in the analysis section of the Staff report, which this report was co-authored by myself, Bruce Erickson, Matt Cassel and Alfred Knotts, the work plan that we tried to outline in the Staff report, other than some other components such as the applicant's traffic demand that was copied and pasted on pages 58 and 59, as well as their traffic mitigation on pages 60, 61 and 62.

The work plan that we tried to create goes like this. Step one, we identify the impacts from the applicant's submittal. Step two, formalize the goals to be achieved to mitigate the impact. The third step, review the applicant's proposed mitigations for ability to achieve the goal. And the fourth item is to consider and formalize qualifying standards by which mitigation can be measured for meeting the established goal. We believe that---we find that this is an appropriate work plan to move forward specifically to the traffic and transportation.

The reason that we have, want to move forward on this specific work plan is because of that, is because of the specific wording that it indicates on Criteria #3, which is traffic considerations.

Some of the other items in the LMC are a little bit more specific than that. I'm going to give you a quick example. Open space. For an MPD it says

60%, and in their case their Master Plan specifically said they had to meet a 70% open space. So in other words, that qualifying standard has already been codified.

The difficulty is that we need to understand what is the specific standard that we need to measure the impacts that the applicant---the measures, the mitigated measures that the applicant is proposing. And that's why we divided into this, this four step approach. And, and that's what we, we did in the Staff report on page 63. We created a Staff first attempt to identify the impacts. And we divided them into two sections: Constructions, which is temporary in nature; and then development, which is the permanent facility.

From that point we moved on to seeing ---or, or checking as we're moving forward with each qualifying standard for each impact that needs to be mitigated. And that's what we did on page 65 through the, I guess the end of the report.

So to wrap up my three minutes. As indicated on page 69, as we have begun to create these mechanisms to implement the applicant's proposed mitigations and prepare the initial draft of the mechanism, referred to as a potential qualifying standard, we're asking you to indicate to see if you concur with the, with the specific outline approach. If we need to take a look at it, I do have one slide ready in power point, so we can go ahead and discuss the four points that we just outlined. But we're just here to answer any other questions that we indicated in the, in the Staff report to move forward on this very important yet complicated item, which is traffic and transportation.

Director  
Erickson:

So, Mr. Chairman, if I might just follow up just a little bit on that. We are developing the impacts from the questions and comments coming from the Planning Commission, and the questions and comments that are showing up in the Staff reports. So I am reviewing all fourteen Staff reports to date. Francisco is reviewing all the Minutes to date to make sure that we include the impacts that are being identified by both the public and the Planning Commission on each one of the 15 conditional use requirements. So that's the process going forward. I think you'll find it easier tonight as the City Engineer and the Transportation Manager talk about transportation. It will move roughly the focus away from whether the number is six trips or ten trips into identifying what the impacts of those trips are and what the goals of the

mitigation can be. And so that's the strategy we're putting forward this evening.

Chair

Strachan: And is it your intention to carry over that process into the other CUP criteria?

Planner

Astorga: It, it is.

Director

Erickson: It is.

Planner

Astorga: And, and some of the other impact, not impacts, but items listed in 15-1-10, some of the other items are easier to, to qualify that standard.

Chair

Strachan: Well, some are going to double qualify. You know, one impact might fit into two or three different criteria.

Planner

Astorga: You're right.

Director

Erickson: Or the, the impact might be identified, and then the potentially qualifying standards might fit under two or three of the criteria.

Chair

Strachan: And how are you going to choose which box you put it in?

Director

Erickson: Let me see which issue comes up. So height, bulk and scale, for example, setbacks, all those things, that potentially qualified standard in the current drafts may end up more than once.

Chair

Strachan: Yep.

Director

Erickson: And then as we move forward in the process and the Planning Commission is comfortable with how the standard is achieving the goal and whether the

standard is measurable going forward and manageable going forward, then we'll cut and paste the ones out that we don't need anymore.

But I think that's what we're asking the Planning Commission to do is measurable and achievable potentially qualifying standards. And so the idea, I don't know if you saw it in the packet, was we could be bringing forward these standards and measurements earlier in the process, rather than waiting for the last Staff report of the last Planning Commission meeting of the last day of the last year of the apocalypse. And then you have to negotiate conditions. So that's why we applied this process to the system. Thank you.

Chair

Strachan: I think you'll probably have a number of questions about that, right?

Commissioner

Joyce: Yeah, just---can you help me? I, I tried to understand it. I crawled through it all and I was going, starting on page 63, and I thought I kind of got the idea of here's an impact, here's potential qualifying standards, and here's the goal. And then I got to page 65 and it felt somewhat repetition but not quite. And it almost felt like two people tried to tackle the same problem and came up with a little different answers or something. But I, so can you explain to me the stuff that starts on page 63 versus the stuff that starts on page 65?

Planner

Astorga: Absolutely. The, the first section on 63 is just an outline. We thought it would be easier to break it down in an outline form, while the second one we add additional specifics, detailed qualifying standards.

Commissioner

Joyce: So, I'll offer to you that just to make life easier for discussion, there's, there's really like some of the ones, like starting on page 65, they say Impact T1. And there is no such thing as Impact T1 before. And I kind of wondered whether you were trying to tie back. But then even the bullets don't tie back. The, the language isn't the same between the two. So if you were trying to kind of do an outline and then do the detail version, I'll say, it looks like somebody different did the outline and the person doing the detailed version didn't look at the outline or something. 'Cause it, it doesn't look like just a filled in thing. There's---

Director

Erickson: We, we will admit to some editorial rush trying in trying to get these standard points out.

Commissioner

Joyce: I, I can understand that. I just---if, if we're going to get---I would prefer to have one thing. And, you know, you can put it in a nice hierarchical format so it's easy for us to follow along and figure out, you know, what---sub-bullets of what kind of thing. But it just kind of confused me a lot more than helped me. And if, if the wording had been exactly the same I would have understood, I think, but it wasn't. So I didn't.

Planner

Francisco: Okay. Noted.

Commissioner

Joyce: Second piece is---I, I think this is a great way to go about doing this, at least for, for me as to start getting to some specifics quickly. There's a lot of stuff. I mean, there's, you know, pages of this that need to be discussed and honed down for, for just traffic. I mean, we spent months on other topics. There's a lot of things that were unresolved. I'm concerned, we've had the applicant tell us, and I, I haven't heard anything different yet, that come September we'll get the notification that within 45 days, you know, we have to render a vote. I'm worried that if we're trying to really craft, correct conditions of approval for a finished document for a vote that I would be comfortable voting in favor of, we have a huge, huge amount of work to do. And really, we only have, you know, effectively two more Treasure meetings the way they are scheduled. So I would offer that we either ought to be looking at---assuming that we're still going to go for the same dates that we've heard kind of thrown out there, we ought to be thinking about having more Treasure meetings between now and then. Whether they're supplement meetings or Treasure is both meetings of the month or whatever. Or somehow we get more material that we have to process offline or whatever. But I just don't see how we get from here to there in 45 days from September or whatever.

Planner

Astorga: Yeah, I think that's a discussion that we need to have more so with the applicant, specifically regarding to their vote now clause that they can enact.

So we'll, we'll go from there. We'll work internally to see if we can come up with an appropriate calendar for, for the appropriateness.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay.

Planner

Astorga: I agree with you with, with the number of meetings that we have left to get it all done.

Commissioner

Joyce: Yeah.

Planner

Astorga: So unless we hire Flash Gordon to come up and do some very fast work it's going to be very difficult. You're right.

Commissioner

Joyce: All right.

Director

Erickson: But our schedule for the completion of the review, like we talked about last meeting, between Francisco and I and all the Staff reports, all the Minutes and all the bullet points is to be done by 30 August.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay.

Director

Erickson: So in preparation for the September meeting. So, depending on how we go on transportation this evening, then we'll be bringing back the next issues. So that's our current scheduling. As Francisco says, we need to have a chat with the applicant. Have a conversation with the City Attorney's Office and make sure we're catching all the points. But I, I do not want to get to the end and have to negotiate 500 points on the last minute of the last day.

Chair

Strachan: Jody, where does that put you?

Jody

Burnett: I, I, I think that we need to open that possibility. And I'm very conscious. I think as much as anything, Commissioner Joyce is talking about your opportunity as a Commission to process and review and come to a consensus on issues above and beyond whatever the Staff and applicant are presenting. But in order to do that we probably do need to have a conversation with the applicant and find out what their thoughts are on that, because the challenge is for both the applicant and the Staff to have sufficient time to meaningfully respond to whatever input they get at this meeting for the next one. And it's been challenging enough as it is to do that within a month. But we could probably, once we get that complete, draft a list of issues. I think---my personal view is it would be most helpful, once we get to that point and you really have something to work on, and maybe one of those is a work meeting, separate independent from a public hearing, and input from applicant and Staff. Kind of separating the process that way. But I think we will need more information before we can probably meaningfully do that.

Chair

Strachan: And I guess a more specific questions is, you know, if they've got, if they pull the ripcord and then there's 45 days, and it's possible that you know, we'll all still have issues and questions up in the air that just are not resolved. Either the evidence hasn't been provided to us or we don't agree with the evidence, or just a unanimous consensus has not been reached one way or the other as to some, you know, either large or minute issue. Where does that, does that bring the train to a screeching halt, or can you draft conditions and findings despite that.

Jody

Burnett: I think we could probably get over that hurdle. I mean, I'm obviously hopeful that we won't reach that point. And of course, that's up to the applicant on where they pull so-called ripcord, and if so and when. But I certainly think---I, I certainly understand what Commissioner Joyce is saying. And I can understand, given the volume of material that's been presented, that as a Commission, you'll need some time to review and consider everything and try to come to a consensus on a decision above and beyond that point when we've completed a review of all the CUP criteria.

Commissioner

Joyce: And I know at least one of us up here has lots of opinions and comments. So.

Chair

Strachan: And I think there's more than one. All right. Well, we will eagerly await the discussion between the Staff and Council and the applicant as to the timeline on that.

Jody

Burnett: Yeah. I mean, I certainly think by the September, what is it, the September 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, wherever we are on that, that hopefully we can come back with a proposal. Ideally, one that has been vetted with the applicant and they're on Board with, but at least our respective viewpoints and a proposal on how to try and strike a balance there.

Chair

Strachan: Okay. All right.

Commissioner

Thimm: A Question.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah.

Commissioner

Thimm: So there, there have been months of---

Director

Erickson: 14 meetings.

Commissioner

Thimm: Okay, there have been 14 meetings. Okay, sorry, of, of commentary and that sort of thing that have gone on. Does the schedule allow time for the applicant to come back and address the comments and provide a meaningful alternative plan or study that addresses those comments?

Jody

Burnett: Well, I certainly think that's an opportunity. And, and I think they're anticipating that a working kind of on a similar track to what is Staff is. I don't want to speak for them, but I think they're trying to make a similar effort to address the issues that have been raised, questions that have been raised by the Commission, and come back with that. I'll let them address when they feel like they're prepared to do that. But yes, I am aware that they're

certainly anticipating and hoping to have that kind of an opportunity as part of the schedule we're talking about.

Commissioner

Thimm: Okay. I mean, there's, there's been serious commentary and I guess for me and perhaps for all of us, we expect, I think, serious response.

Chair

Strachan: I would agree with that. All right. Well, we'll see how it unfolds. Okay. Mr. Knotts and Mr. Cassel?

Commissioner

Band: Sorry, I have just a couple of questions for Francisco. So, Francisco, on page 64 under impacts and deliveries it states, "from 7:00 a.m. to noon; 9:00 to 2:00 during the ski season." And then 67 says "10:00 to 2:00 from November 16<sup>th</sup>." I mean, I know they're two different sections, so is that because one of them is during construction and the other one is permanent? Are you changing those hours or was that, was somebody trying to say that, oh, 10:00 is better than 9:00 and it just didn't get changed in both sections?

Planner

Astorga: I think we're going to let Mr. Cassel address that one. So we're talking about development impact.

Commissioner

Band: Impacts from deliveries.

Planner

Astorga: Deliveries on page 64.

Commissioner

Band: 64. And then if you go to 67. On 64 it's got 9:00 to 2:00 during the ski season, and on 67 it's got 10:00 to 2:00.

Director

Erickson: I think, I think we had a comment on our Staff review that 9:00 a.m. during the ski season is skier arrival time. So Francisco, I think picked it up---

Commissioner

Band: I wholeheartedly agree. That's why---

Director

Erickson: On the second one and missed it on the first one.

Commissioner

Band: Okay.

Matt

Cassel: Right. That's just it.

Commissioner

Band: Okay. I was---that was my question and my comment.

Director

Erickson: Yeah, we caught that one. We're not going to schedule deliveries during peak arrival hour.

Commissioner

Band: Okay.

Director

Erickson: Or that's what we're proposing in terms of a potentially qualifying standard.

Commissioner

Band: And if I were allowed to make a comment on this 7:00 a.m. in the summer. I mean, if I lived in Old Town I'd be pretty bummed if somebody was rolling up at 7:00. I think 8:00 reasonable. I don't know if---I know there is Main Street and there are other things that qualify. That's just a comment.

And the other question, and this is just more of my own curiosity. So, on point 8, page 59, you talk about the applicant proposes less than 7,000 square feet of employee housing, but it's estimated that the project generates, will generate 300 to 500 employees; 100 to 300 per shift. Again, this is just a question. If someone were to try and house their entire work force on site, which obviously we don't expect, what's the calculation.

Director

Erickson: The calculation would be a percentage of the work force on site like we do with the Empire Pass MPD. Park City Mountain Resort has a requirement for 20%.

Commissioner

Band: Sure. No, I just, I'm curious. What's the calculation per employee to square foot?

Director

Erickson: Well, like---per employee to square foot?

Commissioner

Band: Sure.

Director

Erickson: So those numbers came out of the employee generation survey that we conducted to get our new employee affordable housing resolution in place. So they actually surveyed, I can't remember the number. They surveyed a number of the employers in the City to determine the number of employees per square footage. And then we have a ratio of seven or eight occupational types. So for example, a restaurant generates about seven employees per square foot. Nightly rentals that are not hotel have a different number. Hotels are about half of an employee per square foot. So you could look in the housing resolution, and we'll share that calculation with you, but that's how that 300 to 600 was. We vetted it against the Summit County 2016-2017 employee generation study for the Canyons just to make sure we had reasonable alignments between the two generation studies. And the original generation study that was done in '99 compared it to seven or eight other resort towns in terms of generation. So that's where those per square foot number come from.

Commissioner

Band: Okay, but I mean, for 7,000 square feet, how many employees will that house?

Planner

Astorga: It depends on the housing type.

Director

Erickson: Well, 7,000 square feet divided by 800 square feet per unit is nine. Did I get that about right? And if you put two employees in each unit you've got 18. So it's not much.

Commissioner

Band: Okay. Okay. Just a---

Director

Erickson: How did I do?

Commissioner

Band: Like I said, I was just curious 'cause it said, you know---

Director

Erickson: All right, but that's, that's---

Commissioner

Band: You know, less than 7,000---

Director

Erickson: So the, the housing resolution would control how that roughly 7,000 square feet is allocated. And then we'd review it for which employees we were dealing with. If we were dealing with an on-site manager, for example, that might be a different number. But this is the first time you've seen an employee generation calculation from us. And the numbers are consistent with what we're seeing throughout the town.

Commissioner

Band: Okay. No, I was just trying to understand when it stated that only 7,000 square feet is proposed for employees, and it talked about how many employees would be needed, how, approximately, how many of those employees are able to be housed.

Director

Erickson: And I, and I think you're making a good point in that this is why we're doing the, the qualifying standards and the impact. The applicant has not precisely identified the impact of employee generation in accordance with the CUP criteria. So the Staff has taken the applicant's information and identified the impact as 300 to 500. All right. So that, that's how this system works at this point. So there you go.

Commissioner

Band: That's just what I wanted to kind of wrap my arm around.

Director

Erickson: And thank you, Francisco.

Commissioner

Band: All right. Thank you.

Commissioner

Joyce: And just for what it's worth, I mean, the numbers they had, there was also just a little inconsistency you guys need to clear up, but they talked about dorm style housing for that 7,000 feet. And in the traffic study they said they would house 25 people. And in the parking study it said it would house 30.

