

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION NOTES
OCTOBER 13, 2004**

Present: Bruce Erickson, Michael O'Hara, Bob Powers, Jack Thomas, Diane Zimney, Patrick Putt, Jonathan Weidenhamer

It was noted that Chair Barth would be late, and in his absence, Vice-Chair O'Hara assumed the chair.

WORK SESSION ITEMS

Treasure Hill conditional Use Permit for single, multi-family, hotel, and commercial uses

Planning Director Patrick Putt reported that the Planning Commission had just visited the Treasure Hill site. The applicant had prepared a presentation, and Director Putt requested that the Planning Commission discuss the presentation to determine whether they wished to make a recommendation.

Pat Sweeney, the applicant, presented revisions to the project which included a shift in massing. He noted that a wall was lowered 6-1/2 feet to step the building near the Garda and Larson homes. Mr. Sweeney stated that City Engineer Eric DeHaan had indicated that the road could be dropped by 3 feet, which will also help with the slope coming around the curve. Mr. Sweeney requested input on the concept of a traditional Park City rock wall. He indicated the public entrance to a stair/elevator system going to the funicular. He commented on the amount of terracing, landscaping, and trees. He presented a drawing showing the areas deleted from the initial proposal in terms of height along the northwest edge of the project and noted that the resulting height was residential in scale. He indicated the height measured from existing grade at each break in the stepping. Mr. Sweeney commented on the concept of adding a hill at the property line near the Gardas' deck at a strategic location that could be vegetated to block the tallest part of the building from view. He reviewed additional slides showing the project area in general.

Commissioner Erickson felt the point had been reached where most of the information had been provided and that it was time to evaluate the proposal for the site and compliance with the Conditional Use Permit and development.

Vice-Chair O'Hara felt that a great deal of progress had been made in the massing and asked about the wall. Mr. Sweeney replied that there is a garage behind the wall, and 25 feet of landscapable space would be bermed against most of the wall. The concept for the portion of garage that shows would be rock similar to the transit center. The undulating terraces in front would be more informal stacked rock with large boulders. Relative to existing grade, the plaza is set 6 to 10 feet out of grade. This plan would put the dirt and landscaping back in front of the garage.

Commissioner Thomas commented that the modification of the massing seems to work better than the previous plan. He echoed the concern about the wall and asked if the 25-foot step is one vertical step or whether it cascades. Mr. Sweeney replied that it cascades down. Commissioner Thomas verified with Mr. Sweeney that there will be landscaping between the cascading steps with the parking structure behind. Mr. Sweeney referred to the small rock walls between the Marsac Building and Swede Alley and explained that the garage will form the more formal wall and with an informal wall in front. Commissioner Thomas agreed that it is time to move forward with the evaluation of this project.

Commissioner Erickson questioned whether the height restrictions put in place by the development agreement might cause some difficulty since the tallest buildings are not against the hillside. In this case, the highest, tallest building is away from the mountain and more visible than it should be. He was not interested in changing the development agreement but wondered how they could address the fact that their predecessors were incorrect in their thinking. He wanted to be able to discuss that without risking anything for the applicant or for the City. He expressed concern with the height of Building 4B. Vice-Chair O'Hara that he would welcome a discussion about the height restrictions and was sensitive about timing. He was also hesitant to open the development agreement.

Director Putt explained that the issue could be broken into a number of steps. First would be to address in what area the project square footage could be relocated on the site that would be different from volumetrics allowed in the MPD, which could be done in work session discussions. He believed that was generally being done now in terms of shifting the massing and crafting basic larger building blocks to be more sensitive to adjacent off-site residential structures and the view corridors from the town core. Nothing would have to be amended to accomplish that. Once it can be determined whether positive changes can be achieved that will work for the applicant and the City, the next step will be to craft the language and what the volumetrics should be. If that is acceptable to the Planning Commission and the applicant, the last step will be to formally amend the MPD exhibit related to specific areas of the plan. When the application to amend specific MPD elements reaches the point of final action, amendments would be made only to those specific components of the MPD. If a decision is made to not approve the amendment, the Planning Commission would go back to the building heights in the 1985 MPD.

Vice-Chair O'Hara suggested that the evaluation discussion be held with a subcommittee to move the process along faster. Director Putt recalled that the Planning Commission previously appointed a working subcommittee to work with the Staff and applicant. No decisions were made and no clear direction was given, but they examined specific issues and provided a report to the entire Planning Commission. Commissioner Erickson did not object to a subcommittee but felt that they owed the public a debate so that, when the plan is approved, they will know that all the options were considered.

