

applicant to demonstrate why they need longer than one year. Planner Whetstone noted that the current language states, "unless otherwise indicated, conditional use permits expire one year from the date of Planning Commission approval unless the conditionally allowed use has commenced on the project". After further discussion, Commissioner O'Hara believed the language does provide that ability and he suggested that the applicant request an extension at the time of CUP approval.

Chair Barth requested that they make sure they have bonding in place so if work has been done it can be cleaned up without expense to the City.

Chair Barth asked for discussion on limiting the size of guest houses. Commissioner Wintzer felt they should have some restrictions. Commissioner O'Hara stated that he would be comfortable with a formula similar to the one used for an accessory apartment. Commissioner Thomas agreed, noting that most large scale residential developments have a limitation on guest houses. Chair Barth suggested that guest houses may be addressed in the CC&R's. Planner Whetstone remarked that the formula for an accessory apartment is that it can be no larger than a third of the dwelling size but limited to 1,000 square feet, and no less than 400 square feet with no more than two bedrooms. Commissioner O'Hara clarified that he was not suggesting that the same formula should be applied to the guest house. He would like something similar that limits the size of the guest house in proportion to the size of the main house up to a maximum. Planner Whetstone offered to research various CC&R's and draft a formula.

Regarding the definition of telecommunication facilities, Chair Barth felt that definitions belong in the definition section.

Planner Robinson commented on the request to discuss unit equivalents. He cited examples of where the units went right to the line of kicking over to the next UE count. Using these examples, he explained the formula the Staff has proposed for determining unit equivalents. This formula provides more flexibility to architects in designing to fit the market. Chair Barth asked if Empire Pass is using this logic. Planner Robinson replied that Empire Pass is using this formula and he is keeping a spread sheet on each building in terms of square feet and number of UE's. The Commissioners concurred with the proposed change.

#### 5. Treasure Hill - conditional use permit - Continuation of Traffic Discussion

City Engineer, Eric DeHaan, commented on a document that was recently prepared by Fehr & Peers, the City's consultant on the Treasure Hill project. He introduced Pat Sweeney, the applicant; Gary Horton, a professional engineering consultant for the applicant; and Ryan Hales and Jon Nepstad with Fehr & Peers. Mr. DeHaan remarked that over the past few months, they have listened carefully to public input and to Planning

Commission comments with regard to the Treasure Hill project. He distributed copies of a spread sheet that identified the issues raised by the Planning Commission specific to the conditional use application. Mr. DeHaan stated that the objective is to move towards an agreement on language for conditions. If new issues are raised this evening, he asked the Planning Commission to address their questions to him and the other engineers in hopes of finding answers. Mr. DeHaan noted that the information presented this evening is lengthy and the primary purpose is to bring closure to the concerns expressed by the public and the Planning Commission regarding this project.

Planner Whetstone summarized the Staff report and requested input on the three items discussed at the October 12 meeting which are 1) an understanding of the incremental impacts of the Treasure Hill project; 2) an understanding of the traffic impacts of construction and the proposed Construction Mitigation Plan; and 3) an understanding of the potential pedestrian/vehicular conflicts. Planner Whetstone reviewed a number of exhibits showing the site plan and an aerial photo of the parking study. She noted that there are 173 units in the area and approximately 345 off-street parking spaces either in a garage or in driveways.

Ryan Hales, representing Fehr and Peers stated that they were hired by Park City to review the traffic study completed by PEC Engineers. Mr. Hales explained that the table presented this evening has four different columns. The first column were the issues raised at previous Planning Commission meetings. The second column contained the PEC report and some of the recommendations made pertaining to the issues on the left hand side of the table. The third column was the Fehr and Peers review of the PEC recommendations. The fourth column talks about additional data and evaluations. Mr. Hales stated that Fehr and Peers reviewed the Treasure Hill traffic impact analysis completed by PEC and found that it provided an adequate assessment of the traffic characteristics and some of the potential impacts created by this development. He explained that using the term "adequate" means they have met the professional standards and their methodologies and analysis are consistent with the state of the practice within the traffic engineering industry. They also found that the project is consistent with the guidelines provided in the transportation element of the Park City General Plan and the Land Management Code.

Mr. Hales stated that the recommendation of the PEC study was to allow residents to park with permits on only one side of the street along Lowell and Empire. Fehr and Peers concurred that because of the street width, on-street parking should be restricted or strictly enforced to keep people from neighboring areas from overflowing on to the streets. Mr. Hales remarked that an option offered at a previous meeting was that if Park City were going to consider parking, an evaluation should be created to look at where parking could occur. He noted that the Park City staff has created their inventory of the parking on Lowell and Empire and it was one stall short of having two off street parking spaces per dwelling unit along Lowell and Empire. This is independent of the on-street parking that

currently occurs. Mr. Hales commented on the existing roadway noting that it is only 25 feet in a summer time condition. He concurred that the road could be reconstructed to the same width. Concerns were expressed about potential speeding if the road is widened. He concurred that 25 feet could be adequate but several things need to occur. Some of the elements that need to be considered include ten feet wide travel lanes, a six foot snow storage area, and if a pedestrian walkway is installed along one side of the road it needs to be 5 feet wide. Parking should be 8 feet wide. Mr. Hales acknowledged that not all these elements would fit within that 25 foot reconstructed area. He stated that the general options are to widen the roadway to accommodate the cross section of elements mentioned, to restrict and enforce the parking that occurs up there, or to complete some of the stairway connections between Lower Park Avenue and Lowell and Empire through Ninth and Tenth.