Commissioner

Band: No, right. I saw all that, but, you know.

Director

Erickson: Right.

Commissioner

Band: I wondered what, what's the calculation. How many square feet are we talking per person?

Director

Erickson: Depending on how the housing resolution is applied and how we vary the housing types.

Commissioner

Band: Thank you.

Chair

Strachan: All right. Any more questions before we---

Commissioner

Joyce: I---so I don't know how you wanted to tackle this. I had a bunch of comments and questions along these five or six pages. Do you want to do them now, do you want to do them further down or---

Chair

Strachan: Yeah. I don't know whether Alfred or Matt have anything more to add.

Planner

Astorga: They're just going to answer questions.

Chair

Strachan: They just are here to answer questions? Great. Okay. So yeah, let's---I mean to the extent they're just questions, great. But remember, public comment hasn't occurred yet.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay.

Chair

Strachan: So differentiate between comments versus questions.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay. I guess this is a request, which is, when I'm sitting looking at the construction mitigation, just like you did an employee estimate of how many people would be showing up for, for shift, I would like to see some estimate, we've asked for this at least once before, of what the flow of construction workers looks like. So when we look at some peak construction time, are we talking about, you know, 25 people or 250 people, or 2,000 people. You know, how many people are showing up on that work site. Because I don't know how to tackle some of the issues of, you know, people bringing their tools and stuff. You know, if it's three guys in a pickup truck it's not a problem. But I don't think that's what we're expecting.

Planner

Astorga: And that's a request for the applicant, right? Obviously, that's a request for the applicant.

Commissioner

Joyce: Yes.

Planner

Astorga: To provide that information.

Commissioner

Joyce: Well, I'll, I'll go back to kind of what we've done with the employee generation. I, we've asked the applicant for that before, but we're getting to the point where we're starting to have to make some decisions. So if you guys can bring us a number that would be great. If not, I'd ask Staff to give

us their best swag. I mean, we've got other big projects that have been done, like the St. Regis and the Montage. So, I mean, we know things that have been built around here and ought to be able to, to come up with something.

Matt

Cassel: So in, in the qualifying standards that we've set, I think we posted one of those is all employees to be shuttled to the site. So if we answer that question, we'd want to be able to answer a little bit differently how many shuttles during peak season are there. Because our goal, as qualifying standards is to keep all employees from driving to the site.

Commissioner

Joyce: Right. And you guys actually mentioned in here things like, if you were counting on the Park City Transit System handling that versus private shuttles, if there's an impact to transit. Well, again, if it's three guys it's not a problem. If it's 3,000 then it's, you know, we can't handle it. And we don't know where they're coming from anyway. So, yeah. So between applicant and Staff I'd like to, to see some numbers. And I think there's enough history out there that that's not, you know, rocket science or whatever.

Kind of along those lines, do we know for the Montage and the St. Regis, since they were kind of our benchmarks when we were doing similar size projects, did they shuttle all of their employees up? I know Richardson Flat got built for the Empire Pass project, but was, what were the constraints of that if you know offhand?

Matt

Cassel: Montage created a parking area just west of Richardson Flat, and that's where they parked theirs. And they were all shuttled from that point.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay. And do you know about---

Matt

Cassel: Mostly were shuttled from that point.

Commissioner

Joyce: And do we know about the St. Regis?

Director

Erickson: St. Regis was up from the Wasatch County side.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, they were staged out of Jordanelle.

Director

Erickson: And that was that whole Deer Crest disconnect discussion we went through before.

Commissioner

Joyce: Yeah.

Director

Erickson: So the St. Regis construction employees were required to come up from the Wasatch County side.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay. Comments. Let me just look for questions. Oh, sorry to open this one up, but it hit some many places. There was a lot of discussion back in like 2004-2009 about traffic kinds of things of where traffic would flow. Did it go up Empire, did it go up Lowell and Manor, and how those roads either would or wouldn't be widened. And snow storage. And there were all sorts of alternatives for, you know, do we do cutouts and what do we do about speed, all this kind of stuff. And we seemed to have lost that completely in any discussions we have had over our brief 14 meetings that we've had. I, I can't understand---it looks like we're routing construction traffic up Manor and Lowell, but we haven't talked about how to actually stop them from going back down Empire. But all the traffic study stuff for the kind of steady state development side of things seems to be 50/50 between Lowell and Empire. Where are we? And that could be Staff or applicant. I don't care. I just, we haven't talked about this in a long time, and it seems to be left out of all this transportation stuff.

Matt

Cassel: Construction was identified to come up Lowell, so one of the qualifying standards is whether that come up through Manor or Lowell to Silver King. How that route would be. It's of the standards that needs to be identified, and it has yet to be identified. So, what we did was try to set some standards of what we think needs to happen.

As for complete development and which roads they would use, in 2009 we were starting to go down a road of restricting all traffic going to Lowell Avenue. I believe the MPD, though, allows them to use Empire and Lowell as access and egress from Treasure. So, we haven't had a lot of discussion on that. I think as everyone looked and modeled, ran the scenarios, it was with eyes open that it would be both Empire and Lowell.

Commissioner

Joyce: So, I guess I'll go back and ask from a traffic standpoint, from your perspective. All of their modeling was 50/50, but one of the concerns that came up was, if you take Lowell and Manor, you basically have two stop signs you have to go through. And if you take Empire you make a right turn out of the, the hotel and you just go straight through.

Matt

Cassel: Yeah.

Commissioner

Joyce: So it's not going to take a rocket scientist to put, you know, 80 or 90% of the traffic down Empire, 'cause why not. It's the straightforward easy way and you don't have to wait at stop signs for all the other traffic. Are you guys comfortable that they modeled everything 50/50 for the Lowell Empire split? I just can't imagine it actually working out that way.

Matt

Cassel: We haven't been extremely concerned about how its split. I mean, I think from all the traffic analysis that has been done, we can definitely say there's impacts to both streets. And so we've kind of done it more wide-eyes open as what those impacts are. And what you'll see in, in Francisco's report, is at the ends of those roads you start seeing the impacts. Lowell and Silver King fails. Silver King and Empire fails. And those are where we start seeing the need to make changes.

Commissioner

Joyce: So, but Lowell, Lowell and Empire up at the higher end don't seem to have much problem. I mean, as you start getting down to Manor they start picking up issues. But if, if I was correct in my made up assumption that all of a sudden two stop signs, no stop sign; 80-90% of the people are going to take the no stop sign approach. Do you start---does that change your numbers?

I mean, I know you've got problems at, at Silver King and Empire, but if you took either Lowell or Empire and basically doubled their traffic counts, does that become an issue.

Matt

Cassel: It does not. As the traffic analysis is done, as models are set up, they try to factor in influences of things like stop signs, backed up traffic. And what people do when they come into situations, they try to go down alternate streets, they reroute themselves. They don't do a great job of it but when you model it you, you, the models themselves try to take into account people's decision making.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay, I guess the biggest---

Matt

Cassel: And it's not perfect.

Commissioner

Joyce: Well, then let me just throw this into the next one, because there was a question or a comment made about the Old Town, an Old Town street having a capacity of 2500 cars per day. And that's when we start getting into the discussion of are we only looking at traffic studies at intersections or are we actually looking at all the issues that Empire and Lowell have of, you know, in the winter becoming virtually one-lane roads. Now it seems to me that if you told me you were going to double the traffic rate that you are putting out onto Empire, I, I don't understand anything you just said about it won't have much impact because people will adjust. I mean, can you imagine Lowell if all of a sudden, even with today's traffic, you doubled it.

Matt

Cassel: No, the, the traffic models. When I say their adjusting, people make decisions as they're going down a road, so the models themselves try to factor in whether they're going to take Lowell or Empire. They don't just sit there and plug in a number and say 50/50. They will, they will play around and try to make those work and, and see how they work and operate. As you said, our maximum capacity on our local streets is 2500 average annual daily traffic, or trips. And that's a number that we look at just to make sure that as the trips are going up, that we don't trip over to minor collector or major collector, or a bigger road.

Commissioner

Joyce: Like Crescent Tram or something like that?

Matt

Cassel: Right. And so we have to look at---and so when we did that, as a matter of fact, we sat there and took---before we started Lowell Avenue, reconstruction of it, we took into consideration the possibility of Treasure, the Bamberger property, you know, 100% buildout, and what would those trips look like and where would those trips go. And the scenarios we ran were 100% on Lowell or 100% on Empire or a split. And all three scenarios came back with streets that don't get to capacity. Now, we know that there are impacts. And that's one of the impact we have as part of development is number of trips increasing on those streets, and so we have an increase in traffic, an increase in trips impact, but the streets are designed for that high level of trips.

Commissioner

Joyce: So I, I guess, I, I understand that. When I look at the numbers and I, I'm sorry I don't have the right table just sitting here. When I look at the numbers at peak hours at like Lowell and Manor and stuff, it looks to me like you're going to exceed 2500. Of course, you're only looking at one thing that says peak hours, so you're having to kind of stretch out and make some inferences. If you guys are convinced that we're not going to see 2500 cars, could you include that in our next package as to what you, how you came up with your conclusions and, and what you think that number is. Because me just looking and using pure gut instinct, it didn't seem to, to fit with that. It seemed to blow way past that. And again, I'm just having to kind of infer numbers out from peak hours that are reported here.

Director

Erickson: Yeah, those are two different numbers Steve.

Commissioner

Joyce: I know.

Director

Erickson: Right? And so---

Commissioner

Joyce: Oh, I know. But, but we, we're not, we got a thing that said here's this important capacity issue, and I've been trying to get my hands around how

do you deal with not the intersections of Lowell and Manor, but how do you deal with Lowell and Empire and the catastrophes that they already are. And I was trying to find some quantitative way to look at that. And the only thing I saw was this kind of 2500 number for an Old Town street, but then I didn't see either in the traffic study or anything that Staff provided, anything kind of matching up to that. It was just kind of like here, here's an important number and we're not going to tell you where we stand against that.

Matt  
Cassel:

When we put the impacts together, where we tried to address that is operational impacts from the long-term development. And so, so I think as you read through that, where we focused on were winter months when the roads are compromised because of snow storage. Maybe we can all agree, maybe not, that the roads during the summertime are adequate for the amount of traffic that potentially are going to be on them, and are inadequate during the winter months when there's snow taking up half of the road. And so that's why---where we tried to direct the impacts to how people are moving on the streets is toward those winter months when we do realize we have substandard streets because of snow storage.

Commissioner

Joyce: I, I guess the, the thing that I'm left hanging on is, if they do the mitigations that you guys have outlined here for the winter months, are we still---and I'll just make up things. Are we---after that mitigation are we now at 500 of our 2500 cars, or are we at 5,000 of our 2500 cars. Because the answer is, you may have cut it back, but if you cut it back from 10,000 to 5,000 I'm still concerned. And, and again, I just don't, I don't know 'cause we don't have any numbers that match that. And I'll go back to both the applicant and Staff here. You, you understand our concern that all of this traffic study stuff is aimed at intersections, and I got that. But that's not the expected problem that we're really going to end up dealing with. It's those two substandard streets. And so if you can give us something better than that 2500 number to help us get comfortable after the mitigations, I'm fine. I'm just looking for something, and that was the only little glimmer of hope I had from, from going through this.

Matt  
Cassel:

So one of the things, and maybe this would help because it's a thought that we've had and discussed and we haven't flushed it out, is right now on Lowell just from traffic counts, we're probably at 400 average annual daily trips.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay.

Matt

Cassel: And our thought in our mind is do we cap that. Do we come up with a number? Is it a 1,000, is it 1200, is it 800? Do we put a number to that, which would then get you to are, are we within the standards of that street? And so that's been a Staff discussion, but we haven't taken that too far down the road, yet.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay. Well, I don't know what my fellow Commissioners think about that one.

Matt

Cassel: Why don't we save that for after public comment. And recall that the applicant, too, has a presentation that needs to unfold.

Commissioner

Joyce: I think that's it for me.

Chair

Strachan: Okay. David?

David

Bennion: Good evening. David Bennion for applicant, MPE. Sean Ferrin is stuck in Denver and regrets missing this meeting terribly. Just want to introduce what we have for presentation tonight, and then make one---address one issue. The, the presentation tonight is going to include Gary Horton first, and some of these issues that Commissioner Joyce was just raising may be issues that you want to discuss with him. He's going to give an update on the traffic report. After he's finished, then there's going to be an introduction by David Eldredge, the applicant's architect, and Steve Perkins, the design planner, relating to revisions to the application. And this I want to emphasize because of, of what Commissioner Thimm was saying earlier about responses, because this is a lot---there's, there's a significant amount of substantive response in the revisions. So, for example, there's been a lot of discussion about cliffscapes. And so please feel free to ask questions about how much reduction does this revision do to cliffscapes. How much change does this do to excavation, and some of the big issues? This is us trying to be responsive to the last 14 months of issues that we have heard from you

addressed in not just a verbal way, but actual changes, revisions, refinements to the project. And I just can't emphasize enough that this, we think, is very important.

The, the issue that I wanted to address, which has already come up both with Francisco and then some of the questions from Commissioners, relates to the, this concept of potentially qualifying standards. MPE received the Staff's report on Monday of this week, and that is the first time we have ever heard those words. It's the first time that we've ever really heard those concepts. And the Staff states that the, those proposed potential qualifying standards, PQS, as a metric to help the Commission quantify the application's proposed mitigations. And we haven't had enough time to fully evaluate that. And as you, as you have already seen, there are some inconsistencies and so on, and we, and we fully expect to be able to work with Staff cooperatively about that. But we do need time. We, we just got this week. Two days ago.

But there's a couple of issues that we want to point out about that.

Number one, and probably most importantly, PQS's are not part of the Park City Land Management Code, and, and that's, that's a significant concern for us, because now it's becoming kind of a big deal.

Number two, the Staff notes in this Staff report that the PQS's differ from conditions. But the way they're actually phrased is they are conditions; and they're limiting conditions in many of the---you've, you've seen them.

Number three, under Utah law, any condition to the approval of a CUP must be reasonable mitigation of anticipated detrimental effects. But mitigation is not elimination. And in many cases, what we saw so far is absolute elimination. It's not truly mitigation.

Number four, those, those PQS's, if they become the conditions, they need to be reasonable, but many of them on their face are, they're not only not reasonable, they're, some of them are outrageous. For example, to say you can't do any construction for four or five months of the year. Or you can house your employees, but your employees cannot drive to the---they can't park or drive to the facility. And, and no parking for employees. Another example is requiring or purporting to require the applicant to pay for 100% of the snow removal on Lowell Avenue, rather than its pro-rata share.

And so it appears to us---and, and we know we'll have time to, to meet with Staff and talk about this. And we've been working cooperatively on many issues and expect to be able to on this as well. But these, some of these appear to be facially unreasonable. And so we just wanted to make the record on that, and then we'll address when we've had time to fully analyze these PQS's. So with that---

Chair

Strachan: At some point, point out to us the ones that you think require complete eliminations versus reasonable mitigation.

David

Bennion: Pardon?

Chair

Strachan: At some point give us specific examples of the PQS's you think require complete elimination, rather than---

David

Bennion: Such as the employee parking, it's zero. Yeah, we can that.

Chair

Strachan: Okay.

Commissioner

Phillips: But would be good for you guys to discuss between Staff, and then once you're finished with that, then you can let us know where you stand on those.

David

Bennion: Agreed. And we, we have been having, you know, regular meetings to go over these kinds of things.

Chair

Strachan: Great. Thank you.

Gary

Horton: I will try and keep my presentation pretty short. It is not a full presentation of the last traffic study. And I'll get to that explanation as I go through here. Primarily, it's a pretty short synopsis. I wanted to respond to a few comments that I was not here at the last Planning Commission meeting. Some of the comments that I've read, just to clarify a few things. And then a

little bit of a short timeline on the traffic study and what's been done based on, once again, comments that I've read. Somewhat of a perception, and maybe it's just my perception, that I as the traffic engineer has been somewhat unresponsive. So I just wanted to kind of run through a timeline and all the documents that have been provided and why they take the time they do.

