



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
445 MARSAC AVENUE
WEDNESDAY, MAY 12, 2004 – 5:30 P.M.**

WORK SESSION – 5:30 P.M.

Items scheduled for Work Session are for discussion purposes between the Planning Staff, the Project applicants and the Planning Commission. **NO ACTION WILL BE TAKEN.** The public is encouraged to attend, however, no public testimony will be received. For further information, please call the Planning Department at 615-5060.

Spiro Tunnel Annexation

**Village @ Empire Pass (formerly known as Flagstaff Mountain Resort)-Master
Planned Development-Ontario Mine Bench Support Use Discussion
Lots 14, 15, 16, Block 5 of Snyders Addition-Rezone HRM/HR-1 to HRM
Review of Regular Agenda**

REGULAR MEETING – 6:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF APRIL 14, 2004
APRIL 28, 2004**

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

STAFF/COMMISSIONER'S COMMUNICATIONS

REGULAR AGENDA/PUBLIC HEARINGS

**401 Silver King Drive, Snow Flower Condominiums-Amendment to Record of
Survey Plat (Public hearing & Possible recommendation to City Council)**

**501 Woodside Avenue-Lot line adjustment (Public hearing and possible
recommendation to City Council)**

**1483 Park Avenue-Plat amendment (Public hearing & Possible
recommendation to City Council)**

601 Deer Valley Drive-Subdivision plat (Continue to May 26)

**Land Management Code-Amendments relating to Entry Corridor Protection
Overlay Zone (Public hearing & possible recommendation to City
Council)**

Hofmann Annexation (Public hearing)

**8200 Royal Street East, Stag Lodge-Minor amendments to the Record of
Survey (Public hearing & possible recommendation to City Council)**

Spiro Tunnel Annexation (Public hearing)

ADJOURN

The Work Session will be held at 5:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 445 Marsac Avenue. The Regular Meeting will be held at 6:30 p.m. The public is welcomed to attend. For further information, please call the Planning Department at 615-5060. (Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the Park City Planning Department, 615-5060 24 hours prior to the meeting.)

Published: May 5, 2004
Posted: May 5, 2004

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION NOTES
APRIL 28, 2004**

Present: Chair Andrew Volkman, Jim Barth, Bruce Erickson, Chris Larson, Michael O'Hara, Bob Powers, Diane Zimney, Kevin LoPiccolo, Ray Milliner, Kirsten Whetstone, Mark Harrington

WORK SESSION ITEMS

City Parks in Prospector Square area

Ken Fisher, City Recreation Manager, explained that he has worked with the Recreation Advisory Board for the past year on development of neighborhood parks. The City Council prioritized neighborhoods for re-development and directed that they look at the existing Prospector Park off of Highway 248. The City also owns a vacant lot on the corner of Comstock and Sidewinder which it is willing to donate for a neighborhood park. Mr. Fisher reported that he met with the Prospector neighborhood in January to receive input on what they would like to see developed in the parks, and a public survey was available on the web site. The City Council believed the amenities requested were reasonable and directed Mr. Fisher to hire a design firm. The plans are in the conceptual design stage, and Mr. Fisher requested feedback from the Planning Commission before going any further.

Dave Nicholas, with Design Workshop, explained that the goals and objectives for the parks are outlined in the staff report. He reviewed plans for the amenities proposed for each location. The plans for existing Prospector Park include a year-round restroom facility, playground upgrade, and addition of half court basketball. Mr. Nicholas stated that he looked at the park from a master planned standpoint to address EPA issues influencing the park and discussed issues being addressed through existing natural drainage ways. He indicated existing trails and defined the amenities area. He pointed out the open space areas and the plan to integrate public education opportunities by taking advantage of the natural resources on site.

Commissioner Powers asked for a definition of bio-swale. Mr. Nicholas replied that it is a term used for storm water management through natural open drainage systems. It would consist of a series of pools and falls to help filter out imminent standing water and planting of particular plants to help filter out standing water.

Commissioner Larson stated that his primary concern was preserving the multi-purpose lawn, because it is heavily used as an open play area in the winter and summer. He believed basketball courts would change the type of use and suggested that this be carefully considered. Multi-purpose lawns and play areas are a daytime transient or family use, and a basketball court is a destination daytime/nighttime use. Dave Staley with the Recreation Advisory Board stated that he understood those concerns and explained that the intent was to reduce impacts by proposing half court rather than full court basketball and locating it as far north as possible. Commissioner O'Hara commented that a basketball

court may not be a problem if sufficient parking is provided and lights are not installed for nighttime use.

