

# Planning Commission Staff Report



**Author:** Kirsten Whetstone  
**Subject:** Treasure Hill CUP  
**Date:** January 11, 2006  
**Type of Item:** Administrative

Planning Department

## **Summary Recommendations:**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission resume discussion of building volumetrics and massing and construction mitigation as it relates to the Treasure Hill CUP, conduct a public hearing, and continue the hearing until January 25, 2006, when additional information regarding roadway cross-sections will be presented to address the Commission and public comments from the December 14, 2005 meeting.

## **Background Traffic**

At the last meeting on December 14, 2005, the Planning Commission discussed additional information provided by the traffic consultants on the following issues: 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. The consultants provided a table outlining the issues, findings of the PEC traffic study and the Fehr and Peers review, and additional comments/items for discussion.

Planning staff is working to draft findings and recommendations regarding specific conditions to address the traffic related issues and mitigation items raised by the Commission, staff, and public. These findings will be presented to the Commission at the February 8, 2006 meeting. The applicant is working to address the comments raised by the Commission regarding possible scenarios, ie. cross-sections of the roads to demonstrate feasible roadway configurations to address parking, snow storage, pedestrian, and vehicle conflicts. These roadway cross sections will be presented to the Commission at the January 25, 2006 meeting.

## **Massing and Volumetrics**

On August 11<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> of 2004, the Planning Commission discussed Conditional Use Permit Review items #7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 (see Exhibit A- staff reports and meeting minutes). These items include #7 (Fencing, screening, and landscaping to separate uses), #8 (Building mass, bulk, orientation, and location on site, including orientation to adjacent buildings or lots), #9 (usable open space), #10 (signs and lighting), #11 (physical design and Compatibility with surrounding structures in Mass, scale, style, design, and architectural detailing).

The applicants revised the original submittal in an attempt to address concerns raised by the Staff, Commission, and neighbors regarding building massing and volumetrics (namely review items #8 and #11). These massing changes are summarized in the attached Exhibit B.

Staff requests the Commission review the previous reports and minutes, review changes made to the plans, and provide staff and the applicant with any additional input regarding these specific CUP review items. Staff has reviewed the proposed volumetrics, massing, and building heights and finds them in compliance with the approved Sweeney MPD requirements. Staff would like the Planning Commission to give careful and thoughtful consideration of the massing, heights, and volumetrics as proposed.

### **Architectural Review**

In terms of reviewing and approving specific architectural details, the applicant is requesting that a subsequent project review and approval of the architecture, as a conditional use, be considered by Planning Commission. The applicants have expressed concerns about presenting architectural details without a hotel operator on board. They have also expressed concerns about providing complete architectural design without having a final conditional use approval on the site plan and massing, recognizing that any appeal process could be lengthy and outlast a specific design/operator. The applicants would like the Commission to consider a separate CUP review as a condition of approval, for architecture, materials, landscaping, retaining walls, cliff-scapes, and other related details. With approval by the Commission a condition prior to issuance of any building permits.

Staff is supportive of this request, given the amount of time spent reviewing four different scenarios for the Deer Crest Hotel. This process has been done in the past. The Town Lift project, Caledonian Condominium project, and Mountainside Marriot at PCMR were reviewed for architectural detailing, based on an approved volumetric, subsequent to the CUP approvals. Staff suggests that an architectural task force be considered, like the Town Lift Design Review Task Force in the past, to provide review and guidance in approving the architecture and details.

The architectural details should be required to be compatible with the historic district in terms of architectural character. **Staff requests discussion of this request.**

### **Construction Mitigation**

The applicant will present the Construction Mitigation Plan and will outline additional details and revisions since the last time this information was presented (see Exhibit C).

### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission discuss CUP review criteria relating to building volumetrics (mass, location, orientation) and construction mitigation traffic, hold a public hearing on this matter, and continue the hearing to the January 25, 2006 meeting.

### **Exhibits**

- A. Staff reports and minutes from August 11 and 25, 2004**
- B. Massing Summary and exhibits from applicant**
- C. Construction Mitigation Plan**
- D. Letters and e-mails received since the last meeting**