So the first one, simply---you want to roll the next one. There's only like eight slides so. I wanted once again just a gentle reminder based on some comments that I read via in the public and via other sources that there's somewhat of a question of my ethics and qualifications. So I wanted to be clear that, you know, remind---the original report I did back in 2004, the City did hire a third party and they concurred with the conclusions that I came up with in the original study. I think that was done because when I prepare traffic studies, I'm trying to present what the realistic world looks like today, and with assumptions that you have to make, what it will look like in the future if this project is built, or if it's not built. Either way. So that's why I think the original study was done that way and I think, in working with the Staff and some of the comments I read in the Staff report this week, the traffic analysis and items like that, they seem to have concurred that some of that information is correct. They're still reviewing it and I understand that. So I just wanted to state that.

I also want to be very clear that engineering standards are used. This is not just grasping at straws and thinking whatever I think is best. There are engineering standards that are applied in this study and, and in every study, or at least they should be.

That's all I really wanted to cover on that, just to be clear.

So, back up on the timeline of things. First and foremost, obviously the previous studies were done in January of this year at a Planning Commission meeting. I presented on the original study and all the addendums that were done subsequent after that. And at that point that's what I understood was being requested. At that presentation, there were various comments made, this is pretty old, rightfully so, the original counts when they were done. So it was requested that we refresh or update the study. We met with City Staff. And I want it to be understood that by the time we got done meeting with City Staff and defining what the update to the study was, in essence it was a new study. It wasn't the same area. We expanded the study area, which the applicant was fine with and we were willing to do. But I want it to be clear, it

was not like we could take what was done before and just plug in the numbers and punch, punch an answer. Things have changed and evolved from 2005 to 2017, twelve years. So, we used a lot of the same modeling software, but even that information has been improved, as you can imagine. Any IT information has become much more accurate. So, wanted to go through that.

Also, as part of that determination of updating the study, we just decided it was best to count President's Day Weekend so that we had an apple to apples comparison throughout the reports. Well, that didn't happen, can't happen---you want to go to the next slide Francisco. February 18<sup>th</sup>, okay. So there's no way a final report was going to be submitted in February. So that information was gathered then. I received the data because we hired it out from a third party that does that professionally in early March. So we took March and April to update this study. We submitted a draft on May 4<sup>th</sup>. Presented to the Planning Commission on May 10<sup>th</sup>. And roughly about a month after we submitted our study we got comments back from Staff, which tells you how much information is in there. It's a, it's a big report. So, I know they're busy and so that should---I feel like our two months to prepare the report wasn't abnormal considering it took a month to get responses back.

Go to the next one, Francisco. So we, due to a series of vacations between June and the beginning of July, between me and Staff, and I was a part of that thankfully, we weren't able to meet again until July 5<sup>th</sup> to kind of review some of the comments that were provided. I wanted to make sure in the next report that I am addressing their comments as best I can. Sometimes we may not agree, and that's okay, but I at least, if I could, make sure I'm trying to address those.

At that same evening I was requested to try and address the comments that we received from THINC as well, so that was, those were provided at that time. And I was asked to submit that report July 20<sup>th</sup>. So from that time it gave me roughly three weeks, which was a little tight, but that's what we were trying to do.

Between July 5<sup>th</sup> and July 17<sup>th</sup> there was continued exchange of information. July 19<sup>th</sup>, the day before I was supposed to submit the final report, I received comments from the third party, so that made my job pretty challenging to feel like I could provide a report that addressed City comments. So I asked, hey, can I postpone until next week. It was requested that I submit a draft and then follow up next week to try and address their comments.

So, Francisco, if you don't mind rolling the next one. So we submitted July 21<sup>st</sup>, the day after I had committed. A lot of personal things came out, but here nor there, so we submitted the draft on July 21<sup>st</sup>, and the following week we submitted the draft without the appendix, partially because 1) when I originally compiled the PDF it was so large I was concerned putting the appendix on that it would kick over the file size and it wouldn't deliver at all. So I submitted the study with the appendix separate. And then after that we went in and tried to reduce some pictures and sizes and stuff like that and was able to submit it the next day with everything in one report. So I wanted to be clear.

I don't feel like anything's been, that's been in this timeline has been wasted. I think it's been well-spent, but it takes time. Every time we go back to, to the trip generation, is that accurate, it's not starting over but it's recreating the numbers, then redistributing the numbers, re-analyzing that information. Verifying that information, and then re-reporting that and then writing the report QCQA, our Quality Control and Quality Assurance of that report before we can submit. So I want it to be clear that, you know, there's been an urgency felt, but I wanted to make sure that accuracy was also not penalized.

Francisco, if you don't mind. Thank you. So, what's next? A few things. What we would like to do as an applicant is come back in September and present that study, along with trying to address any comments that have been raised about that study. They may not be able to find that maybe I did address it in the study or maybe it isn't, and we can try and address it during that timeline.

Today we received additional comments from THINC. I haven't even looked at them. I'd like to address those next month when we come back. Also, if they're going to get third party review again, I would like to have those and be able to address those if at all possible. Trying to make September, kind of from the applicant's standpoint, the last responses to traffic and what information we have to present it all in one bundled summary, is kind of the hope. The other part of that is we'll continue to work with Staff and try and get some of the clarification on some of the comments that were in the Staff report. But feel that can happen---well, we've been working with them all along, so.

And that's all I had unless you have any questions or comments. And I've, I did receive---I understand the comments you received, so tonight I will be

taking notes. Those are the kind of comments I would like to also come back and let Staff know, hey, I will try and address the 2500 vehicles on Empire/Lowell capacity, versus, how many are there today, how many we think are needed upon Treasure being constructed and occupied. So if there are any comments like that, I will be taking notes and trying to address those next month.

Chair

Strachan: Great. Thank you. Any questions at all?

Commissioner

Band: I have a question. I just noticed in the independent review that we had, they mentioned that the 2014 version of the ITE trip generation was more robust. And I saw that you used the 9<sup>th</sup> edition from 2012. I'm just curious as to why. Or if there is a new one.

Gary

Horton: There, I'm using the latest. There is a new one coming out this year.

Commissioner

Band: I saw. I looked it up before I wrote this question down, 'cause it said the 2014 version is more robust, and then it made some comments in the third party. And then I, I looked up yours and the 9<sup>th</sup> edition was 2012. So I was just curious.

Gary

Horton: Yeah, there's, there's a new one coming out this year. We had a conversation with Staff early on as, you know, unfortunately they don't expect it until the end of the year. So, we grabbed the latest edition.

Commissioner

Band: Which was 2012?

Gary

Horton: Yeah.

Commissioner

Band: Okay. So the 2014 comment wasn't correct?

Gary

Horton: I'll have to---once again I'll to go back and look. That's where---

Commissioner

Band: Okay.

Gary

Horton: I have to get, yeah.

Commissioner

Band: Just, that was my question, yeah.

Gary

Horton: Fair enough.

Commissioner

Band: And so the 10<sup>th</sup> edition is coming out soon.

Gary

Horton: Yes.

Commissioner

Band: But no available. Thank you.

Gary

Horton: And I could have quoted the wrong year. Instead of 2012 it could have been 2014. I'll go back and verify.

Commissioner

Joyce: Do you want, do you want questions about this presentation? Do you want questions about the actual traffic study that we have here or---

Chair

Strachan: Just questions about this presentation. I mean, don't think this presentation really changes any of the numbers in that traffic study. I think it's more explaining kind of the reasons for the delay.

Commissioner

Joyce: So, at some point I have questions about the traffic study.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, and we should, yeah. And I think we can get to those after we get the public comment and after we get the applicant's presentation, because I'm

sure you'll knock out a bunch of ones that the other Commissioners have, and the other Commissioners might not have once you [inaudible].

David

Eldredge: While we're waiting for the screen to come up. David Eldredge, architect. My purpose tonight is to introduce you to some of the major elements of Refinement No. 2. And as Mr. Bennion mentioned, we've been working diligently for more than six months to try to address some of those major concerns we heard from Staff, the Commission, and the public. We only completed the complete set of architectural drawings a few days ago. But we've been discussing the concept and our intentions with the Staff on numerous occasions during our design review meetings over the last several months.

And simply put, the goal of all the refinements was to improve building efficiency, reduce the amount of excavation, reduce the limits of disturbance, and lessen the visual impact of the cliffscapes.

Before you is the revised site plan for what we call B17.2. Major elements are we moved Building 4B towards the east and reduced the connection between. We reduced the connection here so we could move it that direction. We eliminated two entire buildings; 5B and 5D. We eliminated the pool building and put its uses inside of 4B. And we converted 1C from townhouses to flats, so that we could eliminate all of the associated below grade storage and vertical circulation.

We also, sorry, there we go. How do I get---here we go. Another major change is we re-oriented the parking. We started first by adding a single check-in lobby right at the main entrance with short-term parking and drop-off zone. This allowed us to eliminate duplicate below-grade and above-grade lobbies and all [inaudible] the building.

We now go with two-way traffic in lieu of one-way traffic. Whereas before we had the circular ramp here that everyone had to access to get to this building. We increased the roadway width so that there's two-way traffic to the 5 parking, two-way traffic to the upper level with 3, and two-way traffic to the 4 building. On this plan you can also see where we eliminated all of the below-grade accessory, and limited the space to just elevator lobbies off the parking. This, I think, further illustrates how the parking was reoriented to the two rows of double-loaded aisles which wind up beneath the 4B parking, and

it eliminates all the parking that used to be underneath the south wing.

So, bottom line, if you want to talk impacts, the yellow area, which is shaded, is the reduction in the areas of disturbance between the 2009 submittal and our first refinement. The red shaded area is the reduction in the area of disturbance between our first refinement and our second refinement. As noted in Mr. McMahon's report last week, this results in approximately a 90,000 cubic yard or 10% of reduction in the excavation. It reduces the height of the---the maximum height of the cliffscape relative to the '09 submittal by 16' behind 4B, that's approximately there. By 37', which is behind 1B, approximately here. And by 48' behind the 5 buildings.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay. Do you have, happen to have---when you say it's like down 16', can you tell us what it is now, if you happen, happen to have that right there or---

David

Eldredge: Well, if I enlarge it you can see where---that's, that's the first cut of the cliffscape right there, which is at elevation 7292, roughly. Okay.

Commissioner

Joyce: Whoa, whoa, wait, wait come back. So my, my concern is, is it now a 70' cliff, is it now a 90' cliff, is it now a 120' cliff? So---

David

Eldredge: It's, it's about, you can---those darker lines are ten foot contours. So it's roughly a 90' cut versus what used to be well over 125, 130'. That's about a 70' right there. That's roughly a 50'. And again, you'll be getting these documents and so you can study them.

Chair

Strachan: What's that plan drawing's number?

David

Eldredge: It's SP1. Now the, the document you received does not have the shaded areas. That is a comparative visualization that I prepared for you. I can certainly get you that.

Chair

Strachan: That would be great.

Commissioner

Thimm: That's important, I think.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, I think so too. So the one with the shaded is not SP1?

David

Eldredge: Well, it---

Chair

Strachan: Like what, what are we looking at right now? What's that document?

David

Eldredge: That---in your packet it's SP1. What I'm saying is in your packet SPI will not have the shaded areas. I'm going to have---

Chair

Strachan: The little pink shades or the yellow and orange?

David

Eldredge: The yellow and orange.

Chair

Strachan: Okay. So which document will have the yellow and orange?

David

Eldredge: I'll have to get a special comparative. A set of comparative documents for you.

Chair

Strachan: And what number will you designate for that?

David

Eldredge: It will still be the same sheet number.

Chair

Strachan: It will still be the same sheet number.

David

Eldredge: I'm not going to change the sheet numbers.

Chair

Strachan: Okay. Great.

Commissioner

Phillips: But will you put a revision date on it? And can we---

Planner

Astorga: It will say comparison packet.

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay.

David

Eldredge: I'll put a comparison packet together.

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay. And can we get, can we get like clouded revisions of---you, you went through and you went we moved this, we got rid of this. [Inaudible.]

David

Eldredge: You'll see all of the old outline is in the, the drawing dashed.

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay.

David

Eldredge: And if I clouded it, you would see nothing but clouds.

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay, but as long as there's, as long everything is identified that has changed on the plan so that we don't have to look at the two plans.

David

Eldredge: Well, I can certainly add a few labels to the dashed areas of what used to be what, because it hasn't changed. But I think it's pretty straightforward, except for where the buildings are totally eliminated.

Commissioner

Phillips: Well, yeah. But you, you, where you moved buildings. You got rid of this, you got rid of the pool, all of that stuff. Will that, will that be on a page that has that all identified on, on a page? Like clouded revisions? Yeah, I mean, I understand what you're, what you're saying, but I just want to make sure that on the previous page. And, and so, so yeah, you've got all of the---

David

Eldredge: That's the old building footprint, which I will label for you. That's the old, for example, that's the old ski run, which we were able to widen. That's the old pool building.

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay, so, so---

David

Eldredge: And I, if it's just a matter of labeling that stuff---

Commissioner

Phillips: So nothing, so nothing on the last page where you were hand drawing is different than this?

David

Eldredge: No. That's---

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay. So we could have been looking at---okay.

David

Eldredge: That's the same drawing there. I just added the shading.

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay, I just wanted to make sure. And so I apologize. But I wanted to make sure.

David

Eldredge: No, I, I just want to make sure I understand what you're asking for

Commissioner

Phillips: You went through, you went through all of that fast and I wanted to make sure that all of that information is right here on this page.

David

Eldredge: Oh, yeah.

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay.

Commissioner

Joyce: The one thing that could definitely use labels is where you did things like remove the lower level of something if you did move it. It's kind of hard to see that a level, you know, if the basement went away, I mean, we can really tell that from the little dash lines unless you put some flagging on it.

David

Eldredge: We'll have to, we'll have to do a, a full set of comparative drawings for you.

Commissioner

Phillips: And if you could just add notes to describe exactly, you know, so that when I look at, you know. You, you explained it, but if you could add notes to, to the different areas that have changed so that we can read it and, you know, and have time to look at it when we're studying. That would be helpful.

Director

Erickson: Just, just to clarify, while we're doing this. The revisions you're showing this evening are revisions from, from 17.1 to 17.2. Or are they from the 2009 submittal of 17.2.

David

Eldredge: Where I---in the one exhibit the only place I go back to '09 is this drawing.

Director

Erickson: Okay. So the 2015 submittal, or revision that we submitted, your original application for this round was V1?

Planner

Astorga: I think if I could clarify.

Director

Erickson: Yeah, do so, Francisco.

Planner

Astorga: There's the, the version that was submitted December 2008. That's the one we've been looking at, that's the one we've been publishing in, in our Staff reports. We did that '08, '09, '10, all of last year and this year. And then there are two other refinements that the applicant has been working on. Refinement 17 for the year 2017. 17.1, which he shows on here that encompasses the orange area. And then the next one is 17.2, which is another refinement which the applicant is working on.

I've got, I've got the latest, greatest, entire packet, 52 sheets that was submitted to me today, this morning. I don't have the comparison analysis. I do have just the, the updated set. So with the comparison it would be easier to look at unless you're looking at it side by side, and then you'd still have some additional challenges.

Commissioner

Phillips: And it's so hard to find differences.

Planner

Astorga: Right. So, so I, I---and, and we have shared this information with the applicant in these meetings that we got to come up with the appropriate mean to review, to compare the, the three versions, literally. The '08, 17.1 and 17.2. Which I believed that the applicant is moving forward with 17.2 at this stage. We'll let them answer that.

Commissioner

Joyce: So, I'll, I'll offer it. We never spent any time paying any attention or giving comments or anything on 17.1. So that fact that between Staff and you guys, consider that a, a point release that I, I think I can speak for the folks up here, we don't care. As long as, you know, the thing we were going with was the old version. If this is what you're going with now, please don't throw in a release that we simply don't care about. I mean, I, I don't care how you got to here, if you did it in ten steps or one, this is your proposal. So, hopefully, that makes it even simpler for you. I mean, so you don't have to explain two steps along the way.

Commissioner

Thimm: And, and what, what addresses the commentary that's been provided. I, I think as important as the graphic representation, it's going to be updated statistics that---

David

Eldredge: Well, I can give you some of those if you'd like.

Commissioner

Thimm: Don't need them right now.