Mr. Sweeney expressed concern about opening up the master plan and that the process might spin out of control. He was concerned that there would be different opinions and that citizens might challenge the plan. He requested an opinion from the City Attorney as to the legalities involved. He was concerned about the Sensitive Lands Ordinance and that a master plan amendment might have to be considered under the SLO. He was not opposed to making the current plan better if there is a way to address specifics without opening up the entire master plan.

Commissioner Erickson clarified that his intention is to be sure the Planning Commission can explain to the public what they did and why they did it. The basis of Mr. Sweeney's first presentation was on the value of this project to the resort community, and Commissioner Erickson felt they should be sure that the end product supports that. He believed a subcommittee would be appropriate and agreed that they should move forward as quickly as possible.

Vice-Chair O'Hara and Commissioner Thomas volunteered to sit on the subcommittee. Commissioner Erickson noted that this item appears on the agenda every couple of weeks, and the public knows about it. He did not believe this item should disappear from the agenda while the subcommittee meets, because it is important to keep the public informed of their progress. Vice-Chair O'Hara suggested that the subcommittee provide a progress report to the Planning Commission at each meeting. Director Putt expected this to be an agenda item at the next regular meeting on November 10.

Quinn's Junction Annexation - National Ability Center & Recreation Complex

Director Putt reported that the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing this evening and possibly forward a recommendation to the City Council regarding the Quinn's Junction National Ability Center Recreation Complex annexation. This is a 136-acre annexation. 110 acres of the area is owned by the City in two separate parcels, and the other 26 acres is owned by the National Ability Center. One of the City-owned parcels is a 70-acre parcel acquired by Florence Gilmorr a number of years ago with the intent of establishing recreation uses. A deed restriction speaks to specific uses. Part of the annexation will involve a review of the MPD, and submitting an MPD is a requirement of an annexation petition to give the community, Planning Commission, and City Council an understanding of the nature of the proposed uses of the annexation. Director Putt explained that he had asked City representatives Jonathan Weidenhamer and Colin Hilton and the design team to provide a brief overview of the recreation complex development. He clarified that, when the design review goes through a CUP, that is the point when design and location of some of the infrastructure, fields, and parking will be discussed substantively. He explained that the purpose this evening is to provide an understanding of the proposed use and the history to this point. He noted that the use relates to zoning, because the zoning designation is established when property is annexed.

Chair Barth entered the meeting and assumed the chair.

Colin Hilton introduced the ideas for the recreation complex, which started when the City Council directed the Staff to put together a task force to look at recreation uses on City-owned property next to the National Ability Center. The task force was comprised of stakeholders of different sports throughout the community, liaisons with the City Council, and representatives from the Snyderville Basin Recreation District. The task force reviewed the deed restriction from Florence Gillmor to determine what uses would be appropriate. They also looked at current and future forecasted recreation demands by sports. A study was done jointly with the Snyderville Basin Recreation District to determine the future need for sports and recreation facilities. The overwhelming majority of field shortages are rectangular fields for soccer, rugby, and lacrosse and softball and baseball fields. In general, the main theme coming from the task force was to not crowd the facility by trying to make it meet all the recreation needs in the region. It is important to focus on a few of the most needed facilities for sports and do them well. Another goal was to look at a design that recognizes and compliments both current and future anticipated development in the area. They wanted to be sure this facility is used not only for local residents but also as a tool for economic development. Mr. Hilton stated that, after the task force met, they also identified this as a good location for the ice rink to jointly share in costs of infrastructure and parking.

Craig Elliot, project architect, commented that the plan presented this evening is one of two schemes generated describing different uses on the site. The plan presented was the solution the task force migrated toward, and it is now in the development phase. He discussed the benefits of the concept and explained that the intent is to bring the playing fields and activity towards the wetlands corridor, which is the natural part of the site. After looking at various locations for the building site, they felt comfortable with locating the ice facility against the hillside and reducing the mass and scale of the building. This will allow the south side of the area to become a recreation component and the north side of the site to become the building space and a competition area. Parking will be distributed throughout so they can provide good access to each field and pedestrian way across the wetlands.

Mr. Hilton commented on the trails system and stated that this area is a great crossroads for entry into Round Valley and to the Rail Trail. The task force wanted a number of the fields to be lit in a sensitive way that will follow a stringent lighting policy to allow opportunities for extended use of the fields.