Chair Volkman recalled that when basketball courts were proposed at City Park, the public hearing attracted a number of neighbors because it is a noisier, more intense use and tends to go later at night. The decision was made to move the basketball court to a different side of the park. Mr. Nicholas explained that the Recreation Advisory Board has spoken with all the homeowners, and plans will be presented to the neighborhood on May 5. He noted that there is a home at the end of the cul-de-sac with a personal full size basketball court with lights. He envisioned that the use for a basketball court in this neighborhood would be father-son shooting hoops. Mr. Staley noted that neighborhood surveys indicated that basketball was a desired amenity. Chair Volkman stated that he wanted the neighbors to be aware of the impacts associated with basketball, because it is one thing to want it and another thing to live by it.

Mr. Nicholas presented plans for the proposed park at Sidewinder and Comstock. Currently the land is vacant, with a multi-purpose trail accessing the area along the east side of the existing parking lot. The intent is to add a climbing structure, a small open lawn area, and low maintenance xeriscape. The first challenge was how to make the park appealing for the neighborhood and minimize visual impacts.

Commissioner Barth noted that item 3 of the survey for the new park referenced a dog park and he asked whether this is an appropriate location. He asked if a dog park is planned anywhere within the City limits. Mr. Fisher replied that they recently took public input for a park next to the Racquet Club, and interest for a dog park was moderate. There is an interest, but his experience with other parks is that dog parks do not get much use. If there is an appropriate site, that may be considered.

Chair Volkman asked about restroom facilities. Mr. Fisher did not believe the site was large enough to require restrooms. Mr. Nicholas stated that national standards for a neighborhood park this size do not include restroom facilities.

Commissioner O'Hara asked if the walkways would be hard surfaced. Mr. Nicholas replied that the walkways will be paved. Commissioner O'Hara recommended reconsidering use of hard surface pavement from a safety standpoint and stated that he did not think concrete fit in with the natural look of the park.

Village at Empire Pass

Mark Harrington, City Attorney, reported that he has received considerable communication from R.E. Bogart regarding a portion of this parcel to which he claims ownership in conjunction with the Mayflower Group. Mr. Bogart continues to press objections to this

application proceeding and has attempted to file an appeal. Mr. Harrington has informed Mr. Bogart that an appeal is not ripe in this matter until there has been a decision. He has dismissed the appeal because it is not appropriate to accept at this point. Mr. Harrington noted that once the Planning Commission takes action, Mr. Bogart will have appropriate time to submit an appeal. Mr. Harrington and Planning Director Patrick Putt have informed Talisker representatives that this application can move forward, but if they do not have a clean title report for this portion of the property, it must be removed from the application for this phase. Eventually, the density issue related to carving out that portion must be addressed through an amendment to the MPD or another appropriate process. The applicant cannot carve out this parcel and still proceed with maximum density. Mr. Harrington explained that the Pod D equation addresses this, and the development agreement contemplates that reduction, but not in this case. The density issue must be addressed before the Planning Commission can take final action.

Doug Clyde presented visual simulations showing the reduced building heights as viewed from Stein's and noted that the roofs of most of the buildings can be seen. He stated that the roof sections of the buildings are slightly over 20 feet. The trees would be below the eaves without the height reduction, and with the reduction, some of the taller trees would be slightly above the eaves. He also presented simulations showing the views from Stein's II and Guardsman, which is the closest view. Mr. Clyde noted that the project is quite distant from the other views and barely visible. He also provided an analysis of the buffers and indicated the limits of disturbance line that came from construction of the road and the downhill maximum extent of the limits of disturbance from the buildings based on the current concept plan. Buffers would vary from an average of 100 feet on the east side with a minimum of 40 and a maximum of 200 feet, and on the west side from 50 to 160 feet. Mr. Clyde referred to the ski runs previously shown on both sides of the project and explained that they had decided that it would not be a ski run and would only be a snowmobile-packed trail 10 to 20 feet wide. It will not be graded, and there will be no tree clearing beyond good forest health practice. Mr. Clyde requested direction from the Planning Commission on how to proceed with the request for additional height.