David

Eldredge: No, I, I actually did prepare for you a little bit of a comparison.

Commissioner

Thimm: Probably way too many numbers for tonight, I would guess.

David

Eldredge: Okay.

Commissioner

Thimm: But I don't know, the others might differ from my opinion.

Commissioner

Phillips: Yeah, no, we need time to look at it. I mean.

Commissioner

Thimm: That, that said, if, you know, like you have this redline version that shows before and after kind of thing. If the statistics could be provided in such a way so there's a direct comparison to what was provided before square footages or volumes or whatever, before and now so we can, I don't know, a spreadsheet so we can see where the changes are made.

David

Eldredge: Actually, I, I do have a spreadsheet which, it doesn't go every single floor of every single building, but it does go by site total for the three versions and compares and gives you the difference as it, as it was modified.

Chair

Strachan: I'm interested in just ticking off some of the highlights. What's the square footage reduction and then the parking reduction? Got those?

David  
Eldredge: I do not have the parking but I do---on the accessory space we're just over 27% less. On circulation space we're 10% less. On support commercial we're 36% less. And on gross area we're 7% less.

Planner  
Astorga: Is that where your overall number, if I may ask, is 948,730?

David  
Eldredge: 948, yep.

Chair  
Strachan: Square feet?

Planner  
Astorga: Correct. That's all of the areas added together. 948,730.

David  
Eldredge: And those are all for the project total.

Chair  
Strachan: Yeah. Okay. 27% less accessory space. 36% less what space?

David  
Eldredge: Support commercial.

Chair  
Strachan: And 7% less gross space. Okay.

David  
Eldredge: Yeah.

Chair  
Strachan: Yeah, I'd be interested, like Commissioner Thimm, in seeing a spreadsheet that compares those.

David  
Bennion: Do you want, do you also want some kind of narrative [inaudible].

Chair

Strachan: You know I think that's for the applicant to decide. If you want to provide us a narrative, that's fine. I mean, if---

Director

Erickson: We have get this conversation on the record, Mr. Chairman, so you may want to get---

Chair

Strachan: Yeah.

Director

Erickson: May want to get a microphone.

Planner

Astorga: Oh, and by the way.

Chair

Strachan: I think we can just short it. Mr. Bennion asked whether he wants to associate a narrative with the spreadsheet. You know, I think that's up to you. I think what we are going to need is what the impacts you think you've mitigated through this are. And if that has to come in the form of a narrative, which is very well might, then great.

Commissioner

Joyce: I would, I would offer that you guys are doing this in response to things that we have brought up. So whatever, whatever you think the most useful, easy way of saying you were worried about X, we did this. Here's out it changed, boom. I mean, that's, that's what you're trying to convey here. So the more you make us hunt for it and hope to God we see what you tried to do on our behalf, don't make us guess because we'll miss something.

Commissioner

Thimm: I think a narrative would be very helpful, actually, so we understand how you address the commentary.

David

Eldredge: Sure.

Chair

Strachan: Okay. All right. Anything further, Mr. Eldredge?

David

Eldredge: That's it.

Chair

Strachan: That's it? All right. Questions?

Commissioner

Thimm: The only, only one more just to follow up since we, we are looking at these cliffscapes. I believe it was the, I can't remember if the last meeting or the meeting before that, I was curious to know the, the change in grade in those cliffscapes. So, you know, maybe in the future if, if, you know, I want to know if they went from this to this. Yeah, because it makes a difference on the way that they appear, as well, you know.

David

Eldredge: I can answer that very briefly.

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay.

David

Eldredge: And in rough numbers.

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay.

David

Eldredge: They went from 1-1/2 to 1, in most cases, 2 to 1, and in some cases 3 to 1. The 3 to 1 is very limited and that's all based on like a dip and strike stone. And we actually never employed those except in very short terraces in anything approaching that height.

Chair

Strachan: All right. Any more questions. All right. I guess I would just tell the applicant that, you know, we're at the middle of August and you're springing some new plans on us, and we're staring down the barrel of an October 25<sup>th</sup> vote date. So, you guys did that, not us. All right? I want that to be very clear. That may factor into the timing. I don't know, maybe

we can get our heads around all this quicker than that, but as we discussed at the outset of the meeting, we are on a very protracted---a ton of information and not a lot of time. So, I would just make that comment.

All right. Unless there are any more questions, let's open the public---well, should be take a quick break? How many from the public wishing to speak tonight? Okay, so we've just got a handful. All right. We can probably press through without a break or is that not---Okay.

Commissioner

Thimm: Press on.

Chair

Strachan: Okay. All right. Let's open the public comment, then, for the Treasure Hill CUP application.

#### Public Comment

Arnie

Rusten: I'm Arnie Rusten. I live on 1058 Lowell Avenue. I had Francisco pull up some pictures that I took the other day. This picture here is on the way down to Kimball Junction. You've probably seen it. It's just west of that McPolin Barn. And I just brought this in since cliffscape issue was going to be discussed. This is over on the hillside there, and basically I'm saying is the, the cliffscapes you're going to see in Old Town are going to be enormous compared to this. So there definitely is going to be a significant visual impact no matter what you do to, to flatten them or not.

By way of background, I have spent over 40 years in engineering. I'm a licensed civil/structural engineer. I have spent countless hours in commission meetings like these, and I, I will say I do know for the most of it what I'm talking about. The last month, last month's meeting the buzzword was specificity. I found that very intriguing. It's a very apropos description in my mind because I have never been through anything like this where there has been such lack of specificity. We're here 14 meetings in. I have yet to be given any indication as to how long is this project going to take, and what are the impacts from that duration.

I, I look at things, and I, I want to address the, to me the elephant in the room, which in fact is construction. Construction impact will be enormous to this community. This mining project of excavation, whether you now

have reduced it by 10% or not, it's going to, to be a huge impact on you for a long period of time. Recognizing that, while you may want to work 12 months a year, you won't be able to. Consequently, the excavation portion, I believe, was mentioned as 2-1/2 years last meeting. It will take considerably longer. And during that period you will be talking about drilling, blasting, excavating, crushing, and transporting. Creole has been identified as basically a disposal site. We're talking about something in the order of 50 feet of thickness, of material. And that would be an enormous impact visually to, to this city, let alone the process of getting it done via a, a conveyor system. It's going to be a huge project and will take a long time.

And all of this tied to the traffic. The traffic during construction without question will be a real issue. I took a couple of pictures on Sunday. Number 2. Yes, this is Lowell Avenue as of Sunday. The parking now--- this down near the Resort. You can barely see the Marriott on your left there. And this is what we have. And so this is the reality that they're dealing with. And I cannot, in my mind, get 2500 cars a day going here. Basically what you're have here, between the parked car on the east side, which is going to be allowed, is you're going to have basically a 15' lane so two small cars can pass at slow speed. There is no way for you to do anything relative to moving cars on this.

And the next picture. Here I am driving home yesterday. Now---

Commissioner

Joyce: You lose.

Arnie

Rusten: I lose, exactly. I'm afraid I'm going to see a lot of these. This one, he happened to be backing up and I was following him. This was bringing up material to in front of my house because they're doing the street there. But just envision this truck, or hundreds of them. I've been told and seen numbers of 300 trucks a day now essentially then using Lowell. Three hundred trucks a day in a ten-hour day is one every two minutes. It is just to me absolutely out of the question not feasible. Not feasible. So this truck here with a parked car, there's no choice. Someone has to give and, and give way. So this, this project relative to what it's going to demand and the impact on the community is to me beyond words. We just cannot do this.

Now think about this. What are the construction lengths? In my opinion, let's say they're digging a hole for maybe four years. I mean, I have built some enormous buildings. Tack on another four years. Tying up---and, and what about the impact during that time just to the downtown Main Street. Clearly, in my mind I just don't see how this could be fitting and allowed in Park City.

I would have liked to have seen the extensive studies, for example. You're going to do a lot of blasting. Blasting and drilling and crushing. Noise impacts, vibration impacts. Clearly will impact structures nearby. There's got to be some proposals then to do proposed construction surveys so that you know what you're dealing with, so that also you as, as the, the builder won't be saddled with every crack that will show up in someone's house.

But, you know, bottom line to me is I don't see how this project under these circumstances can go forward. I urge the Commission to, to take a close look and keep asking questions. But then again, if you're not getting any answers, why keep asking questions. But I say, be diligent, please. I also will say, you know, that personally I'm not against development. I never have been. I'd like to see something done for sure that will blend in. Today's photo in the paper, I don't see how that blends in with the architecture or the surrounding areas which certainly is a condition of that permit.

So, I, I hope that you will have the courage to do the right thing relative to this proposal. It cannot under the current proposal, in my mind, go forward. I appreciate the time. Thank you.

Chair  
Strachan: Thank you.

Nikki  
Deforge: I'm Nikki Deforge here speaking on behalf of THINC, a non-profit group of Park City residents and businesses. In response to the applicant's May 2017 draft report, THINC previously submitted a report commissioned from Avenue Consultants. And that report identified numerous flaw in the methodologies, assumptions and conclusions. And earlier today THINC submitted an updated report from Avenue Consultants, which evaluates the applicant's final traffic report that I'm seeing might not be final. But at least the one that was presented and submitted in July. Many of the

same problems that were identified in that earlier draft report are perpetuated in this current report. And there are also new and equally problematic issues raised as well.

The updated report from Avenue Consultants addresses those flaws in detail, so I'm only going to highlight some of those today, but---and call your attention to that other report and, and strongly urge you to look at that in detail, especially as you're reviewing the July report from the applicant, and then critically consider the conclusions and assumptions that were made in that most recent report.

The, the first and, and possibly most egregious flaw in this latest report from the applicant is that it still fails to address the impact of the Treasure Hill Development on the capacity of the neighboring streets. And Commissioner Joyce has mentioned that tonight. The, the report continues to really blindly focus on intersections, while providing absolutely no information as to the current or projected street capacity. Given the documented capacity problems, we've seen photos tonight, we've seen them in the past, that already exists on these narrow roads, the City cannot possibly evaluate the actual potential impact of traffic and other things of this development on these historic neighborhoods without that specific information. And, and here we are again, mid-August, and we don't have it.

Now it appears that in this latest report, rather than providing this critical capacity information, the applicant acknowledges that there is a capacity problem during winter time, at least, without disclosing what the actual impact is. And then instead, it sort of leapfrogs over defining the actual impact and offers a mitigation solution, which is quite radical, and that is to turn Lowell and Empire Avenues into one-way streets during winter time only. The problems with this mitigation solution are detailed in the report by Avenue Consultants. And I'll give you a few examples. One is that transforming Lowell and Empire into one-way streets would actually result in a substantial increase in the traffic on these streets. Currently, the local residents and hotel guests at places like the Lift Lodge head north straight down the hill to get out of that neighbor without ever driving on the uphill portion of Lowell and Empire. If Lowell were to become a one-way street, all of this traffic would be forced to drive south along the entire length of Lowell, and then loop around and come all the way back down the entire length of Empire, and precisely the most problematic parts of those streets. Also, driver's currently accessing the upper end of Lowell directly

from Crescent Tram would be forced to drive all the way down Empire and then loop back through Manor Way, and up along Lowell to access their properties. And the same would be true of anyone attempting to access Treasure Hill from the upper end of Old Town. The south end. And the same would also be true of all the new traffic from the Bamberger and Resort developments. Rather than those people heading north downhill, all of that traffic during the winter time would be funneled right up through these old neighborhoods of Lowell's narrow streets, and then back down Empire. The past traffic studies that the applicant has relied on for these two projects assumed that these would be two-way streets; not one-way streets. And so none of the impact from that would be reflected in those, those studies, and it would not be reflected in these current studies.

Because the applicant's purported traffic mitigation solution would dramatically increase traffic on both Lowell and Empire, it is not a feasible mitigation option at all. And this is particularly true and concerning given that the current traffic volume on Lowell and Empire is estimated by Avenue Consultants to be up to 1400 vehicles per day. Maybe 800 at a low end. The Treasure Hill development will double that number adding about 2600 daily vehicle trips, for a total of up to 3700 vehicle trips per day on each street. Although 2600 vehicles might be plausible under ideal conditions, as, as we heard today, the conditions on these streets are not ideal at any time, even during the summer. And most certainly are not ideal during the winter time.

Avenue Consultants estimates that during winter driving conditions, the roadway capacity on Lower and Empire is only about 720 vehicles to 1440 vehicles per day. If these roads are made into one-way streets during winter time, then again, all the Bamberger and Resort traffic would have to be factored in along with all of the traffic currently taking alternative routes that would be instead funneled on to Lowell and Empire before we could determine what the actual volume versus capacity is. And again, we don't have any of that information. We, we're trying to just figure it out in the dark.

Transforming these roads into one-way streets during winter would also create a logistical and safety nightmare. The applicant does not explain how these seasonal changes would be communicated to drivers, much less to the vehicle navigation services that direct driver's down these streets. Switching back and forth between two-way and one-way access would lead to serious confusion between the drivers with potentially

catastrophic safety consequences. Again, the applicant makes no suggestions as to how to mitigate this very real public safety impact that results from their purported mitigation. Making these roads into one-way streets would also impose a serious inconvenience on residents and visitors alike, and lower the quality of life in these neighborhoods. The one-way portions of each street would be nearly a mile long, with a posted speed of only 20 miles per hour. As noted in the Avenue Consultants report, this would create traffic delays of over 2-1/2 minutes, even under ideal conditions, with much longer delays during bad weather, snow removal, garbage days, deliveries, emergencies, and so forth. As the report states, this would be a unique situation to have such a [inaudible] of one-way roads with intermediate turnaround locations on such a low speed road. Again, this is not a feasible mitigation option.

And even if the City were to adopt this and create one-way streets on these roads during the winter time, there would still be unacceptable flows at Park Avenue, Deer Valley Drive---at the Park Avenue/Deer Valley Drive intersection. That intersection, according to the applicant's own study, would operate only at Level of Service E, which is not considered acceptable. Yet the applicant's report acknowledges that any further improvements to this intersection to address that failure would be too impactful. So the Treasure Hill development will increase p.m. peak hour delay beyond the 2037 background by at least 10% without any possible way to mitigate that impact and leave us with an intersection that is not acceptable.

Therefore, rather than safely mitigating the acknowledged impact of the development on traffic in these residential neighborhoods, the applicant's radical solution of season one-ways street would simply create new and different impacts, and even increase the traffic on these streets. And yet again, the applicant is merely shifting impacts from one area to another in the guise of mitigation.

And obviously, if the City does not adopt the one-way street option for any of these reasons, then the applicant has failed to identify any feasible mitigation for the significant traffic impact on these streets. That it acknowledges but never quantifies. In that case there's no question that there is a serious unmitigated impact to traffic safety, quality of life, and other factors as a result of that development, and a conditional use permit cannot issue under those circumstances.

The second major issue with the applicant's recent study is that it aptly demonstrates that the current iteration of the Treasure Hill development directly violates the conditions of the Master Plan approval. The Master Plan approval expressly mandated that the development not attract commercial traffic from off-site. We've talked about this a lot. But the applicant's own study conclusively establishes that it will not only, knowingly and intentionally draw off-site commercial traffic, but draw it in droves. According to Table 6 of the applicant's study, there would be 56 a.m. peak trips and 109 p.m. peak trips per hour in off-site commercial traffic. That represents 20 to 30 percent of the total traffic to the project. According to Table 7, even after traffic, excuse me, trip reductions, the commercial traffic represents 40 to 47 percent of the total traffic, and exceeds the projected traffic to the hotel and all residential aspects of the project. According to Table 14, the off-site commercial traffic will generate a need for 178 weekday parking spaces, and 184 parking spaces during the weekend. This represents 36 to 37 percent of the total parking needed for the project. Added to this is the fact that the Cabriolet is designed to carry approximately 2500 passengers per hour. There is simply no way that this much capacity is needed for on-site guests alone. To the contrary, the project is designed to draw and accommodate large numbers of off-site commercial traffic to the site, as the square footage numbers of commercial plainly demonstrate.