Mr. Hales commented on the existing traffic and noted that traffic counts were conducted on June 16, 2004 and re-validated in February of 2005. PEC had inflated the traffic volumes in 2004 to look at winter time conditions and they overestimated the traffic when they performed their counts in February 2005. Mr. Hales believed the PEC analysis was on the conservative side with numbers higher than actual.

Mr. Hales referred to trip generation and reduction. He noted that the trips generated in the PEC report were generated by the Institute of Transportation Engineers standards. PEC completed their counts adequately and used a 30% reduction based on some of the area observations. Fehr and Peers concurred with their recommendations. Mr. Hales noted that while the report limited details on how the percentage was obtained, the reduction is conservative as recorded by other developments in this area. Mr. Hales remarked that future traffic was generated and distributed to different roadways to Lowell and Empire and it was added to obtain a design year traffic volume. He felt the background traffic should have been increased slightly but he did not believe this was a major hindrance.

Regarding pedestrians, Mr. Hales concurred with the PEC recommendation to construct and maintain the proposed pedestrian connections. However, the PEC report was vague with specific plans and recommendations for maintaining that pedestrian connectivity. Mr. Hales commented on the idea to construct a sidewalk on the west side of Lowell Avenue and outlined the pros and cons of having a sidewalk on that side of the street. Another recommendation was to construct the stairs and create additional routes into the Old Town area. These could be constructed during Phase 1 of the construction. If the project is not phased, the stairs could be constructed ahead of time or at the beginning of the construction. Mr. Hales noted that the construction traffic and mitigation plan proposes to use Lowell Avenue to arrive at the site and Empire Avenue to leave the site. This would create one-way circulation for construction traffic only. Fehr and Peers concurs and believes this is a good routing plan. Mr. Hales outlined additional measures proposed to mitigate vehicular traffic on these roads. He commented on intersection mitigations at

Deer Valley and Park Avenue. This intersection currently has operational problems and it is not functioning adequately. Additional turn pockets were recommended for this intersection and Fehr and Peers agree that improvements need to occur. The intersection is currently functioning at a Level of Service E. Mr. Hales stated that this intersection is a current problem that needs to be addressed by both Park City and UDOT. Treasure Hill will only add 6.6% more traffic to this intersection. Mr. Hale remarked that the next intersection mitigation is the intersection of Empire Avenue and Silver King. Fehr and Peers concurs with the recommendation to have a human traffic controller at the end of the ski day helping people move through that intersection. Fehr and Peer also recommend further study if this intersection becomes signalized. Mr. Hales stated that the other intersections function fairly well, however they need to consolidate some of the movements and minimize the pedestrian/vehicular conflicts on Lowell and Empire at Manor Way. He noted that Fehr and Peers have also recommended restricting parking further away from that intersection at Manor Way because of the restricted site distance. Mr. Hale referred to the Crescent Tram road noting that the PEC report assumes that no additional project generated trips will be using Crescent Tram Road. Fehr and Peers conducted a scenario test and feel that traffic should be discouraged from using Crescent Tram Road. Mr. Hales outlined possible ways to discourage traffic.

Mr. Hales noted that PEC recommends that snow removal be prioritized to maintain travel lanes. Fehr and Peers concurred. The PEC study states that the project should be signed to encourage guests to use Lowell going into the Treasure Hill project and Empire to leave the project. Fehr and Peer concurred with that recommendation.

Commissioner O'Hara wanted to know how they made the decision about whether to drive up Lowell or Empire. Mr. Hales replied that one reason a traffic engineer will typically look at a circulation pattern in one direction is that it creates a lot of right turns. Heading south bound on Lowell and north bound on Empire provides a right turn into Treasure Hill and a right turn coming out of Treasure Hill.

Commissioner Thomas asked if the industry standards take into consideration the elevation of Park City and its annual snow fall and cold temperatures. Gary Horton, representing PEC, replied that industry standards do allow for coefficients where travel aid may be restricted due to parking, snow, or other items. Commissioner Thomas asked if the initial traffic study and/or the peer review took these coefficients into consideration. Mr. Horton replied that it did.