Commissioner Powers stated that he was glad to see that the ice arena had found a home. He reiterated comments he had made previously about being sure they are willing to subsidize the ice rink, because it will not pay for itself. Mr. Hilton reported that, as of August 26, there is a signed interlocal agreement between the City and the Snyderville

Basin Recreation District to provide for the initial funding and commitments for operating subsidies in the future.

Commissioner Erickson asked if City Engineer Eric DeHaan was being facetious in his comments regarding bright lights. Mr. DeHaan stated that, depending on other developments in the area, there may need to be urban lighting. Commissioner Erickson stated that he could not understand from the traffic study whether higher peak trips are anticipated into the ice skating facility or into the baseball operations. Mr. DeHaan replied that they stopped short of trying to determine the counts until they are further along in the design. He believed the summer peak of all the fields together would be considerably greater than the winter time peak for the seasonal ice facility.

Chair Barth anticipated that transit would be part of the overall discussion. Commissioner O'Hara remarked that his concern for the future will be to make sure the traffic pattern does not impact the regular bottleneck at Quinn's Junction morning and night.

Jonathan Weidenhamer stated that he expected to return at the next meeting for a public hearing and to begin discussion of the design details for the master planned development.

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
OCTOBER 13,2004

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair Jim Barth, Bruce Erickson, Michael O'Hara, Bob Powers, Jack Thomas, Diane Zimney.

EX OFFICIO:

Patrick Putt, Planning Director; Ray Milliner, Planner; Brooks Robinson, Planner; Jonathan Weidenhamer, Planner; Tim Twardowski, Assistant City Attorney

=====

REGULAR MEETING - 6:00 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Barth called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present with the exception of Commissioner Volkman who was excused.

II. ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOTION: Commissioner Powers moved to APPROVE the minutes of September 22, 2004, as written. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

III. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There was no comment.

IV. STAFF & COMMISSIONERS' COMMUNICATIONS

Planning Director Patrick Putt recalled that the Planning Commission approved a steep slope Conditional Use Permit for a single-family house at 822 Lowell Avenue on September 22, 2004. There was a discrepancy between the plans and the exhibit submitted by the applicant. The Staff report stated that the height of the structure was 27' 7", and the Planning Commission granted a height exception for that area which is specified in the analysis and in Finding of Fact 18 and Conclusion of Law 4. Director Putt clarified that that the exhibit in the staff report and reviewed by the Staff shows that the height is approximately 29 feet. This refers to the gable end of the dormers, and the Code-required

height probably could have been met by flattening the dormers to a shallower pitch. In this case, the Staff and the architect believed a more traditional 6/12 pitch would be more appropriate. Director Putt stated that the Staff will issue a revised action letter. The plans are consistent with those reviewed and approved, and he wanted the Planning Commission to be aware of the modification and action letter.

Chair Barth stated that he understood a Treasure Hill subcommittee might be formed. Director Putt explained that the purpose of the subcommittee is to continue discussions on possible alternatives to building massing and location and report back to the Planning Commission at regular intervals during the public hearings. The subcommittee will work with the Staff to explore options and alternatives but will not make definitive decisions. Director Putt noted that three Commissioners volunteered for the committee but asked that it not be formalized until Chair Barth was present. Commissioner Erickson stated that he would prefer not to sit on the committee as he expects this project to be on-going, and he believed institutional memory would be very important several years from now. Director Putt noted that the subcommittee does not have to consist of a mandatory number as long as it does not constitute a quorum, and he believed two volunteers would suffice. Chair Barth volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

Chair Barth commented on the interlocal agreement discussion in the Brighton Estates area and asked why Bonanza Flats is not being considered in the annexation overlay. He recalled that he has asked this question in the past and will continue to ask it in the future.

REGULAR AGENDA/PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Paintbrush Condominiums at Empire Pass - First amended Record of Survey

Senior Planner Brooks Robinson reviewed the application for the first amended and restated Paintbrush Homes record of survey to add two units, numbers 11 and 12, to the Paintbrush Homes condominium plat. This was previously shown as part of the Village plat. The Staff has prepared findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval for a positive recommendation to the City Council after taking public input this evening.

Chair Barth opened the public hearing.

There was no comment

Chair Barth closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner O'Hara moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the first amended and restated Paintbrush Homes record of survey. Commissioner Powers seconded the motion.