Commissioner Larson felt that the key would be a mechanism to ensure that the requested vegetation buffer is achieved. The visual analysis indicates that there is not a huge difference in heights from a distance, and the question is how to protect the buildings. His experience has been that the buffer diminishes when the infrastructure is put in, and he will watch that closely.

Chair Volkman agreed and felt that the Planning Commission should express their opinion on the height issue this evening.

Commissioner Erickson noted that the visual analysis is also dependent on the orientation of the buildings. They are not perpendicular to any one of the viewpoints, and the height is

seen in relation to any of the viewpoints. He will be looking to see that the massing diagrams do not change, because the perspective of the roof elevation will vary depending on the orientation of the building. He summarized that significant issues will be the buffer protection and orientation of the building mass and location of the height.

Review of Regular Agenda

210 Ontario Avenue

Commissioner Larson recommended a modification to Condition 2 to state that the construction mitigation plan needs to insure uninterrupted pedestrian access across the property during construction.

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
APRIL 28, 2004

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair Andrew Volkman, Jim Barth, Bruce Erickson, Chris Larson, Michael O'Hara, Bob Powers, Diane Zimney

EX OFFICIO:

Kevin LoPiccolo, Planner; Ray Milliner, Planner; Kirsten Whetstone, Planner; Tim Twardowski, Assistant City Attorney

REGULAR MEETING - 6:30 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Volkman called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present.

II. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

III. STAFF & COMMISSIONERS' COMMUNICATIONS

Commissioner O'Hara reported on a conversation he had with Planning Director Patrick Putt regarding water conservation issues. Based on the number of projects with significant densities which are being proposed, Commissioner O'Hara suggested that the Staff consider a requirement that conservation plans be submitted by the applicants and memorialized as conditions of approval. He and Director Putt did not believe the Land Management Code would have to be revised, because standards or criteria would not be set up for the applicant. Commissioner O'Hara stated that he spoke with Diane Murphy, a member of the water task force associated with Recycle Utah, and she has a wealth of information regarding what can be done to conserve water, particularly in large projects, and she is willing to meet with the Planning Commission. Commissioner O'Hara felt this comment should put the applicants for Empire Pass, Treasure Hill, and Spiro on notice that they may be requested to submit a water conservation plan.

IV. CONSENT AGENDA

1. 210 Ontario Avenue

MOTION: Commissioner Larson moved to APPROVE the Consent Agenda with the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval outlined in the staff report with the modification to Condition 2 as stated in the work session. Commissioner O'Hara seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact - 210 Ontario

1. The property is located at 210 Ontario Avenue of Block 53 of the Park City Survey.
2. The property is zoned HR-L.
3. The development pattern in this area consists of single-family dwellings.
4. The lot exceeds 30% slope.
5. The applicant has submitted a Historic Design Review application for the proposed construction of the single-family dwelling in excess of 1,000 square feet.
6. Access to the dwelling is proposed off of Ontario Avenue. Ontario Avenue is a narrow street with limited area for parking and construction staging.
7. The lot size for the dwelling is 3,800 square feet.
8. The maximum height for a single-family home in the HR-L zone is 27 feet above existing grade.
9. The applicant is required to provide a minimum 18 feet along Ontario Avenue (Thrill Hill) with a minimum seven and five foot side yard setbacks, and a ten foot rear yard.
10. The proposed structure is stepped with the grade. The individual components do not exceed the height and scale of existing structures in the area.
11. The applicant stipulates to the conditions of approval.

Conclusions of Law - 210 Ontario Avenue

1. The application complies with all requirements of the LMC.
2. The use will be compatible with surrounding structures in use, scale, mass, and circulation.
3. The use is consistent with the Park City General Plan, as amended.
4. The effects of any differences in use or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

Conditions of Approval - 210 Ontario Avenue

1. All Standard Project Conditions shall apply.

2. City approval of a construction mitigation plan is a condition precedent to the issuance of any building permits. The construction mitigation plan needs to insure uninterrupted pedestrian access across property during construction.
3. All utilities for the new structure shall be accessed from Ontario Avenue unless otherwise approved by the City Engineer.
4. Access to the proposed structure shall be from a driveway accessed from Ontario Avenue.
5. City Engineer review and approval of all appropriate grading, utility, installation, public improvements, and drainage plans for compliance with City standards is a condition precedent to building permit issuance.
6. A preliminary landscape plan showing grading and developed landscaping around the house, as well as grading proposed for all disturbed areas, including the driveway area, shall be submitted as part of the Historic District review for the houses and driveway design. A final landscape plan, consistent with the preliminary plan, shall be submitted for review and approval by the City Landscape Architect prior to building permit issuance.
7. This approval will expire on April 28, 2005, if a building permit has not been issued.