Commissioner Wintzer referred to Planner Whetstone's earlier comment about having 300 parking spaces in that area. He wanted to know if those are 300 existing parking spaces, and if so, how many they will lose if they limit parking to one side. Planner Whetstone replied that the parking spaces she counted were either in a garage or off the driveway. All the spaces are on private property and will not be eliminated if on-street parking is

restricted. Commissioner Wintzer referred to the proposed modifications at various intersections and asked if there is enough room to physically make those modifications. Mr. DeHaan stated that adding an extra left turn lane southbound will cause some headaches because Jan's and Cole Sport have property corners that go to the existing sidewalk. By the time they widen the intersection to allow additional turn lanes, it would be necessary to obtain a right-of-way. However, UDOT and the City need to look at this for the entire build out of Park City because that intersection handles traffic from all points. Commissioner Wintzer remarked that Manor Way is more of a pedestrian walkway that connects the lower end of town into the Resort area. He asked if they have contemplated widening that road or adding a bigger sidewalk. Commissioner Wintzer was unsure if the intersections at the upper and lower portion of that road could handle the large construction vehicles. Mr. DeHaan replied that it has been considered. The Four Seasons plan, which has not been built for various reasons, is heavily oriented towards pedestrians and traffic improvements on Manor Way, Shadow Ridge Road, Lowell Avenue, and Empire Avenue in front of the Park City Mountain Resort. He agreed that Manor Way needs additional attention. Commissioner Wintzer stated that he was more concerned with establishing a right-of-way than doing improvements. Mr. DeHaan remarked that the right-of-way is not there, however through a complex subdivision and platting approval they would work with the Resort to obtain that right-of-way as necessary.

Chair Barth opened the public hearing.

Annie Louis Garda, a resident on Lowell Avenue, thanked everyone for listening to their concerns and addressing the issues. Ms. Garda believes the ideas suggested for Lowell Avenue are very workable. She is still concerned about Empire Avenue which carries the most pedestrian and vehicular traffic. Ms. Garda remarked that most of the parking spaces on Empire Avenue are vertical. If the consultants recommendation of widening the roadway is followed, it will take away all the parking spaces since there is not enough room to widen the road. Ms. Garda heard that the construction period could last 10 to 15 years.

She noted that Empire Avenue was completely clogged on Monday when three cement trucks were waiting to pour cement at a very small Old Town home. She wondered how many cement trucks will be needed for a 400 car parking garage and a seven story hotel. Ms. Garda asked if the traffic consultants have considered the impacts of those things on Empire and Lowell. She noted that the traffic study determined that the corner radius is adequate for service and delivery vehicles and wondered if cement mixers and field delivery trucks were included in that analysis. Ms. Garda wanted to know who will pay for snow removal during the construction period when there is no revenue from this project.

Chair Barth closed the public hearing.

Commissioner O'Hara felt that Treasure Hill should be responsible for mitigating the incremental impacts generated by this project. Safety and health issues are key,

particularly in terms of construction traffic and separating pedestrians and vehicles. Commissioner Thomas echoed those considerations. Circulation/traffic/pedestrian issues already exist in that area and they cannot expect Treasure Hill to mitigate all of those problems, however he is concerned with the incremental impact of the development.

Commissioner O'Hara remarked that as the IHC subcommittee looked at traffic impacts, there was concern expressed by the City regarding some of the issues at the Junction and the cost to repair all the impacts at Kimball Junction. One question was whether they would require payment from those causing the impacts if they could do it over again. After discussing this matter, the general consensus was not to have an applicant write a large check and let the City worry about mitigating the problems in the future. They preferred to have the developer as a cooperative partner. If Treasure Hill moves to the approval process, Commissioner O'Hara expects there will be requirements on the conditional use permit that will tie this type of responsibility.

Commissioner Wintzer felt Ms. Garda made a great point about construction traffic. He requested that someone put together a plan that shows how this can physically be done with the road and snow conditions. Commissioner Wintzer was not convinced that all the recommended modifications could be accomplished due to the lack of space. He wanted to see a best case scenario plan of what will work before they approve this project. Chair Barth asked if Commissioner Wintzer would be comfortable with an aerial photograph of the area with an overlay of how it will be implemented.

Mr. DeHaan stated that based on their experience in Park City they should be cautious about the need for sidewalks, putting overhead utilities underground, and reserving some of the 50 foot of right-of-way for future transformers. Mr. DeHaan felt they could come up with suggested possible cross-sections, recognizing that those improvements may not need to be implemented until well after Treasure Hill is in operation rather than concurrent with the construction. He noted that in some places in town, parking has overruled landscaping and sidewalks as a priority.

#### 6. 147 Ridge Avenue - Plat Amendment

Planner Ray Milliner reviewed the application for a plat amendment for Lots 27-32 of Block 75, a portion of Lot 17 and all of Lots 18 and 19 of Block 76 in the Park City survey. These lots are a conglomeration of lots located on the knoll of the hill where Ridge Avenue courses around towards King Road. There is an existing historic single family home on Lots 27-32 and Lots 17,18, and 19 are vacant. The applicant received a variance from the Board of Adjustment to reduce the minimum lot size for Lots 17, 18 and 19 from the required number for the HRL zone down to 2,250 square feet. The applicant also has a prescriptive right-of-way of Ridge Avenue which runs through the property. The historic