As various Commissioners have pointed out in the last months, there is no way that this enormous amount of commercial space can be sustained solely by on-site guests, particularly during the off season. And clearly that is not applicant's intention. This is an egregious violation of the Master Plan approval that cannot be mitigated. If for any reason this development violates the condition of the Master Plan approval, then we don't even get to the CUP criteria or mitigation. As a threshold matter, the project must comply with each and every condition of that Master Plan approval, and it does not.

Finally, as set forth in detail in the report by Avenue Consultants, there are numerous flaws that continue and are exacerbated in the methodologies, calculations, and assumptions in the applicant's report. And those failings likewise render this report unreliable and speculative.

So in short, although the potential qualifying standards proposed by the Planning Staff are a good start, they do not begin to fully address the enormous impacts of the Treasure Hill development on traffic, safety,

noise, emergency vehicle access, parking pedestrian access, and other quality of life issues in these surrounding historic neighborhoods.

Even if the applicant were to fully comply with all these proposed standards, the impacts of this enormous development would be substantial and unmitigated. And at the end of the day, the applicant still far exceeds the scope of its Master Plan approval, and also fails to comply with the CUP criteria or to mitigate those impacts. The Treasure Hill conditional use permit application but therefore be denied. Thank you.

Patricia  
Kraftin:

Yes, my name is Patricia Kraftin. I'm a resident at 1240 Lowell Avenue. The last two speakers have been very articulate and I certainly won't want to repeat what they've said. Just to reiterate my concurrence with their comments. I would like to say for the past 14 months I've been asking when is traffic and transportation going to be addressed, because as a resident of Lowell, and over the past seven years that I've lived there the traffic and transportation, even without Treasure, even without Bamberger, have been an enormous issue. Getting up and down into my home with the Resort traffic and pedestrians and bikers and dog walkers, the street is barely passable, even without the trucks. The picture that you saw is representative, obviously, of this construction period, but frankly that's a calm photo of what our street can present.

So I've been asking for the past 14 months, and every month it's a delay. This was going to be the meeting, yet I've sat here and heard no answers. If anything, I've heard questions but no answers. And so I am perplexed as to where we are, and then I hear a horrifying comment that you may be triggered to render a decision without any information on what Staff report says. Traffic and transportation are massive areas of importance to review of this project. So I could only reiterate that for such an important impact, massive, to here we are in August with no answers and only very vague suggestions of mitigation that show really no comprehensive or serious review is, is truly horrifying for me. And I just urge you to go through all the criteria as you should.

One other point I'd like to make as a resident of Lowell. If I understand this document correctly and the outline, it would appear that it's being proposed that all the construction impact, all the delivery impact, all the impact of the operational maintenance is to be borne on Lowell. If, if that is correct, it's unclear. Again, I don't see how that can realistically in any

practical, feasible sense occur given what you've seen in that picture. So again, more questions that have not been answered or addressed. And I hope we address this in a way that is realistic and practical, and not some sort of arm waving over what is potentially one of the most important areas of mitigation and impact of this development, or really any development, but particularly one of this scale and, and size. Thank you so much.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you.

Kyra

Parkhurst: Hi, I'm Kyra Parkhurst. I live up on Empire. And I don't want to be repetitive, but I am standing here tonight representing every tourist, every person, every pedestrian, every skier, every dog walker, every---

Chair

Strachan: Every single one?

Kyra

Parkhurst: I am.

Chair

Strachan: Every single. They all communicated to you and said that---

Kyra

Parkhurst: Yes, yes.

Chair

Strachan: You could say the following things.

Kyra

Parkhurst: Yes. Every family on Sunday who comes up there---

Chair

Strachan: Okay, that is a tall claim but we will listen.

Kyra

Parkhurst: With their eight kids and four strollers coming up and down our street. No one---I've been not only the last 14 meetings, I've been the last eight

years of meetings. I have yet to hear one thing said about how a person will safely walk up and down the street. Nothing has been done to accommodate. We've done stuff to accommodate trucks and tractors and [inaudible] and, but not how is a person going to walk, 'cause there are no sidewalks. And I really would love these tests of whether the street is compatible. It's showing the street is 31' wide. Now I would love to have the same tests run on the street when cars are parked on the side, when there's 6' of snow, and when there's pedestrians on the street. And that's all I ask, that a realistic study be done.

So thank you very much. I'm going to keep bringing it up because no one is addressing that.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you. We appreciate it. And all the eight years that you've spent here with us. All right. Anyone else from the public? All right, seeing no one, we'll close the public hearing. Let's take a quick break before we move into the Commissioners' comments and through the rest of the Planning Commission agenda. We'll take ten minutes. Thanks.

End of public comment

Break

Chair

Strachan: Call the August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2017 Planning Commission meeting back to order. We have heard from Staff and the applicant, and we have heard public comment. Commissioners, let's do our comments now. Let's start with Steve. I see pages and pages, so maybe you can knock out several of the comments that we might have, and we can pick up if necessary where you leave off.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay. So I'm going to---a mix of just some comments. Some, some of this first batch is really aimed at Staff's attempts at mitigation. You, you mention in a number of places these white noise alarms as being a requirement. If we're going to do something like that I think that's a citywide for all construction processes. I don't understand how it's important for this and not for other projects. 'Cause we have all sorts of projects that get done deep in residential areas. And so I don't

understand how this can be important for these guys and not for anybody else.

On page 63, let me just get there real quick. I'm sorry, I was on the wrong thing. You guys are talking about moving up 50% of the material during shoulder season, blah, blah, blah, blah. This is in the middle of the page. I, I couldn't figure out what you were trying to accomplish there, what you were mitigating. And, and I couldn't even guess whether it was 50% or less or 50% or more, or what. So whatever you were trying to mitigate there was, was lost on me. If it's trying to get work done in the shoulder season I wasn't sure just why simply delivery kinds of things accomplished much. So if you'll help explain that when those things get flushed out.

Page 64, in a number of places you talk about whenever major events are being held, you need to be more specific if we're going to actually put some construct there. The City Special Events people have like level one, level two, level three. And obviously, if it's a level three thing out at Quinn's Junction it probably doesn't affect stuff. But if it does and you think it does, we, we need to kind of tie that into how the City evaluates events. There's a nice structure there so that we can have something concrete to work from.

Page 64, down near the bottom. Talk about managing snow and parking along Empire. It's like widen snow removal along Lowell. And this gets back to thing. I don't---we've kind of lost track of the whole widening the road project. And is this purely a snow removal or is this a sidewalk discussion. And there was questions about which sides of the road the sidewalks were on. And there were all sorts of things back historically about how do you remove the snow with parked cars. And if the applicant's doing this versus the City, how can they possibly get people to move cars. So I think we just need to talk something, again, kind of more detail about what we mean when we talk about widen the snow removal. I mean, there's got to be a place to put it. So, it's not like you can just magically, magically do that.

Page 64 going to 65. The long term trip. It says that the thing is to minimize overall trips. And then it had things that didn't make sense to me. That a post monitoring program to show achieving trip reduction. Unless we have like specific numbers or something, you monitor, you see that it's 842. So what? I mean, what, what do we do with that. So I didn't know how that was a mitigation piece. And participate in the Empire

Silver King upgrade. While I agree they need to do that, that doesn't really fit under eliminating any of these trips. It doesn't actually eliminate a single trip. It just makes it so that the traffic flows more smoothly. So, that probably belongs somewhere else, but not there.

And I apologize for everybody sitting through these, but if we're going to get all these things in place we've got to nail them down.

Page 65. Where was it. Down near the bottom. The goal is to reduce construction related trips to a less significant level. I'm not sure what to do with that. I mean, as we get more specific, and maybe that will come as we get further, but less specific level is really vague. So if you saved, you know, two cars you did that. But, you know, what are we trying to get it to and can we get that to some sort of metric that we're trying to drive to.

Page 66. Again, you mention the, the major events down at the bottom. We just need to fix that.

Page 68. I didn't understand this. When we get to---oops, I guess it was the top of page, or the bottom of page 67. I'm sorry. Minimize impacts to the site and adjacent commercial and residential properties, especially during winter months. Oh, this was in the construction piece. Is it? No, this is in the ongoing piece. So I didn't understand why it was Lowell only if it was in the development side of things. If I read that right. It should be both Lowell and Empire.

And 4C, down in---where did we go. 4C, project applicant, in cooperation with Park City Municipal and Vail should contribute their fair share to the construction of blah, blah, blah, blah. That should also include the King's Crown application. I know that's coming separate, but that ought to be filtered in here.

So, page 70. This is one that you guys know is one of my hot buttons where we talk about the---at, at the top we're talking about the property being used, the commercial property being used as convenient service to those residing within the project, and not designed to serve off-site or attract other customers. This is one I'd like you guys to think about because you've heard me voice this complaint before. I can open any weeks Park Record and see all the places that had similar kinds of discussions in their approvals, where you can see ads for the spa, the Montage, you can get two for one coupons at a bunch of the restaurants.

You see advertisements for Ruth's Chris and Hotel Park City. And it's very clear that these places are trying to draw traffic that is not just internal to their, to their hotel or their, their facilities. As a possible mitigation, would you guys agree that there would be a long-standing thing that says no one can advertise these properties, any of these commercial, support commercial properties in anything other than an internal facility advertisement kind of thing. In other words, no Park Record ads, no radios, no promotions or anything like that that would be clearly intended to draw people from outside into these commercial properties. So I'd like you guys to consider adding that as a mitigation. I'm---when we get to the commercial support you know I have a big issue about how much is allocated, and I don't think that's justified.

Planner

Astorga: Commissioner Joyce, if I could clarify. This is specific Development Parameter and condition #3 that starts on page 69 and it continues on to 70. That, that, that's the one you're referring to?

Commissioner

Joyce: Yes, thank you. Yes. Page 76. Hey, we get to skip some. I already hit this. This is where I get into the whatever happened to our sidewalks and everything else. Somewhere that needs to get brought up really quick because it never seemed to get resolved back in 2009. It seemed like you were getting close but it, it just seems incredibly relevant with all the discussions we're talking about with Lowell and all the pictures we're seeing and things like that, as to what that road is really going to look like now that we just rebuilt Lowell.

Page 77. This should be one of the easiest ones we have is I want to see mitigation to keep trucks off of Empire. If all the construction traffic and delivery traffic is supposed to be going up Lowell and Manor I don't understand how that's really going to happen. And just, you know, putting a little sign there or something isn't going to work. So I'd like to see something that you think is actually going to keep traffic going the way that we expect it to go.

Let me---on to the traffic study. Page 91. If I look at like the---there's a table there. And you might actually want to bring this up if you want just for the people in the, in the room here. In Table 1 on page 91, there's two columns. It's the 2005 counts, traffic counts, and then the 2017 counts. And, and I don't care about the estimated traffic. I care about the ones

that are actual counts. And when I look down the things like Lowell and Empire and go from 2005 to 2017, they go up anywhere from 300 to 500 percent, at a time there were no Treasures built or anything like that. I mean, there was, there was change going on, there was certainly infill happening, but there wasn't any massive projects and stuff. So I, I would love if it from maybe from our traffic guy here. Can you talk about at all why---my concern is that when we look at the future growth, we're looking at 25.8% for this long period of growth; and yet we had 12 years where no major changes happened, and we went up 300 to 500 percent. What happened?

Gary

Horton: I'd have to go back and look, and I'll verifying at the meeting. But part of that is the, the parking requirements [inaudible].

Commissioner

Joyce: I'm sorry. Could you pop up here. In fact, could you stay for a minute.

Gary

Horton: I will go back and verify this, but part of my thought would be that people are parking up and down Empire and Lowell to increase the traffic. But honestly, off the top of my head I'd have to go back and look. Those are numbers---they go out and they video it. They come back, they count them.

Commissioner

Joyce: I, I believe the numbers. And, and what I'm concerned about is if somehow we didn't add anything substantial, and yet we went up by a factor of five, I, I look at the 25.8% and I go, hey I know you worked scientifically to come up with that, but I simply don't believe it anymore. Because if nothing else, I've got Vail telling me that they're projections are they're going to increase skier, skier days by 5% per year compounded every year. So it takes me all of about four years to hit your 30-year goal based on their skier numbers. Now I know that's not sufficient, but I also know on top of that we're adding Treasure and we're adding some other projects. I, I can't begin to believe 25% right now, and I'll just tell you that. So you could start helping me with that one by explaining why we went up 500%.

Page 98. And this is again one of these little detailed things. If you look down at the bottom left-hand corner of this, this may be something I'm

reading these things wrong, but I just don't understand. So if I look at the little red dot that says North Star there, and I look at the number of people going down the street. As I read that, that's a peak of 18 in the morning and 29 in the afternoon per hour, is that right?

Gary

Horton: That's correct.

Commissioner

Joyce: So, if you could scoot up just a little bit, Francisco, and, yeah, stop right there. Go back down just a hair. At the intersection, there's a red dot at the intersection of Manor Way and Lowell right there. And all of a sudden by the time I get down there I've gone from 18 going down the street to 120 going down the street. And from 28 going down the street in the afternoon to 198 going down the street. Am I reading that right?

Gary

Horton: Yes.

Commissioner

Joyce: So you're telling me that somehow there's 170 cars an hour going down Lowell somehow starting below North Star but above Manor Way?

Gary

Horton: Yes. And I've asked them to check it twice.

Commissioner

Joyce: I---

Director

Erickson: That's Marriott.

Commissioner

Joyce: Huh?

Director

Erickson: It's Marriott. It's Marriot and it's the Team Building.

Chair

Strachan: It's the Team Building, too. Yeah. There's also a bunch of duplexes up there.

Commissioner

Joyce: Yeah, I know duplexes. Marriott drops off at a point where it would count into those numbers?

Director

Erickson: Yep.

Commissioner

Joyce: Okay. That helps. Because I just---

Gary

Horton: Yeah, sorry.

Commissioner

Joyce: It's like ghost cars showing up or something. I couldn't figure that one out.

There was a thing in the, the review that the City had done on---if we look on page 100 we come up to a total use count for cars. And if you look at the---for trips generated. And if you look down at the bottom the specialty retail center, we get 109. But there was a table that was included that was listed as partial plan P2 that actually broke down those special things, like it was a coffee shop and all the things that were actually indicated. And that drove 218 trips a day. And I couldn't figure out what the difference was between---it looked like two tables that you provided both of, and the more detailed one came up with twice as many car trips.

Gary

Horton: So the other table came from the third party review from the City. We generated this partially from this, assuming that they're specialty retail and quality restaurant. The reality is, exactly what's going to be in there is still not 100% defined. So we felt like this gave the most reflection of what would be there, not just when they open, but potentially five years later because something could swap out, and something could come in place of it. So, in general in a resort kind of a community, quality restaurants and specialty retail seems to gather the, the people that are staying in that area. So that's why we kept with that definition instead of a coffee shop or something different, because it could change over time.

Commissioner

Joyce: So, from what I remember, though, when you guys provided the, a little bit more detail. I think this was two months ago when you first showed us the incremental 17.1 and 17.2 plans, you actually had some space drawn in as coffee shop and retail store and, and restaurant and that kind of thing. And I thought that's where, they actually took that from your plans. And it worries me that it's a factor of two for trip here. I mean, 100 trips a day is, is significant. So you don't, you don't have to answer that one here. That's a little bit more complex question, but I think the mix that you guys put into your plan was what we see at the base of most of the ski areas. And so when I saw it a month or two ago I went, oh, yeah, it seems like about the right mix of what I would expect to see. And it looks like it drives twice as many car trips. So if you could work through that for me I would appreciate it.

We did that one. On page 103, it seems like we just ignore Crescent Tram. Down at the bottom when we're taking about peak hours and Lowell, the trip distribution and assignment area. It looks like we really are ignoring Crescent Tram completely. And it seems to me as we heard from our City Engineer that when people start reacting to traffic being backed up and things, they're, they're smart. They, they learn to adapt. And if you look down Empire, you look down Lowell and you see people trying to figure out how to back up and all this kind of stuff, you're going to go down Crescent Tram. Does the modeling and stuff that you do somehow include that or compensate for that, or do you just assume some flat percentage based on what's happening now?