V. REGULAR AGENDA/PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. 9009 Marsac Avenue, Lot 10, Northside Subdivision - Plat amendment

The Staff requested that this item be continued to a date uncertain.

MOTION: Commissioner Erickson moved to CONTINUE this item to a date uncertain. Commissioner O'Hara seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

2. 1483 Park Avenue - Plat amendment

The Staff requested that this item be continued to May 12.

MOTION: Commissioner Erickson moved to CONTINUE this item to May 12, 2004. Commissioner Powers seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

3. Hoffman Annexation

The Staff requested that this item be continued to May 12.

MOTION: Commissioner Erickson moved to CONTINUE this item to May 12, 2004. Commissioner Powers seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

4. 601 Deer Valley Drive - Subdivision plat

Planner Ray Milliner reviewed the application for the subdivision of a metes and bounds parcel located at the intersection of Deer Valley Drive and Sunnyside Drive. The applicant wants to divide the parcel into two lots of record for the purpose of constructing a duplex on each lot. The lots, as proposed, would meet the minimum requirements for duplexes in the RM zone. Location of access to the lots is the main issue related to this application. Because the property is located at the intersection, Chapter 3 of the Land Management Code requires that access to the property be at least 75 feet from an intersection. The applicant is requesting that the Planning Commission grant dual access to both lots from the lot furthest to the east. The Staff requested that the Planning Commission provide direction this evening and conduct a public hearing. The Staff will prepare findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval for the next available meeting.

Chair Volkman opened the public hearing.

There was no comment.

Chair Volkman closed the public hearing.

Commissioner O'Hara asked what size buildings could be built on a 7,000-square-foot lot. Planner Milliner replied that the Code allows up to a four-plex, and minimum lot size for a four-plex is 5,500 square feet. At this time the applicant is only interested in building a duplex on each lot.

Chair Volkman stated that he was comfortable with how the problems were resolved and felt they could move forward if the applicant is willing to follow the Staff's recommendations.

Planner Milliner stated that he would work with the City Engineer to be sure the access is appropriate and meets all requirements.

Commissioner Erickson commented that a combined access for two lots is a reasonable approach and may be reasonable for two duplexes. However, whether that would be adequate access for two four-plexes may need to be discussed or analyzed by the Staff. He felt that dual access for two four-plexes in that location would be a problem.

Commissioner O'Hara noted that, in the past, the Planning Commission has considered lot combinations and splits based on not maximizing density, and he believed they should

continue that policy. He was comfortable with a couple of duplexes but could not imagine sending traffic into two four-plexes. Commissioner Erickson clarified that, theoretically, the combined access is acceptable, but there will be limitations on the uses on the lot.

Planner Milliner stated that the Staff will create findings and conditions that would limit the potential development to a duplex on either lot.

5. Village at Empire Pass at Deer Valley (formerly known as Flagstaff Mountain Resort, Pod A) - Master Planned Development

Due to a conflict of interest, Commissioner Zimney recused herself from this item.

Doug Clyde, representing the applicant, noted that the Planning Commission reviewed the comparative height analysis on the visual simulation during the work session. He requested direction from the Planning Commission on the height issue.

Chair Volkman opened the public hearing.

There was no comment.

Chair Volkman closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Erickson stated that he was comfortable with the height and visual simulations as presented by the applicant. The applicant's proposal appears to be in keeping with the height guidelines, and he supports them with the following conditions discussed in the work session:

1. The limits of disturbance and vegetative buffer be preserved as represented in the site plan.
2. The orientation of the buildings and the location of the heights remain as presented.

Commissioner Larson concurred with the analysis but requested a mechanism for preserving the vegetation buffer.

Commissioners Barth, Powers, and O'Hara concurred with the comments stated by Commissioners Larson and Erickson.

