

Planning Commission Staff Report



Author: Kirsten Whetstone
Subject: Treasure Hill CUP
Date: October 12, 2005
Type of Item: Administrative

Planning Department

Summary Recommendations:

Staff recommends the Planning Commission resume the Treasure Hill Traffic Review discussion and conduct a public hearing, continued from September 14, 2005.

Background

See attached staff report and minutes from the September 14, 2005 meeting.

Questions asked at the Public Hearing

There were a number of questions raised by the public and/or Commission at the public hearing on September 14th that have not yet been addressed by the consultants, staff, or Planning Commission. In order to determine whether or not the recommendations outlined in the Traffic Review (see Sept. 14th staff report) adequately mitigate traffic impacts from the Treasure Hill Conditional Use Permit staff is requesting a thorough discussion of the following questions raised by the public and Commission:

1. What does the term "adequate" mean in terms of the traffic study? This term is used throughout the study, ie. "adequate assessment of the traffic characteristics", "the conditions are adequate", the "corner radius is adequate for service and delivery vehicles", etc.
2. There has been much testimony about the current conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles on these streets, due to lack of adequate parking for the existing houses, lack of adequate snow plowing, insufficient snow storage, lack of sidewalks, etc., and questions regarding how this project further degrades such conditions. Recommendations included in the traffic study include mitigation measures to reduce future and current conflicts, such as reconstruction of the streets, adding sidewalks and staircases, constructing a people mover, improved snow removal, and alternatives to address the current parking situation.
3. Does the Commission agree that the project will not contribute additional cars to

the current parking situation on Empire Avenue, since all parking and delivery is required to occur on-site? The project will contribute additional vehicles and pedestrians to the streets which will impact the flow and compatibility of pedestrians and vehicles. How would implementation of recommended mitigation measures (as elaborated below) affect this "pedestrian issue"?

4. Can the Commission further define specifics regarding the "human factor" as raised by the Planning Commission where it disagrees with technical recommendations/findings by the consultant? Are there other measures that can address these issues? Do the necessary mitigation measures improve, rather than de-grade the quality of life in this area? Recommended mitigation measures include:
 - 1) Construct a sidewalk (possibly a 5' paved and 3' soft for additional snow storage) on the west side of Lowell Avenue from the project to PCMR- there is room within the dedicated Lowell Avenue ROW for these improvements (**Applicant**);
 - 2) Construct additional staircase connections between Empire and Lowell in both the 9th and 10th Street ROW- to direct pedestrians off of Empire and onto a designated pedestrian/bike lane that would lead directly to PCMR without causing additional pedestrian conflicts at Manor Way (such connections already existing in 11th and 12th streets) (**Applicant**);
 - 3) Reconstruct Empire and Lowell Avenues to clearly delineate auto travel lanes, gutters, and possibly provide bulb-outs and additional paved "off-street" parking spaces along Empire Avenue (such as was done on Park Avenue) (**City and Applicant**);
 - 4) Enforce no parking within the drive-lanes (as is done on Park Avenue), as well as no parking on the west side of Lowell (currently in effect), with the goal being no net loss of resident parking on these streets, but reducing all day skier and resort parking on these streets-implement residential parking program) (**City**);
 - 5) Implement no parking (ie. no day skier parking and no PCMR or Sweetwater employee parking) on the east side of Lowell in front of the PCMR Administration building and Sweetwater, which causes snow removal issues (**City and PCMR**);
 - 6) Construct people mover, ski lift, or gondola between the project and Main Street and/or Ski Resort prior to issuance of any certificates of occupancy (**Applicant**);
 - 7) Construct new stairs in the 6th Street ROW (already a requirement of the MPD) (**Applicant**);
 - 8) Construct new stairs from the project to Crescent walkway with additional improvements to the walkway (already a requirement of the MPD) (**Applicant**); and

- 9) Construct new stairs in the 8th Street ROW between Norfolk and Woodside (**Applicant**).
- 10) Improve and/or prioritize snow removal on Empire and Lowell Avenues (**City**).
- 11) Pedestrian crossings and traffic flow improvements at PCMR (Lowell Avenue, Empire and Manor Way, etc. (**Applicant and PCMR**))

The responsibility of these mitigation measures is primarily the Applicant's, although some would be the City's responsibility because they involve use or management of (parking, snow removal, etc) the City's dedicated ROW, which is a City function.

5. Should the existing use of the dedicated rights of way (Lowell and Empire Avenues) for off-site parking, take priority over the use of these dedicated streets to carry traffic and for the City to efficiently plow snow? Are there ways to ensure that existing garages and driveways are utilized for parking cars?
6. Are there other acceptable solutions to the current parking, snow removal, access, pedestrian conflict problems that occur today on Empire Avenue? How would this impact the traffic study results?
7. Could Empire Avenue be re-constructed similar to upper Park Avenue to allow parking free travel lanes, gutters, and paved parking areas?
8. Does the Commission find the project worsens the pedestrian/vehicle conflict and travel delay at the intersection of Empire Avenue and Manor Way? Are additional mitigation measures necessary to resolve any impacts at Empire and Manor Way? Is additional information needed to mitigate impacts on this area? If traffic flow is directed down Lowell Avenue to Three Kings Drive and pedestrian improvements are implemented at PCMR, would traffic flow and pedestrian conflicts be further mitigated?
9. Should Crescent road be improved as part of this project? What would those improvements be, curb, gutter, profile, pavement? Do the projected 16 additional trips on Crescent at the peak hour warrant additional improvements for those vehicles?
10. Should the Commission recommend changes in the plans and priority of public improvements in the CIP as a result of this project?
11. The traffic study did not include Norfolk or Woodside Avenues. What impacts are anticipated on these streets that should be included in the mitigation, if any?
12. What additional items should the traffic study address in terms of emergency

access and public safety? Emergency access was addressed by the Traffic Review and is also discussed at length in the Fire Protection Plan, approved by the Fire District and the Chief Building Official (see attached). What additional information or mitigation measures are needed to consider this issue (fire protection, emergency access, public health and safety, etc.)?

13. Further discussion of proposed improvements to the Deer Valley Drive and Park Avenue intersection is needed. What project impacts, ie. What percent of the traffic through that intersection at peak times is attributed to the Treasure Hill project and what improvements can be recommended to mitigate that impact?

Summary

In summary, Staff finds that additional discussion of the Fehr and Peers traffic review and recommended mitigation measures is warranted. Recommendations of the traffic review, with additional mitigation measures raised by staff that may also resolve many of the existing problems in the area, should be thoroughly discussed.

Staff also finds that based on the Fehr and Peers traffic review, conditions related to these recommendations would be necessary to address, in part, the standards of review for Conditional Use permits (specifically as they relate to the mitigation of effects of any differences in Use or scale, as well as, compatibility in terms of use, scale, and circulation) (LMC Section 15-1-10 (D)). Staff also finds that such conditions would be necessary to address LMC conditional use permit criterion #2 – traffic considerations including capacity of the existing Streets in the Area, as well as criterion #4- emergency vehicle access (LMC Section 15-1-10 (E) (2) and (4)).

In response to City liability questions, any new road or pedestrian improvements will meet applicable standards and are unlikely to increase City liability. The City's liability for the existing condition is minimal. The City is allowed to prioritize on-going maintenance and upgrades to its historic roads in the CIP in accordance with legal standards.

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission hold a public hearing on this matter and directly respond to public and Commission questions, including questions raised at the September 14th meeting.

Note: The exhibits for this report are not attached. They were handed out at the previous meeting. See below for minutes.