Gary

Horton: No. that is factored in. That's part of the reason we actually expanded the study area was to include down at the other end of Crescent Tram and those connection points down to Park Avenue. And that same information and technology is available now. So this year, given the weather we had and the good ski conditions for most days, we anticipated more would be going down Crescent Tram. But when we gathered the counts they weren't there. So, from previous information, what's there today, we didn't feel comfortable all of a sudden assigning 20% to go down Crescent Tram 'cause they didn't do it this year. And Google Maps and everything that gives you the quickest route out of town or to various places was available. So we tried to stick pretty close to what was realistic this year.

Commissioner  
Joyce: Okay.

Gary  
Horton: Not knowing what the future holds. But that's why we used that information.

Commissioner  
Joyce: Okay. Thank you. Good that you guys considered it.

You, you heard from the THINC people. I had the same questions. With this kind of one-way traffic look at looping cars around Empire and Lowell, is that something that you guys are seriously proposing, or was that just kind of a hey, look at this numbers. Or I, I didn't know how to treat that. I had never heard you guys propose that before.

Gary  
Horton: So there's, there's been many conversations about Street capacity. And in the beginning of that section we commented on the things that impact street capacity. Snow plowing, enforcement of parking, you know, elements that as an applicant we can't drive or control. It's shown in the summer months, and when the weather is good that the capacity is there. Our challenge would be how do we address something that we don't control. So if you---one of the, some of the email changes we had is can somebody define for me what the width of the street will be available for cars to travel. And when that's given, I can give a capacity of a street much more clearly. When it's 20' one day and it's 12' the next day, and if cars are parked, then it's 16 or whatever that fluctuating number is, it's, there's a lot more assumptions in both. And that's why all the pictures that were presented and everything I looked at were conflict points when a car, one car was coming one direction and the other one was coming the other way. And it's like, well, If you remove those conflict points, the capacity of the street, I believe, will flow pretty smoothly. But you have to remove those conflicts, so either by maintaining a certain width, or if you make it one way it removes those conflict points. So, that was a---with that analysis in place, then we said, okay, will the intersections work if we did one way. And we showed that they can still work in an effective manner.

So it was---I don't know that it's a you must do this. It was here's something to consider for the safety of people when you have one-way

traf-, or only one-way availability because of snow plow limitations and safety.

Commissioner

Joyce: So can I ask one thing of you guys and one thing of you working with Staff, which is, I'm getting kind of tired and frustrating with not knowing what the plan for that street is. And I mean, width, sidewalks, snow storage, you know, parking, who can park, which side, what that's going to look like, and then, therefore, what your road width is to work with. And it seems ridiculous that we're seven months into traffic stuff and we don't have a crisp answer. And I think they actually got closer to a crisp answer but never got agreement back in 2009.

But, I mean, I, I don't know how to deal with this. My first thing was, I don't know how to deal with it when you're throwing two separate sets of traffic numbers at me and I didn't know whether you were treating this separate or was this becoming your recommendation or what. But it seems ridiculous that we're this far. So between you, you, Matt, you guys figure it out, and at least be working from the same set of assumptions, or at least tell us which assumptions, even if it's not the same ones, so we at least understand the disagreement because, I mean, this is just silly. 'Cause we, we know there's an issue there and I don't know what to do with these numbers. And I'll tell you, on page 115 where you actually have the table showing that everything's an A, I don't know where all your cars went. You're back to most of these roads having like four cars an hour or something at peak. And I'm pretty sure it's the same cars that there were like 170 of and 3 or 4 hundred of per hour. They didn't just go away because you made it a one-way loop. So I, I don't know what these numbers are, but these---this, this is messed up on, on page 115. There's no question about it. I can---there's hundreds of cars missing from key intersections. Hundreds of cars at peak hours.

I mean, if you just go back and look at page 93, which is where we're going next and look at how many of your intersections along Lowell and Empire and Park have hundreds of digits. And then I look down here it's like one, two, eight, six, one. I don't know what this table is.

Gary

Horton: Okay.

Commissioner

Joyce: Along the thing---a simple question. If we're pushing all the traffic onto Lowell for construction, I got one quick question. When two construction trucks pass, one going up and one going down, what happens? Other than they don't fit. But what happens? What's the plan and how does that work? I know it doesn't fit. So the question is, what are you guys proposing? I'm sure you've thought of this. You're not first people to think of two trucks passing. But we'd had example of example where two cars can't pass. So put two big construction trucks along there and we're forcing them, hopefully, to actually all take the same road so they'll be passing over and over and over again. And if we constrain delivery times of materials down to a tighter time, the chances of them passing goes up even more 'cause now we can't spread them out as much. So, that's, that's an easy one. Not easy to solve. It's an easy one to understand is what do two trucks do when they're halfway up and down and they can't fit.

One last piece, and again this is back to my capacity question. If you could go back to page 93. And this, I promise, is the last thing. I'm looking at the line that says Empire and Manor Way. And so it's the fourth one there. And I look and I, the way I understand this, and I could just be missing this, is especially if I go over to the 12.8% factored counts. I see 534 cars and 726 cars in the afternoon. And I thought I understood Matt to say earlier that we thought that those roads had about 400 cars a day on them. And I don't understand how we have 726 in an hour at that intersection. There's not that many people doing big trips up and down Manor Way since it's about 100 feet long. How 726 cars are on that in an hour, and 400 are on it in a day.

So either Matt or you guys, when we talk about capacity I said I was just trying to kind of swag things out to, to figure out how we got to 2500. And you can't take one hour. But if I can take two hours, one in the morning and one in the afternoon and quickly get up to 1250, I'm pretty the other 22 hours aren't going to be like 50 or something like that. So, just ballpark, these are your numbers. They're big numbers. And if I go up Empire up to Shadow Ridge, which we already know is a problem. Now we're at 2100 in two hours of the day.

So I either need to understand how that road can handle a lot more than the 2500 that we said it could, or what I'm interpreting wrong or something. But I think we're blowing those numbers out of the water.

And I just, I don't know where the 400 came from when I see numbers like this. I mean, your actuals that you guys did is still 1100 in two hours. So anyway, if we can see that. That's, that's why I really want to see some quantitative number about the capacity of those roads and where we are right now. And certainly then apply that out when you look at your future with Bamberger and Vail and Treasurer and all that kind of stuff as well, 'cause that's not even in here yet. This is just what's real today.

Gary  
Horton: Okay.

Commissioner  
Joyce: Thank you. Sorry about that.

Chair  
Strachan: Thanks, Steve. All right. Let's move this direction. Commissioner Band.

Commissioner  
Band: All right. In the Triton review they used and use 85% for resort occupancy, but the independent review, the notes on page 3 of the independent review states that the requirement should be reviewed at 100% occupancy as is standard in other resort towns. That's a quote. I actually agree with that. I would really think that we should be looking at worst case scenarios and every possibility just to see how we can really mitigate on the worst of days.

So the gondola Ms. Deforge brought up and Steve as well, but I've got some additional things. If the gondola is open it's an attraction. You know, my kid loves to ride the funicular. Are you kidding. The free trolley. People are going to be going on this and they are going to be coming into this resort. It is going to be pulling people off of Main Street whether we want it to or not. So I---but I still, even given that, have serious doubts that this can sustain the immense amount of commercial space that you've got.

So what we've got on Table---this is page 100, right here. Resort hotel occupied rooms, 172 units. Employee housing, 30 units; 20, 25, we've got some mixed numbers on that. Condominium and townhouse, 103 units. So, that's 305 units for 17,470 square feet of commercial space. That's a lot. I mean, 300 units and they're going to fill up and keep all of this commercial space viable. Just to give you kind of an idea because I

looked it up, the average size of a freestanding Starbucks, and that's the one that has the drive-through and is larger than what you would see in an urban area, is 2,000 square feet. A chain restaurant, say Chili's, Macaroni Grill, 6,000 square feet. So, just to kind of put that in your head, we're talking, you know, a restaurant and a coffee shop, a big one, that's only 8,000. And we're at 17-1/2 thousand square feet.

So what scares me with that, is that we just had a little discussion not too long ago, a couple of weeks ago at the Planning Commission on Main Street about chain stores. And boy, if, if occupancy drops low well maybe we better change our minds and allow stores. So if we allow you to build something that going to fail commercially, and we can---I'm not going to say without a doubt, but we surmise that it's going to be very difficult without outside business to keep your commercial ventures afloat here. What's going to keep you from coming back to us in a couple of years and saying we've got all this vacancy. It's terrible. It's terrible for the town. We're going to have to change it. And I think it's going to be hard for us and the Council to say no to that. You know, we don't want failing businesses. We want a thriving economy. That is a huge, huge concern for me.

So, moving on. The suggested mitigations still seem overly broad to me. I do agree with Staff's comments for more clarification. I don't how the construction impact---the construction impacts and the mitigations were confusing to me as well, but I like the specificity of it, even if it was a little confusing to read. I mean, that's what we want to see. We're going to do X, Y and Z not, you know, floating out there, oh, we suggest do this or we'll, you know, ask employees not to park on certain days.

I think airport courtesy shuttles, apart from being good mitigating factors, are also good business. Just speaking personally, if I was choosing a hotel that was going to pick me up from the airport complimentary and take me, I would definitely be looking at that pretty carefully.

Let's see. So the traffic studies, and I am not a traffic engineer obviously. I'm just struggling with why these modeling is saying these---why the modeling is saying the streets are going to function with all this added capacity, when they're quite clearly not functioning now. I mean, we've seen some pretty impactful video and pictorial evidence from the residents that is a little frightening, honestly. Like, like Steve said, if two trucks can't

pass each other, what's going to happen, especially if you add some snow on there.

So another thing the studies that we should---nobody's mentioned yet but I think is important is that half of Old Town is under construction right now. Anyone who lives here knows it. Anyone who drives through it knows it. I tried to go down upper Park, which is now two-ways but is one-way in the winter, the other day. And it took me---I mean I might as well have gone down Main Street and dodged the, the tourists walking across the street. It was not a faster way to go down. And it's because there's a ton of construction going on. So if we have residents, we have visitors, and we have Treasure construction, and potentially Bamberger construction, and then we've also got the five other houses that are having, you know, redoing their home. I think that's worth considering as well that, you know, on any given time, period of time, there's at least a couple of houses on every block in Old Town that's doing additional construction.

And I do also support hiring another company, which I know Bruce was talking about on the radio, to do a third traffic study. I mean, this is one of the most important things we're talking about here and we, we can't get it wrong. Like we really can't afford to do that. So, the new traffic study, or the additional traffic study really needs to take road capacity into account in the worst of conditions, not just the intersection capacity. And that's it.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you. Commissioner Suesser.

Commissioner

Suesser: I'm going to start with some things that are already addressed. I, too, noticed the significant increase in traffic since the 2005 study on Lowell and Empire. And I'd like to understand that increase. And also, if there were projections done in 2005 as to what was anticipated on those streets. If there were long range projections, I'd like to see how those compare to what we have going on there now just as a reference point.

I'd also like an explanation as to how the numbers that were put up in the traffic study in the February 2017 report, how those numbers don't exceed the capacity of the streets. If the, if the capacity of the streets is 2500 cars a day, those numbers clearly exceed that based on the hourly numbers that we see in those charts.

On Table 3 of the traffic report on page 92, Table 3, I noticed one discrepancy for the Lowell Avenue and Manor Way line. I see the actual count in the morning as 471 cars. And then you're supposed to factor in 12.8% increase, but it's 472 in the, in that column for the a.m. So it doesn't look like that increase was included, that percentage increase was included on that number. So I'd like that adjustment to be made.

I was wondering if the applicant had any plans for off-site parking facilities other than public park and rides. I noticed that none of the traffic mitigation strategies address pedestrian safety concerns, or the reality of the existing conditions on Lowell and Empire and Crescent for most of the year. And I think that needs to be factored into these studies.

As Steve mentioned, we heard a lot about sidewalks. And I think they're were stairs on 10<sup>th</sup> Street connecting Lowell and Empire that were proposed in 2009. And I believe the sidewalk was discussed earlier this year. And I was just wondering why those issues were included in the traffic study, and if they're still being proposed by the applicant.

I agree with Staff that the, the strategies need to go further and need to address concerns not just during the winter and special events but year-round. And that incentivizing employees not to drive to work is really inadequate. We need to require them not to, not to drive to work. To provide free shuttle services or require them to use public transportation, but just incentivizing them isn't, I don't believe, adequate.

I think that's all I have.

Chair

Strachan: Commissioner Phillips.

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay. Let's see. I'll start by just saying that I do agree with the Staff's comments in the packet as well. I agree with the Staff's comments in the packet. I also agree with the need for more emphasis on pedestrian traffic and safety. I don't know how traffic studies account for that, but there are a lot of people walking up and down there, so.

Let's see here. I'm just trying to go through and cross off things that have been discussed. I agree with Commissioner Band's comments regarding the commercial space. It's a big, you know, it's a big concern of mine and

that also ties into me still trying to figure out how the anticipated trip generations from the commercial space are justified when outside customers aren't allowed into the MPD. So I'll just be, you know, trying to make my best judgement on that.

What else do I have here. I also agree with Commissioner Joyce on the, kind of a comprehensive plan on the streetscape, and how it's anticipated to function. One of my biggest concerns, I think, is public safety. And I'm still trying to wrap my mind around how, how we, how we figure for the worst case scenario and snow storms in the winter. I know your traffic studies, you don't have a way to, to quantify those conditions, but I would like to see some more thought put into it, even if they are guesses.

My biggest fear is---because I witness it, I live it, it's part of life. It's part of being in Old Town, but I don't think that this project should exacerbate the problem of when we do have winter storms. Is there, you know, can we put some sort of trigger that construction's just gotta stop. You know, after you have several days of storms and snow removal sometimes the plows need to come in. Sometimes during a, a large snow storm these roads are going to become dangerous. And I don't know how or what we can do to have a trigger that just stops construction, period, when it's just not safe, when emergency vehicles can't get up there. That's, that's immensely important to me just because I personally do know what it's like to be in that situation.

You know, there's, I just don't see a whole lot of thought put into worst case scenario because they happen, and they happen several times a year. The worst case scenario actually is a common occurrence. It's not something that happens every 100 years. It, it happens virtually every year. And this last year it was a good amount of the year as well. So, anyhow, enough on that.

I would still prefer, I would still---well, I'm curious to know how many, how many truck loads are anticipated for snow removal, and how is that all factored in. And not only that, but usually that is also when the road conditions are, are the worst. So if it were up to me, the snow wouldn't be hauled off those roads; or, or at some sort of reduction of those trucks, and, and a plan on where this, you know, where the snow is going to go. I'd still prefer it to stay on the hill whether it be melted, moved up the road to on-site as opposed to having these large dump trucks going through town. And I'm still really trying to wrap my mind around just how is, how is

it handled, you know. When, when is the snow hauled off. You know, I don't know. I, I guess I just don't quite understand how that is going to be handled.

And I think that pretty much concludes my comments.

Commissioner

Band: Sorry, I just wanted to jump in and say one thing that Commissioner Joyce pointed out. I was looking at that table on page 100, which had specialty retail center and quality restaurant at 17,470 square feet. That is actually not the total commercial. The total commercial is closer to 50,000, which would be---thank you very much for the calculations and for pointing it out, 36 Chili's and three Starbucks for 305 units to support. So, just wanted to point that out.

Chair

Strachan: Sure.

Commissioner

Band: Thank you to, to Commissioner Joyce for doing so.

Chair

Strachan: Commissioner Campbell?

Commissioner

Campbell: I'll be short because I gave most of my time to Commissioner Joyce. I, I think anybody that lives here and has driven out between the high school and the hospital in the last couple of months when they're putting in that new infrastructure out there can see what, what we would face with this. And so, I, I think that the traffic studies---it's difficult for me to know how much weight to put into them because we have one that's clearly pro and one that's clearly con. And I'm not in any way impugning the integrity of the traffic engineers. I understand they have rules and regulations and data that they collect.

I, I do like Melissa's idea that we would have a third party completely impartial, not because I distrust the two that we have, but because I think they're too limited. I would really like to see, you know, what's the impact going to be on the, on the Interstate 40/248 exchange. We're talking about something that's already broken, and I don't know how it can get much worse before people just stop wanting to come here altogether.