With regard to the property that was withdrawn, Commissioner Erickson referred to the discussion by the City Attorney regarding additional density in this location. He did not favor supporting additional height in the applicant's proposal in order to accommodate additional density. He clarified that pulling density out of these parcels would not allow the

buildings to be raised beyond what was presented. Mr. Clyde replied that they are finished with consolidating density.

6. Treasure Hill - Conditional Use Permit and plat

Due to a conflict of interest, Commissioner Zimney recused herself from this item.

Chair Volkman clarified that the purpose this evening is to present the project to the public. The plans are preliminary for this development, and there is more to the process than what will occur this evening. He clarified that the applicant is looking for general opinion and preliminary ideas of what the Planning Commission may want as the project moves forward.

Planner Whetstone explained that information was presented to the Planning Commission at a work session on April 14. The staff report contains a recommendation for the Planning Commission to open a public hearing and continue it to the May 26 meeting. The staff report also contains items for discussion and direction. Planner Whetstone distributed copies of two letters she had received.

Pat Sweeney, the applicant, provided a visual presentation of the project that has been in the works for 2-1/2 years. He discussed the history of the property which has been in his family for a long time. He noted that this is a large and complex project, and the plans have been approached in a careful and thoughtful way. He reviewed the project and outlined the community benefits including open space, more customers on Main Street, and increased tax base. He remarked that the process with the City started in 1982, and in 1986 the City Council approved the master plan. Two of the findings that he believed summed up the approval process were that the proposed cluster development concept and associated projects are consistent with the Park City covenants of Master Plans and underlying zoning and that site planning standards set forth in Section 10-9(g) of the Land Management Code have been satisfied at this stage of review or practical solutions can be reasonably achieved at the time of conditional use review and approval. Mr. Sweeney explained that they are at the stage of asking for conditional use approval.

Mr. Sweeney stated that the major approval parameters of the master plan include height zones, 70% open space within 11.5 acres, 197 residential unit equivalents, and 19,000 square feet of support commercial. The project elements include underground parking, buildings and building locations, ski trails, and ski lifts. A key part of the site plan is excavation, and the intent is to excavate in a way that looks natural and minimizes cuts and manmade retaining walls. Mr. Sweeney reviewed the proposed ski trails.

David Eldredge, with Perkins, Eldredge and Sedonaen, reviewed the building placement and noted that the basic concept is an uphill extension of Old Town comprised of 12 distinct buildings or clusters of buildings in varying sizes, heights, and architectural character. The building locations will be in three areas and oriented toward the streets

wherever possible. The hierarchy of structures is designed to be sensitive to surrounding neighborhoods, with the smallest structures along the perimeter adjacent to existing neighborhoods and designed in character with the existing neighborhood. The design transitions to Main Street type flat roof structures and the largest structures will be tucked into the hillside away from the neighborhood. Mr. Eldredge stated that Phase 1-A consists of six single-family dwellings with common walls on the lower levels. The smaller structures are 2-1/2 stories high with an offset third loft level one story above the ski run. Each single-family dwelling will be a condominium unit. He indicated three-story row houses on the other side of the ski run and four- stepping up to six-story structures at the gap comprised of 20 two-and three-bedroom units and described the other structures proposed for the site.

Steve Perkins, representing the design team, explained how the site functions from a pedestrian circulation perspective. There will be a limited amount of commercial development that is not intended to compete with Main Street. He commented on the diversity of building plans within the project. He noted that the master plan requires 70% open space, and a major portion of that open space is included in the cliff scape area located at the perimeter of the residential areas. The plan is to apply a series of techniques that are appropriate to the environment and will give a diversity of character and quality to the greater slope areas. Mr. Perkins commented on circulation issues associated with a mix of vehicular, pedestrian, skier, and other circulation elements and commented that this project will have a complex circulation plan.

Mr. Sweeney indicated the cabriolet portion of the lift and noted that the purpose is to encourage people to support the commercial district of Old Town without having to use their cars. He indicated the stairs that will access the plaza to Main Street and vertical and horizontal circulation through the project, with a funicular connecting the three levels of the project. Mr. Perkins explained that the funicular is appropriate for the site because it allows circulation of guests and residents from the various plaza and terrace levels to their units without using stairs and bridges the ski run and avoids problems with pedestrian movements across ski runs.