People are going to stop wanting to live here altogether. And I think Kimball Junction, when you look out there in the morning or in the afternoon, how many more cars can we put out there. The idea that we only have to worry about Lowell and Empire and what this project would do to them, I think, is very shortsighted. There are so many other choke points. The Deer Valley/Bonanza thing is, is almost---my office is around the corner from that and making a turn out of there because almost undoable. And, and the worst part is people seem to be jumping the red lights now and the, the traffic has become, you know, it's, definitely the number one issue in Park City. And I think if we're going to look at this, it has to be more holistically.

And so, the infrastructure and how that's going to tear up the streets, those are short-term mitigations. But the long term ones, I think we really want to look at what's it going to do with traffic everywhere and not just right in the neighborhood.

That's all I've got for tonight.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you. Commissioner Thimm?

Commissioner

Thimm: Don't have a whole lot to add. The commentary from the other Commissioners I, I find myself falling in line with by and large.

There were a couple of things. Staff asked if we would concur with the, the PQS's. I appreciated the detail that Staff went to in preparing those. The modification and format as well as the other comments that Commissioner Joyce provided I am supportive of. As important as looking at that and, and feeling like I'm supportive of what Staff has put together, the applicant has, has indicated that there is a, it's the first time that they had seen them when, when this Staff report came out. And I'm very interested in their responses to each one of them. And I guess it would be my hope that rather than trying to refute them that the applicant would look at them with a positive attitude and, and look at---try to understand the intent and, and how we can actually achieve the goals that were set aside in those.

With regard to the traffic analysis that we were provided to look at. All along I've had kind of a major question with regard to some of the

reductions, in particular with both the ski runs and the cabriolet. The third party, the LSC review document, basically completely discounts those. And you end up with a very wide variance between the, the reduced numbers in, in the Triton Analysis versus the reduced numbers in the LSC review. The---it, it, it's a factor of almost 2.

We're, we have some fundamental building blocks all through here that we're working with, whether it's a site plan that was approved in the Master Plan way back when. Another one of those is, is the traffic counts. And if there is a significant difference between what a third party reviewer has provided in comparison to the, the applicant's analysis, it would seem like there's a need to strive towards some sort of a concurrence. Because that's a fundamental building block in terms of the number of trips and what's happening on, on these streets. And I, I think that it's very important that Staff and our City Engineer work closely with the applicant and determine some level of concurrence and some level of agreement with regard to any reductions that are being suggested.

With regard to the, the overall presumptions that are being made concerning what happens day to day and that sort of thing, and winter and summer conditions and that sort of thing. I, I still feel very strongly that it is important to address what happens on the worst day when there's an emergency. And what are we going to do to mitigate a situation where we have a truck going uphill, a truck going downhill, and an ambulance needed or a fire truck needed. That's, that's kind of a fundamental analysis that that needs to happen.

I'm not sure what happens to pedestrians. I mean, we've seen photographs of what happens during the snow, but I, I would like to have that explained much more thoroughly.

And I think that's my basic commentary.

Chair

Strachan: Great. Commissioner Joyce, yeah.

Commissioner

Joyce: I'm sorry. I get, since Preston gave me his time I get one more question. I missed, I missed my parking question. And this may be one that you can easily explain because---kind of like my ghost cars on Lowell.

On page 118, if you can bring that up. There's a chart up at the top. I don't, I didn't understand how parking generation works for hotels, and what's included and what's not. Can you, can you kind of explain, you know. Well, let me just tell you. Kind of my basic concern is when I look at like a 200-unit hotel with commercial and meeting space, it takes less parking than 100 condos, and considerably less than half as much commercial space. So, so can you tell me what's included in hotel, and why that number is so small relatively, relative to the rest of the things on there? Did that make sense? I'm sorry, I kind of babbled.

Gary

Horton: No, I think it does. I prefer to look into that an answer it next month.

Commissioner

Joyce: So, so then let me give you two or three more sentences because I asked this once before. We hadn't seen this one. This one is really important to me, which is when I look at the hotel I'm looking at 200 units. And I think what I read in here, and again I was kind of reading into some of the description you put in, is that that seems to include employee parking at whatever level you're assuming that employees are parking there. But I would assume a hotel has hundreds of employees versus a condo, which has close to none, other than maybe some maintenance or check-in or something like that. But you know, so you've got twice the number of units, you've got a lot more employees. You've got 30,000 square feet of commercial versus the 17,000 that you have separate here. And those are all wrapped up into one and come out with a number smaller than the rest of the things. And it seems like that number is off. Intuitively, it seems like it's off by 2 or 3 hundred or something. I mean, big. So, I, I just, that's, that's probably the single biggest hole for me with parking. But it's monstrous to me right now.

Pat

Sweeney: Which way is it off?

Commissioner

Joyce: I, I think it's way too small. I don't see how you have 200 hotel units, plus a bunch of employees, plus 10,000 square feet of meeting space, plus 30,000 square feet of commercial space, and it's two-thirds of a little chunk of commercial. It just, that, I don't get it. How can that possibly be.

So, and, and even for the rest of them, if you could kind of explain. Again, this is probably just standard parking, you know, science, whatever. But are there assumptions for, like the commercial, does that assume some number of employee spaces versus customer spaces. And if there's any more kind of breakdown you can give us of, of what you, how you, or how they, how the, the whatever numbers you're drawing from. Even if it's just a one liner that said, commercial assumes 28% employee blah, blah, blah, blah. Whatever it is that comes up with that. Then that will help us feel more comfortable about, about these numbers.

But the big one to me, the hotel seems like it's off by a factor of 2 of 3.  
Thanks.

Commissioner

Thimm: I had one other comment.

Chair

Strachan: Sure.

Commissioner

Thimm: If I could have a little bit more of your time. In terms of the one-way loop that was mentioned, and not tonight, or not necessarily tonight anyways. I'd like for Alfred and/or Matt to provide commentary with regard to their thoughts about the potential of success of that, and whether or not that should even be considered.

Chair

Strachan: Great. I don't have anything to add. It's sort of the benefit of going last. I do like the approach of the PQS's, but those need to be tied to certain criteria. So, pick the criteria that you think each one of those ties to, and analyze it as a sub-heading under that particular criteria. And if it fits into more than one, so be it, just put it again. But remember, it's the criteria under the Code that we're applying; not just PQS's that may be accurate but aren't necessarily spelled out verbatim in the Code.

The revised plan that we just saw tonight. I'm going to be looking for some specific numbers in terms of the amount of dirt that's reduced, the amount of truck trips you think that reduces, and what other impacts you think that mitigates and by how much. And that's all I have.

All right. Anybody else. Final, final, final, final. Okay. All right. Let's have a motion to continue the Treasure Hill conditional use permit.

MOTION: Commissioner Thimm moved to CONTINUE the Treasure Hill conditional use permit to September 13, 2017. Commissioner Suesser seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

2. **1787/1791 Prospector Avenue – Plat amendment to unify two (2) lots adjacent to Parking Lot G of the Prospector Square Subdivision into one (1) lot of record. (Application PL-17003559)**

Planner Astorga reviewed the application for a plat amendment combining two lots at approximately Parking Lot G within Prospector. At one point the Planning Department received a conditional use permit application that was never brought before the Planning Commission and was denied due to inactivity.

Planner Astorga noted that the new property owner purchased the two lots and the intent is to place x-number of units on this lot. Planner Astorga clarified that the Planning Commission was not looking at a conditional use permit for multi-unit dwellings this evening. This plat amendment would simply allow the removal of the lot line between the two lots in order to build the proposed building.

Planner Astorga explained that the former approach was that it would be a simple condition of approval of the CUP; however, the correct approach is to remove the lot line first.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Band assumed that if the Planning Commission approved this plat amendment they would see the conditional use permit for the apartment building since residential is a conditional use in the GC zone. She asked if that would be changed to an allowed use.

Planner Astorga clarified that a conditional use permit had not yet been submitted, but when it is it would come before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Band remarked that as the City wants to promote live/work/play and as more things are being built in Prospecter, she thought it might be a good idea to have it as an approved use rather than a conditional use for residential in the GC zone. Planner Astorga replied that it was a difficult topic and discussion because they have to look at all of the GC zone. Commissioner Band pointed out that she raises the issue every time she has the opportunity.

Planner Astorga stated that the trigger point that kicks the MPD, which kicks another type of requirement is 20,000 square feet. In this case, it will be 19,999 square feet. They have to be careful about the gets that the City gets with the MPD, and extremely careful in removing that requirement from the GC District. Planner Astorga remarked that it was something that the Senior Team and the Planning Director could look at in the future. He reiterated that it was a complicated issue based on the current Code.

Commissioner Joyce was concerned about the opposite and disagreed with making the change. He thought the commercial district was becoming the residential district; and they have no other commercial district. Therefore, everything they do right now is pushing every bit of the commercial service industry out of town. Commissioner Joyce remarked that ever since they stopped doing Form Based Code they have forgotten to plan for their only commercial district. He did not want to make it easy for someone to buy a piece of property to build high-end nightly rental residences, because it would run the commercial business down to zero over time. Commissioner Joyce preferred to find a way to keep the commercial district.

Commissioner Band did not disagree. Her issue has always been thinking about affordable housing. When she thinks about apartment buildings it is something they need in town; however, she was opposed to more nightly rentals.

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the Prospecter Square supplemental amendment to Lot G, amending lot 48B and 48C, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as found in the draft ordinance.

#### Findings of Fact – 1787/1791 Prospecter

1. The property is located at 1787/1791 Prospecter Avenue.
2. The two (2) existing lots are designated as Lots 48B and 48C of the Prospecter Square Supplemental Amendment to Lot G.
3. Both lots are privately owned, located between Parking Lot G of the Prospecter Square Subdivision and the Rail Trail.
4. The property is located within the General Commercial (GC) zoning district.

5. The proposed Plat Amendment is to combine Lots 48B and 48C into one (1) legal lot of record, removing the interior lot line that separates them.
6. Currently, Lot 48B contains 4,775 sf. and Lot 48C contains 4,774.44 sf. of area. The proposal would create one (1) lot that contains 9,548 sf. of area.
7. Both lots are currently vacant.
8. None of the other lots, easements, or their configurations as shown on the Prospector Square Supplemental Amendment to Lot G will be affected by this amendment.
9. The newly created lot will have frontage on an existing private access easement that connects the lots to Prospector Avenue, a public right-of-way.
10. In the GC District, all Residential Uses require a Conditional Use Permit.
11. Per LMC §15-2.18-3(I) and Plat Note #8 of the Prospector Square Supplemental Amendment to Lot G, the maximum allowable floor area on site is limited to 10,800 sf.
12. Zero lot line development is permitted on the subject site, as indicated on Land Management Code §15-2.18.3(I).
13. Future development is limited to the Zone Height of 35 feet from existing grade, as indicated on Land Management Code §15-2.18-4..
14. Per Plat Note #2 of the Prospector Square Supplemental Amendment to Lot G, all parking demand created with future development shall be mitigated on site with the construction of underground parking.

#### Conclusions of Law – 1787/1791 Prospector

1. There is good cause for this Plat Amendment.
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 – 1787/1791 Prospector

1. The City Planner, City Attorney, and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat 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 at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one (1) years' 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. New construction shall comply with all applicable parameters of Land Management Code §15-2.18 regarding maximum floor area ratio, front, rear, and side yard setbacks, building height, etc.
4. All plat notes included on the Prospector Square Supplemental Amendment to Lot G continue to apply.
5. Modified 13-D sprinklers will be required for new construction by the Chief Building Official at the time of review of the building permit submittal and shall be noted on the final Mylar prior to recordation.
6. The Applicant shall coordinate all future development with the City Engineer to coincide with the future work to be completed along the Prospector Avenue right-of-way.
7. Any soil disturbance or proposed landscaping shall adhere to Park City Municipal Code 11-15-1.

**3. Consideration of an ordinance amending the Land Management Code Section 15, Chapters 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.5 regarding roof pitches and limiting the use of flat roofs to protect streetscape façades.**  
**(Application PL-16-03352)**

Commissioner Campbell thought this issue was too complicated to have a quick up or down vote.

MOTION: Commissioner Campbell made a motion to CONTINUE this matter to a date uncertain when the Planning Commission could discuss it in a Work Session.

Assistant City Attorney stated that Chair Strachan needed to at least open a public hearing before taking action on the motion.

Director Erickson stated that this proposed ordinance has been before the Historic Preservation Board five times and to the City Council at least three times. He believed it had been well-vetted. Director Erickson recommended that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to the City Council if possible this evening, rather than continuing it to a work session.

Chair Strachan thought it would be beneficial for the Planning Commission hear the Staff presentation even if it were continued to a work session. He recommended that they listen to the presentation and take public input before deciding on the motion. Commissioner Campbell was comfortable with that approach.

Planner Anya Grahn reported that Historic Preservation Board has been reviewing the Design Guidelines since early 2016. As they review the Guidelines they look at

compatibility, infill, and new additions to historic buildings and try to understand how they can add a contemporary addition that still compliments and is characteristic with the character of Old Town. Flat roofs continue to emerge as the sore spot, and the Staff has been trying to figure out a balance between flat roofs, roof top decks, and green roofs; and how they can fit into Old Town without compromising the historic character and the National Register listings.

Planner Grahn assumed the Commissioners had read the Staff report and understood the history of this proposed ordinance and the number of times it had been to the HPB. She noted that the Staff had a special meeting with the design community, architects, contractors and people who work mostly in Old Town to get their feedback. The HPB met last Wednesday and their feedback was also incorporated into the Staff report.

Chair Strachan recalled that this has also been before the Planning Commission at least twice in his time on the Commission.

Planner Hannah Tyler noted that the Staff report included photos of what the Staff believes are compatible flat roofs in Old Town. She presented photos and described the elements that makes them compatible. Planner Tyler presented a rendering to show what the Staff is consistently being asked for by the development community. They took the typical roof forms found in the Historic District, and added the flat roof. It was built to 27' high. There are some advantages to flat roofs, and they tried to address it so they could still be allowed; however, they hope the front of the buildings can start contributing to the streetscape more consistently.

Planner Tyler reviewed two examples of what could be possible under the proposed ordinance. One roof form was a side facing gable, which is more contributory to the streetscape. Party decks and other things that people like to see in new development is still allowed in the back. A second photo was a cross-wing two story. Planner Tyler remarked that they tried to allow design flexibility for the design community that likes more modern infill.

Planner Grahn reviewed the proposed definitions. They came up with definitions for both rooftop decks, as well as a platform deck. A flat roof should be 2:12 or less. The primary roof form would be the largest area of the roof. Contributory roof form was more related to the street. Secondary roof form is like porches, bay windows, and things that are not necessarily the focal part of the project. The total roof is the roof plan.

Planner Grahn stated that the intent is to keep the compatibility of the historic character along the street front. That is the most important, particularly from the National

Register viewpoint. She explained that there needs to be between a 7:12 and 12:12 pitch as a contributory roof form, which is the part that is visible from the primary public right-of-way. The secondary roof form could be accent pieces like dormers, bay windows, and other things. Behind the first 20' along the street they would allow flat roofs and other elements. The height of railings, parapets, stairs, etc. must be part of the zone height. Otherwise, the railing would be added above the 27', which adds more bulk and mass to the structure.

Planner Grahn stated that accessory structures would be exempt from these rules because a garage or a shed can have various roof forms without hurting the streetscape.

Commissioner Suesser asked the Staff to comment on planted roof tops and whether they would be permitted. Planner Grahn replied that the Staff was comfortable with green roofs as long as they are in the back. The wall heights with the flat roof are similar and when there are gables and flats, it does not seem to hurt the streetscape as much. However, when there is 27' at the peak and the next one is a square box that goes up to 27 feet, that begins to change the mass and scale of the streetscape and impacting the historic character. Commissioner Suesser understood that a green roof would be allowed in the back as long as there is a gabled front on the streetscape. Planner Grahn replied that she was correct. It could also have a hip. The goal is to have a pitch.

Director Erickson stated that it is almost impossible to assure that a green roof would remain a green roof. To address regulatory difficulties, they decided to allow it in the back where it would not impact the streetscape and still allow it to continue.

Commissioner Campbell referred to the photo of 1280B Park Avenue on page 171 of the Staff report, and asked if that would be allowed under the new rules. Planner Tyler replied that this particular one would because it fronts Park Avenue. Planner Grahn pointed out that it was a rear addition to a historic house. If it was a freestanding single-family house facing the Park it would not be allowed.

Commissioner Campbell read, "It allows it to blend with its neighbors while not detracting from the historic." He thought that was confusing. Planner Grahn stated that it is along Sullivan Road where a number of apartments and condo buildings have the square, boxy appearance. Since it is behind the historic Park Avenue house it is largely invisible from Park Avenue. She noted that they had pulled in the shapes of the windows, the reveal of the siding, and some of the pitches to try to loosely contribute and compliment that historic house.

Commissioner Campbell felt like they were trying to dictate taste. He thought the 20' rule for the main roof seemed arbitrary because neither of the example roof structures were anywhere near 20' in depth, but they do break up the face. He thought it was hard to define. These are complicated issues, which is why he had suggested a work session where they could talk about it. Commissioner Campbell disclosed that he has built nine flat roof houses in Old Town in the last four years. He thought everything they were trying to accomplish was valid. There were many loose definitions that need to be tightened up and he thought they were on the right track. Commissioner Campbell was concerned that the 20' section in the front, where they basically fake it into looking like an older building, would not lead to good architecture. He referred to the photo that was shown earlier of what would not be allowed, and stated that in his opinion it should be allowed. Commissioner Campbell wanted one last work session where they could talk about the arbitrary 20' rule.

Director Erickson stated that 20' was not arbitrary. It was taken very carefully from the deck homes with the pitched roofs behind High West. It was also taken very carefully from the two homes that Jeremy Pack constructed on Ontario Avenue. It also mimics the size of a traditional miner's house on a 25' x 75' lot. Director Erickson stated that if the Commissioners headed down to High West they would see good examples of the blend of pitched roof with flat roof. He also commented on two other structures with flat roofs that did not meet the size criteria they were looking for.

Commissioner Campbell thought the railings should come into the height. There have been exceptions, which was a loophole that people took advantage of. He supported everything they were proposing, except for having such a rigid number. However, he understood that it probably has to be rigid from the standpoint of enforcement.

Commissioner Campbell referred to the images on page 175, and asked if that side gable roof would be 20' back. Planner Tyler answered yes. Commissioner Campbell thought it looked historically accurate. Planner Grahn believed they had also incorporated a flat roof for the porch. It was another way to show that it did not have to be an exact replica of a historic house.

Commissioner Campbell understood that the roof on the home shown on page 171 would no longer be allowed in the HR-1 if this ordinance is adopted. Director Erickson explained that the house on Park Avenue that faces Sullivan Road is a contemporary addition to a historic home. The historic home meets the 20' façade shift. However, if it was the front façade it would not be allowed.

Commissioner Campbell clarified that he did not have any other flat roof projects, and the other were already built. However, he thinks the building on page 171 would still be

a good addition to the street and would make it a more interesting area, regardless of which direction it faced.

Director Erickson stated that the Staff looked at the General Plan, the Historic District Guidelines, and the National Registry for the Historic District, and decided that architectural beauty was less important than maintaining the historic character in order to maintain the register district.

Commissioner Campbell thought there were many projects in the pipeline, and he would like the opportunity for more people in the design community to have a say.

Planner Grahn commented on the outreach to the design community. She noted that this was first started last summer with the HPB. The HPB recommended that they get input from the design community. Planner Grahn stated that they met twice with the design community. In addition, throughout all of 2016 she and Planner Tyler had open office hours on a specific day when anyone could come and talk to them about flat roofs or general guideline revisions. The Staff also received written comments, which were included in the Staff report. Planner Grahn acknowledged that the outreach was minimal and she offered to reach out to the design community again.

Commissioner Campbell offered to provide the names of four or five architects who were currently working on projects that had not yet been submitted. He believed they would be disappointed if they were not able to have a say on this matter.

Commissioner Suesser referred to the new addition on the house that faces Sullivan Road. If they saw a number of those homes in Park City, she wanted to know if they would lose their historic designation. Commissioner Suesser asked if gabled roofs were a hard and fast rule in the Historic District. Commissioner Grahn answered no, and that it was more about compatibility. According to the National Register, compatibility is maintaining the historic look and feel. For example, the Historic Main Street District maintains the look and feel of the mining era. They wanted to make sure they maintain the look and feel even in the residential districts to avoid looking like suburban America. It needs to maintain the mining era look and feel.

Commissioner Phillips stated that he has always felt that if they perpetually mimic the mining era, they would not be telling the next generations about this era. He believed this was a huge era for Park City. Director Erickson pointed out that the guidelines require that they do not mimic. He explained that they put two strategies together. You can take the form, mass and scale of a historic structure and do it with contemporary materials. Or you can do a more contemporary design with a better use of historic materials. The Staff's approach is to be as authentic as possible and maintain an

identifiable character inside the thematic district, rather than an imposition of a characteristic from outside the District.

Commissioner Phillips stated that he had recently been through this process. He found it interesting because he started off with a flat roof all the way through. It evolved and actually looks similar to what the Staff was trying to achieve. He did not believe his design would fit the new requirements, but he felt like he had achieved the same effect.

Commissioner Phillips personally would like more time to discuss this issue. He asked if it was possible to identify flat roofs around town. Director Erickson stated that there is a photo tour of the flat roofs, which is how they reached this point. He noted that compatibility is a defined term, legislatively defined in the LMC and the Historic District Guidelines. The Staff took photographs of the roofs in the District and the HPB went through them line by line and identified elements of compatibility, as well as the elements that disrupted the compatibility, rhythm and scale of the streets. Commissioner Phillips assumed those photographs were in the Minutes from the HPB meetings that were included in the Staff report.

Commissioner Phillips stated that in general he agreed with the proposed ordinance. However, it is a big decision and he would like more time to go through it himself. He was willing to put in the time to read any additional background information or research that the Staff could provide. He noted that the Minutes were not available at the time for one of the HPB meetings, and he would like to read those Minutes as well. Commissioner Phillips acknowledged the amount of time Planners Grahn and Tyler have put into this, and he has the utmost respect for their ability and how they approached this.

Commissioner Campbell clarified that he was not opposed to this ordinance and he believed they were 95% there. The loopholes needed to be tightened up, but he would like to find a way to provide a little more flexibility. It may not be possible, but he would like to have that discussion.

Commissioner Phillips wanted to discuss rooftop decks. He asked if there was a proposed maximum square footage for rooftop decks, or whether it would be constrained by the new requirements. He pointed out that the issue of roof top decks impacting neighbors had come up many times and he was not opposed to limiting the square footage. He thought rooftops decks should be allowed over 23' as long as it has been mitigated thoroughly and it is limited to a maximum square footage. Commissioner Phillips thought rooftop decks needed more discussion.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside stated that she has followed all of the manifestations of this Code, and it is struggle. She thought this was a good start and a good place to work from. The definitions are good, and the numbers were good. Ms. Meintsma thought it was missing some nuances that would allow for more design. She has seen some projects coming forward that are difficult for the neighborhood, but currently do not have Code to make them work better. For that reason, she thought time was an issue. Ms. Meintsma anticipated that the Planning Commission say that this proposed ordinance needed more time and more work. She personally thought it needed more 3-D pictures with different options. Ms. Meintsma reiterated that the language was a good beginning.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Thimm stated understood that this has been going through an evolution for a long period of time. He noted that the Staff report talks about compatibility, and it is important to not look at individual buildings, but rather to look at the street scene and understand the composition of the street scene, and what each structure contributes to that street scene. The Staff report indicates that the HPB made a Finding that pitched roofs better contribute to the historic character, but he was looking for evidence of that fact. He was interested in understanding the background for saying that roof pitches do contribute better. Commissioner Thimm referred to page 173 of the Staff report, which showed a box with a straight flat face on the street, and that is considered inappropriate. Page 175 shows a pitched roof and an articulated façade. In his opinion, if the porch was removed it would not be compatible and evoke what they were trying to do. Commissioner Thimm referred to the bottom photo on page 171 and noted that there was a lot more there than just the roof lines that draw the eye. There is articulation and materiality. It becomes a sum of its parts, but at the same time those parts break it down and presents a façade that has the elements that are headed in the direction of what this ordinance was trying to achieve. Commissioner Thimm was interested in having the opportunity to understand why they made the Finding that pitched roofs are more contributory. He did not see it in the report.

Commissioner Joyce stated that he was a traffic and parking person and this was out of his realm. However, in listening to the other Commissioners, he was hearing that certain roof forms would make the street more interesting. There were also comments about managing taste. Commissioner Joyce remarked that the conversation was about compatibility and not the other things mentioned. He does not care how something is designed or articulated. Those structures should be built in Park Meadows or other places outside the Historic District. He emphasized that the Planning Commission should be talking about compatibility with Old Town. In terms of the flat roofs, he

challenged anyone to show him a structure in Old Town that looks remotely like the photo they all like. The goal is not to make the street look prettier, and it is not the restriction of Old Town or the compatibility. Whether or not they like a particular design is irrelevant to the question of compatibility. Commissioner Joyce stated that he is not an architect and he was not prepared to discuss design, but in listening to their comments, the main theme is that they like the look and it would make the street more interesting.

In response to Commissioner Joyce, Commissioner Phillips asked the Staff if the new addition on his house was compatible. Planner Tyler replied that it was compatible and it was approved. Commissioner Phillips pointed out that under this new ordinance his house would not be allowed. Commissioner Joyce remarked that it was compatible under the current Code where none of the proposed requirements exist. He did not believe it was a fair comparison. Commissioner Phillips thought the question was whether or not his house was compatible with the Historic District. He felt strongly that it is compatible, but minor things in the proposed ordinance would keep him from doing the same thing again.

Commissioner Joyce believed that was the intent of the new ordinance. The City has approved structures and elements that would no longer be allowed. Because they were approved does not mean they were compatible. It only means they were built when the rules allowed it. He understood from the Staff that the rules are broken and this ordinance would fix them.

Commissioner Suesser believed there are different ways to reach compatibility. Articulating roofs, such as the building on page 191, was an example of how a flat roof design can be compatible in Old Town. Commissioner Joyce disagreed that it was compatible. Commissioner Suesser believed that requiring a pitched roof in order to be compatible was too rigid a standard.

Director Erickson stated that the issue of compatibility is not completely linked to roof pitch. The issue of compatibility is probably more heavily linked to mass, bulk and scale above the 23' high floor plate elevation. The third floor square box, regardless of how it looks, disrespects the mass bulk and scale of houses with a pitched roof above the 23' floor plane. Director Erickson clarified that it was about making that distinction. It was not about a pitched roof. It was about the entire box above 23'. When dealing with compatibility, that is a piece of the puzzle. That is when the mass, bulk, and scale of that house appears to work when viewed from Sullivan Road. Director Erickson clarified that he would not have signed off on that house under the old Guidelines or the new Guidelines because he believes the windows are out of character and out of scale for the Historic District. Whether or not the unaligned roof pitches meet mass, bulk, and

scale, if they were to look at the Design Guidelines as a whole and how the rhythm of the street is repeated in the first floor elevations, in the door elevations, and in the window lines, some contemporary work can be done without disrupting the mass, bulk, and scale of the streetscape as seen from the lay eye. Director Erickson remarked that this was what the Staff was trying to accomplish.

Commissioner Thimm thought the proposed ordinance was all about roof pitch. Director Erickson replied that roof pitch goes to reduce mass, bulk and scale of the box. Commissioner Thimm stated that in looking at the changes, it appeared to be all about roof pitch. Director Erickson stated that the alternative to change it would be to reduce the square footage above the 23' height floor plate elevation. That does not work as well as saying what they want to see is a series of different roofs and different orientations with gables, gable ends, and hips.

Planner Grahn agreed that they were talking about roof pitch as one of the character defining features. They were talking about roof pitch because the overall shape and form of the building was one of the issues that kept recurring in the compatibility discussions with the HPB.

Commissioner Campbell asked why the first 20' could not be a flat roof and then step down to 23' maximum for the rest. Planner Grahn thought it would depend on the streetscape, because the goal is to get a compatible streetscape. The Staff has also talked about incentivizing the pitched roof by saying the zone height is lower and they add the pitch. Planner Grahn thought those issues needed to be discussed. She also suggested that they further discuss the meaning of compatibility so they are on the same page with the HPB.

Commissioner Campbell agreed with Commission Joyce that just because they like something, it is not what they were being asked to discuss. Commissioner Thimm concurred. Commissioner Campbell pointed out that three-fourths of the buildings on Main Street have a flat roof. Director Erickson remarked that Main Street is excluded from this ordinance. Planner Grahn noted that historically commercial buildings had flat roofs. This ordinance would only apply to the residential districts.

Commissioner Phillips favored the new definitions because there have been many meetings where he was unable to define the primary roof pitch. He clarified that he did not disagree with what was being proposed. He only wanted the opportunity to study it a little further.

Chair Strachan noted that there was still a motion on the table to continue this item to a work session. If they continue to a date uncertain, it would require a Work Session

meeting and then another meeting on the Regular Agenda. He asked if the Commissioners were comfortable enough after this discussion to Continue it to another meeting but put it on the regular agenda. Commissioner Phillips was comfortable with that, as long as the Staff can provide the requested additional information prior to the next meeting.

Director Erickson stated that it could be scheduled for a Work Session and as an action item on the Regular Agenda the same night. Chair Strachan thought work sessions and action items were duplicative if they were on the same agenda. He recommended continuing to another meeting and putting it on the Regular Agenda and they could have the discussion prior to taking action.

Commissioner Campbell withdrew his motion to continue to a work session.

The decision was made to continue to September 27<sup>th</sup>.

MOTION: Commissioner Phillips moved to CONTINUE the LMC amendments regarding roof forms on residential structures subject to the Design Guidelines for Historic District to September 27, 2017. Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Joyce recommended that the Commissioners read through the HPB Minutes prior to the September 27<sup>th</sup> meeting because they contain a lot of background information and answer some of the questions that were raised this evening.

4. **Land Management Code Amendments regarding Master Planned Development Applicability in the Historic Residential (HR-1), Historic Residential (HR-2), and Historic Residential-Medium (HRM) Density Zones in Chapter 15-6-2 Applicability in Master Planned Developments.**  
**(Application PL-17-03661)**

Planner Tyler reviewed the amendment to the HRM, which would eliminate the threshold for Master Planned Development applications. Currently, MPD applications in this zone and several others in town require ten lots or 20,000 square feet. The Staff found that because this is a Historic District and land is scarce, it is difficult to hit that threshold. Therefore, many projects would never come to the Planning Commission that would otherwise utilize that review.

Planner Tyler explained that much of this was the implementation of the General Plan. She stated that currently the HRM and the MPD chapters align, but a lot of the projects do not meet the criteria for an MPD. For that reason, the Staff cannot honor that alignment.

Planner Tyler stated that this amendment would allow review of projects that previously were not reviewed by the Planning Commission. Currently, these projects only require individual HDDR applications. HDDR would still be required, but the Planning Commission would provide another level of review.

Planner Tyler remarked that it also allows for more design flexibility through the MPD process. Not only are there incentives such as setback reductions, but there is also an affordable housing requirement. Some of the incentives might be worth going through the MPD process, which provides additional affordable housing. It also helps with Historic District compatibility, because when someone comes in with five lots, the Staff can look at it on more of a contextual analysis versus one lot at a time. Planner Tyler pointed out that it was an important transition to the Resort base because the HRM abuts the RC zone.

Commissioner Joyce asked if this amendment was driven by the City's own affordable housing requirements. Director Erickson answered no. He clarified that the Woodside Park project would be a beneficiary, but this amendment was more of a reaction to the number of times the Planning Commission did not have the opportunity to review the previous affordable housing project. It was also a reaction to some of the projects that were occurring further south than the fire station with multiple lots that had access issues and required separate steep slope CUPs. If an MPD was available, they could have worked through all the issues as a combined project rather than piecemeal.

Commissioner Campbell asked if an applicant would be forced into an MPD, or whether was just available if they wanted to use it. Planner Tyler replied that the MPD is an option, but not required.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Joyce moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation for the LMC amendment to Chapter 6 regarding applicability of Master Planned Developments in the HRM zoning district. Commissioner Band seconded the motion.

Planning Commission Meeting  
August 9, 2017  
Page 86

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Park City Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: \_\_\_\_\_