Jane Sedonaen with the design team provided a description of the upper amenities areas and their relationship to the funicular. The upper area will contain the middle pool area, and the lower plaza area will provide three distinct experiences within the resort. The design of the central plaza commercial area was based on a grand staircase to connect the two levels. Each level contains connections to meeting levels of commercial within the ends of the other buildings, providing numerous opportunities for outdoor dining and views through the central corridor and a sense of active interconnection throughout the area. The lower level plaza is the primary connection to Lowell/Empire and Main Street which will be served by an elevator connection to grade at Lowell/Empire. There are opportunities for a conference area to the north and an outdoor space for conferences. Ms. Sedonaen noted that the upper area amenities serve a different function with passive recreation and

possible water features. Areas will be available for outdoor picnics or weddings. Because of the steepness of the slope, the views will look out over the lap pool. The pool area is intended to be a lively recreational space with opportunities to work with terracing for private hot tub spaces and to include a water slide on the lower side coming down the cliffscape.

Mr. Sweeney noted that the geology report shows the proposed location is firm rock, and they will try to make the cliffscape look natural and not manmade. One type of landscaping will incorporate a water feature constructed with native rock. Mr. Perkins noted that the techniques presented offer a tool kit to draw from to address the various areas. They planned to be on site as the slopes are excavated and take the approach to each area on a case-by-case basis depending on the solidity of the rock and its ability to be manipulated. He stated that they would like to build as much diversity as possible into the cliffscape.

Mr. Sweeney provided examples of the revegetation plan which emphasizes native plants and low water usage. Erosion control, rock fall hazard management, on-site snow management, skier safety, run maintenance, and fire safety have been considered, and a written agreement has been reached with Ron Ivie, Kelly Gee, and the County Fire Department.

Jenny Smith, representing the Park City Mountain Resort, commented on the lifts and runs. She stated that the Resort has been involved with the Sweeneys from the beginning of the planning process to decide the type of lift and where it should go. The cabriolet will operate like a bus and provide transportation to and from Main Street with a capacity of 2,600 people per hour. The lift will be approximately 4,500 feet long. Those who plan to ski for the day would spend 45 seconds on the Cabriolet and 5-1/2 minutes once on the ski lift. She noted that fill from this project will be moved into Creole Gulch which will change the grade from 45% to approximately 35%, allowing the upper beginner to access that area.

Mr. Sweeney stated that an important improvement and public benefit is the dedicated open space in the master plan. He noted that information on this project and all the drawings are available on their website (www.treasurehillpc.com).

Chair Volkman opened the public hearing.

David Johnson, representing Bob and Annie Lewis Garda, owners of a residence on North Star, referred to a letter in the staff report from the Gardas dated April 21. He stated that the Planning Commission should also have a letter from the Gardas dated February 26, 2004. Mr. Johnson commented that the building contemplated to be seven stories high will be the one most proximate to the Gardas' home and will impact the use and enjoyment of their property. The Gardas asked Mr. Johnson to express appreciation that the Sweeneys have worked with them to determine the best means of mitigating the impact on their

property. Mr. Johnson referred to items contained in the April 21 letter. Access through the Sweeney development to the Gardas' home is contemplated on the plan, and they hope that will remain the case. Landscape buffering from the larger building is a major priority for the Gardas. In terms of a larger view for the neighborhood, the Gardas asked Mr. Johnson to address a few items from their February 28 letter. Access to the project will be at the Empire/Lowell curve, and there is at least one stretch where only one car can pass and traffic is confined to a single lane. If construction will involve several years, the Gardas are concerned about the construction and access to their home. They are also concerned about site drainage onto Lowell and Empire because it is already a problem to access their home on North Star from Lowell. The Gardas hope the issue of noise mitigation during and after construction can be realistically addressed. They are also concerned with construction phasing and worry that the parking garage will be built and nothing else will happen.

Ron Shepard, a resident on Norfolk, noted that Crescent Tram is a right-of-way, not a defined road, and the Sweeney plan shows it as a street. Before Crescent Tram is allowed to be an access point, he wanted to know if it has been defined as a platted road. He noted that the majority of cars that get stuck on 8th Street in the winter are from out of state and discussed the impacts on 8th Street and Crescent Tram from the people living in the Treasure Hill project who are not likely to be residents. Mr. Shepard remarked that an historic home located at the corner of 8th Street and Crescent Tram is not located on the Sweeneys' map and asked if the home is owned by the Sweeneys. He stated that when he was first told about the Empire Pass project, a gondola was proposed to bring traffic from Empire Pass to Main Street, and that did not happen. The Sweeney's have talked about the project bringing traffic to Main Street, and he supports the plan because he does not want to see 300 cars driving down to Main Street. He noted that the majority of businesses at the Town Lift are owned by the Sweeneys, which means they have a lot of irons in the fire. This was of concern to him given the size of the project, and he asked if they have accurately viewed the associated costs and likely sales prices and rents so they would not end up with 284 empty units. He asked if there would be public access to the pool and how water will be supplied to the units since Park City is on every other day water usage. He expressed concerns about light, air, and noise pollution and asked to see elevation drawings. Chair Volkman explained that traffic studies, construction mitigation plans, vegetation studies, and trails studies will be part of the ongoing process.

Arnold Sprung asked if there will be a traffic study.

Ryan Ettrein, a resident on Norfolk Avenue, was concerned about traffic and was pleased to know that there would be traffic studies. He noted that this is a residential area, but with more resort coming, it is more and more becoming commercial traffic. He stated that, if he had wanted to live in a resort he would have purchased a condo near the Park City Mountain Resort. Now he is surrounded by it and has many concerns. He questioned

what impacts this project would have on existing businesses in the Resort area. He wanted to be certain that checks and balances are in place and that they will not see an influx of open pillows and open commercial property without planning for what will happen when everyone moves to this new resort.

Ruth Gezelius remarked that, with the constraints on Lowell and Empire and the various van transportation companies, this can be a problem in relation to planning for deliveries of people. She was aware that the Park City Ski Resort has suffered for many years because it did not plan for vans fully loaded with skis standing up to pull into their underground entry.

She hoped this project would plan to do so. She was also concerned about access to the Park City municipal bus system and encouraging people to use the mass transit system, because most people will not walk up or down hill. Putting this large number of people on a bus stop along Park Avenue should be planned for now.

Tom Peak stated that he and his wife own a home in the area, and he was not surprised with the development going in. They have watched it since the early 1980's, and he believed putting all the density in one spot was a positive move. Mr. Peak stated that he purchased his home in Old Town three years ago because he wanted to live there with this project occurring. He noted that the public walkway from the Crescent Tramway will be in front of his house. He was concerned with grading and how the pedestrian circulation would function.

Scott Schreier, owner of four buildings between Crescent and Empire to the south, echoed previous comments and expressed concern about skier access to those areas. He currently has the ability through a cat track to reach the top of Lowell and Empire Avenue on skis, and this is a concern from his perspective.

Mary Whitesides, a resident at 812 Empire, stated that she is sandwiched between Crescent Tram Drive and Empire Avenue and roads run in front of and behind her house. Currently the front of her house is impacted by light, traffic, noise, and anything that occurs on Lower Main Street. With this project, she is concerned about the commercial space proposed behind her house. She recalled the funicular trains she experienced in Europe being quite noisy all the time. She stated that the traffic on Crescent Tram lights up her house, and the noise level from the cars increases when they reach her home. She was concerned about the length of construction time, machinery noise, and the dust she would have to endure. She came to Park City because of the environment, and now the environment behind her house will disappear.

Carol Shepherd asked if the proposed condos will be nightly rentals or second homes. Mr. Sweeney replied that the condos are intended to be resort residential use. Ms. Shepard felt that second home ownership would be more desirable than nightly rentals because people are invested in the community. She voiced concerns about noise, air, and light

pollution on a long-term basis, especially during construction, and wanted to know the timing of the entire project to completion. Chair Volkman noted that nightly rentals will be an allowed use in the project, and the market will probably dictate to what extent they are nightly rentals versus second homes.

Peter Roberts, stated that he is fortunate to know the Sweeneys and finds them to be thoughtful and deliberate. He believed they would be sensitive to the needs of the community. He thought the project was great and would add a lot to Old Town, particularly the businesses. As part of Park City's Economic Development Focus Group, he could see that this project meets many of the City's goals. It will be great for Main Street, and free skiing from the top of the lift to the Town Lift is a wonderful benefit. He noted that the ski bridge and Town Lift Plaza have been successful, and this project should add much to Park City. (Free skiing would be from this plaza to the Town Lift plaza only because of the proposed cabriolet.

MOTION: Commissioner O'Hara made a motion to CONTINUE the public hearing. Commissioner Barth seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Volkman commented that valid issues were raised which will be addressed as they move forward. The key issues are traffic studies, traffic mitigation, construction mitigation, and phasing in a way that amenities used for the public and the bed base will be incorporated in the early phases of the project.

Planner Whetstone discussed the viewpoints required in the LMC, which are the bus stop at the Park City Mountain Resort, the Park City Golf Course, a photo from the Gardas' deck, a view between the Resort and the switchbacks, Miner's Hospital, the intersection of Heber and Main, and the Town Lift Plaza. Commissioner Larson felt they should also consider Rossi Hill or the Aerie. Mr. Sweeney explained that they are looking at nine views and would like to get a list of favored viewpoints from the Planning Commission. Commissioner Larson suggested that Mr. Sweeney and the Planning Commission provide their lists to the Staff.

Chair Volkman wanted to be sure they have all the viewpoints before making an analysis. Commissioner Larson believed the Planning Commission could discuss technical issues before getting into the visual analysis. They need to define how they want to address this project, and a visual analysis would be secondary to the review criteria. Planner Whetstone noted that this project will be reviewed as a CUP and the 15 criteria outlined in the LMC will apply. There will be an intermediate step, because there is not a specific developer to design specific buildings. The process for the Town Lift Caledonian was approval of volumetrics first, which was an intermediate step that identified the height and stepping. An

architect was brought in later with a specific architectural design. Commissioner Larson asked if another CUP will be required when this goes to a developer. Planner Whetstone replied that it will be unless a condition is drafted with this CUP stating that the specific architecture is to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. She noted that a CUP approval expires after one year, and the Planning Commission should discuss a time frame for this project, because it is a different case and more complex than typical conditional use permits. She offered to take those issues to the Legal Department so the Planning Commission will know how to proceed. In the interim, she will provide the findings of the Sweeney Properties master plan and the detail sheets for review.

Commissioner O'Hara stated that he once lived at the top of Lowell and Empire, and it was his experience that even the shoulder seasons were not good for traffic. He believed it would take more than an engineering exercise for a traffic engineer to determine how traffic will move in that area, particularly during the winter. He commented on the transition into Old Town and stated that, in addition to mass and scale, use transition is an important factor. He felt it would be important to have a phased buildout and that those phases be bonded or otherwise set so they will be finished and can stand alone. He requested a water conservation plan and wanted the Planning Commission to review the service and utility access, because all kinds of service vehicles will come in and out of the property.

Commissioner Erickson echoed the concerns about service and delivery. Since there is not an end developer, the Planning Commission set parameters in the development, and there would be a need to focus on externalities. Service and delivery need to be controlled. He intended to closely scrutinize some of the opinion in the traffic study, one of which is the assumed trip generation based on a 41% occupancy rate. He felt they should consider the effect of events and festival operations, particularly when this project is occupied 100% during Sundance. He expected to see a control mechanism for outdoor operations on the plazas to control events and minimize impacts to the neighborhood.

Commissioner Powers stated that he had not heard a plan for keeping people from driving their cars into town. He believed there could be serious gridlock when the units are full. He felt a program should be put in place to encourage tourists not to rent a car. Planner Whetstone remarked that a shuttle service sponsored by this project would be a good program and one that has worked successfully for other projects.

Commissioner Larson believed the comments made by Commissioners O'Hara and Erickson touched on the factors that could make or break this project. He noted that the Planning Commission is looking at a master plan approval from the mid- to late 1980's, and given the tools and mindset of the time, it was a good job. However, given the LMC and current mindset of the City, this project in his opinion would not be considered today. From that perspective, they are beating a square peg into a round hole. While he believed it could be done, it will take a lot of work and time to refine this project. The Planning

Commission has purview within the LMC to review this project, and preservation of the residential historic district will be important to the Commissioners. Commissioner Larson looked forward to hearing from the public and encouraged them to stay involved throughout the process.

Chair Volkman agreed that density, number of available units, maximum heights, and other factors have been pre-determined, but that there is still room for being creative and planning a nice project. This is an important project with significant impacts, and he was pleased to see a large public turnout this evening.

MOTION: Commissioner Larson moved to CONTINUE this item. Commissioner Powers seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Park City Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission _____