



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
September 29, 2021**

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair John Phillips, John Kenworthy, Sarah Hall, Laura Suesser, Doug Thimm, Bill Johnson, Christin Van Dine

EX OFFICIO: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Julie Schultz, Executive Office Administrator; Alexandra Ananth, Senior City Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Phillips called the meeting to order at approximately 5:45 p.m. He noted the presence of all Commissioners.

The following written determination was read:

The Chair issued a written determination that because of the public health emergency, conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may attend in person. This determination is based on the ongoing risks and infection rates statewide and in Summit County. For these reasons, this meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location. Planning Commission members will connect electronically.

Public comments will be accepted virtually. To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom. Written comments submitted before or during the meeting will be entered into the public record but will not be read aloud. For more information on attending virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

There were no minutes for approval.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Chair Phillips mentioned that he and Planning Director Gretchen Milliken discussed allowing the public who attend meetings via Zoom to share their screen. He stated that they would do their best to allow that, however it may create a longer delay between speakers to allow them to be promoted to panelist. He urged the Commissioners to show themselves on screen more often. He added that

it is understandable if someone needs to turn his or her video off, but felt it helpful to have video on when speaking.

Planning Director Milliken reminded the Commissioners that the annual training could either be done either via a Work Session or online at the Commissioner's convenience. Chair Phillips suggested that due to the intensity of the meetings, they reserve as much meeting time as possible for Commission business. He expressed a preference that the Commissioners complete the training on their own but recognized the advantages of training in a group setting. Planning Director Milliken stated that they could schedule a Work Session for Commissioners who wish to complete the training in a group setting while also allowing online training for those who wish to do so. She confirmed that the training is three to four hours long and while it is similar to the prior training, it has been updated. She would communicate with the Commissioners to schedule the training.

She reminded the Commissioners of the site visit on October 27, 2021, at 4:00 p.m. at the Summit Blanc site. They would be looking at the site and transportation and potential road cuts. She noted that the site visit will be legally noticed and open to the public.

Planning Director Milliken reported that Staff would be suggesting a Snow Park site visit and would be reaching out to schedule that visit. She stated that ideally they would like to schedule this site visit before October 27 but would also look at dates in late October/early November. There was discussion regarding general availability and possible scheduling. Commissioner Suesser noted that she would be unavailable on October 20, 2021, and added that she would support the hybrid training, as discussed.

5. CONTINUATIONS

There were no continuations.

6. CONSENT AGENDA

There was no consent agenda.

7. WORK SESSION

- A. Park City Mountain Resort Base Parking Lots – MPD Modification Work Session – Replace Expired Exhibit D of the DA, the 1998 PCMR Base Area Master Plan Study Concept Master Plan, with a New Master Plan, known as the Park City Base Area Lot Redevelopment Master Plan Study. The Planning Commission Will Discuss Off-Site Parking and Transportation, Draft Findings of Fact, Draft Conditions of Approval, and Other Issues Raised in the Staff Report. PL-20-04475. **Public Input will be Taken via e-comments and Zoom.**

Senior City Planner, Alexandra Ananth, reported that tonight's meeting would address the smaller issues raised at the previous meeting and delve into parking and transportation issues. She anticipated that the next meeting would take place on October 20, 2021. She recalled that one of the issues that arose at the last meeting was separating the exceptions the applicant is seeking from the Land Management Code ("LMC") and the Development Agreement ("DA"). Planner Ananth explained that the applicant is seeking the following exceptions from the LMC:

- A reduction in the required perimeter setback in portions of Parcel B from 25 feet to 20 feet, which is the setback for Recreational Commercial (RC) zones. These setbacks are sought for locations on Shadow Ridge, Lowell Avenue, and Empire Avenue facades;
- A reduction in the required number of off-street parking stalls for the commercial and residential uses of the project. The applicant seeks a reduction of 502 parking stalls based on the applicant's shared parking analysis; and
- An increase in allowed building height from the RC zone height for all parcels.

Planner Ananth explained that the applicant is seeking the following changes from the 1998 Development Agreement:

- Replace the expired Exhibit D site plan with a new Master Plan;
- Transfer density to Parcel C to allow for a hotel use that was not contemplated in the 1998 DA;
- To allow the new housing mitigation plan to not include 600 underground parking stalls, as required by the 1998 DA; and
- Update several exhibits, including the Phasing Plan and Traffic and Parking Mitigation Plan.

Commissioner Suesser pointed out that the requested change to allow for a hotel use was made in lieu of a condominium building with skier services located on the first floor. Skier services were contemplated to include parking and drop-off, ski school, day care, and ski lockers. She emphasized that the change to a hotel use was requested to replace what was proposed in the 1998 DA. She added that the applicant requested to not provide 600 extra underground parking stalls, and clarified that the 600 parking stalls were in addition to the requested reduction of 502 parking stalls. Commissioner Suesser also noted that the proposed amendment to the Master Planned Development ("MPD") would be a bifurcation of the obligation contained in the 1998 DA that the resort operator would be involved in the development of the parking lot. Chair Phillips concurred with Commissioner Suesser's comments.

Planner Ananth requested that the Commissioners think about any additional information they need on the above issues so that they can be addressed prior to moving on to the parking and transportation issues. Commissioner Suesser stated that she would like to know what the drop-off within the garage would look like.

Robert McConnell, PEG's legal counsel, focused on proposed Finding of Fact No. 134 and addressed the issue of compatibility. He stated that compatibility is defined in the Code as the "characteristics of different uses or designs that integrate with, or related to one another to maintain and/or enhance the context of the surrounding area or neighborhood." Elements affecting compatibility include, but are not limited to, height, scale, mass, and bulk of a building; pedestrian and vehicular circulation; parking; landscaping and architecture; topography, etc. He reported that there is also guidance from the General Plan with respect to this project. The project is located within the Resort Center planning area identified in the 2014 Park City General Plan, which expressly contemplated the redevelopment of the property. The General Plan recognized that future development within the Resort Center would create a denser village core.

Mr. McConnell read from the General Plan, which contemplated development and redevelopment of the Resort Core to combine the ski experience with the lodging experience. It anticipated that such development would redefine the character of the base area and influence the entire Resort Center

neighborhood. The Plan also recommended flexibility in the execution of the existing Park City Mountain Resort ("PCMR") and MPD approval to facilitate public and private partnership opportunities for public transit, visitors, and locals. Parking and affordable housing, potential relocation and transfer of density, and new uses were also contemplated in the General Plan.

The General Plan recognized the few single-family homes that exist at the northern edge of the neighborhood; however, specifically identified the Resort Center neighborhood as one of the densest resort-oriented neighborhoods in Park City. He noted that the typical lot configuration accommodates multi-family structures. Mr. McConnell emphasized that the language used in the General Plan specifically addressed compatibility with the neighborhood. He further stated that the LMC provides guidance with respect to the RC zone, and this project is within that zone. The LMC identifies the purposes of the RC zone to allow for the development of hotel and convention accommodations in close proximity to major recreation facilities. The RC zone also allows for resort-related transient housing with appropriate supporting commercial uses to encourage the clustering of development with the preservation of open space, while keeping site disturbances and the construction costs of municipal services to a minimum.

Mr. McConnell reminded those present that the 1998 PCMR Master Plan sought to consolidate the uses within the various parcels and preserve open space with respect to the mountain area. He noted that PEG is providing additional open space that is mostly hardscape plazas, which are permitted by the LMC. He showed the Commission depictions of the open space included in this plan.

He added that the proposed open space was intended to limit new development on hillsides and sensitive view areas in conformance with the guidance provided by the LMC. It also provides opportunities for architectural variation in design and housing types and promotes pedestrian connections while minimizing the architectural impacts of the vehicles.

He noted that this project sought to comply with the purposes of development outlined in the LMC, which include the promotion of development of buildings with designs that reflect traditional Park City architectural patterns, the promotion of Park City's mountain and historic character, preservation, and rehabilitation of historic buildings. He presented images of historic Park City architecture, as well as from the General Plan for the Resort Center neighborhood. Mr. McConnell stressed that this project is trying to promote the same architectural interest that currently exists, as well as what was included in the General Plan. They tried to pay homage to the mining architectural influence. He acknowledged that the design is more mountain modern, however, it harkens back to some of the historical notions.

In terms of Code guidance, all of PEG's proposed uses are allowed uses in the RC zone, including parking structures, multi-unit dwellings, major hotels, and related amenities. He referenced the usage tables contained in the DA, on pages 4 and 5 (pages 381 and 382 of the recorded document) and noted that each of the Unit Equivalents ("UE") speak of motel rooms, hotel suites, hotel rooms, or hotels. Most importantly, the document states that "The residential development is intended to occur in the form of condominiums, hotels, and time-shares, and is intended to serve the visitor." He added that there is no express provision in the DA that prohibits hotel uses, and the usage table contemplates such uses. He added that the September 2, 1997 Notice of Planning Commission Action that was recorded with the DA (at page 554-555 of the recorded document) specifically indicates that it is intended to occur in the form of condominiums, hotels, and time-shares.

Mr. McConnell addressed the compatibility goals, which include complimenting natural features, ensuring neighborhood compatibility, and encouraging mixed-use, walkable and sustainable development, and residential uses. PEG has sought to achieve each of these goals in connection with this application. He referenced the guidance provided by the Development Agreement. He noted that it provides for certain vested rights with respect to the subject parcels and the City previously acknowledged that in the 2015 Amendment. PEG also recognizes the need to amend the DA. Mr. McConnell acknowledged that PEG is seeking to bifurcate responsibilities between the resort operator and PEG. He stated that PEG's proposal integrates with, relates to, and maintains or enhances the context of the surrounding neighborhood and area. He referred back to the depictions included in the Park City General Plan.

Mr. McConnell opined that the application responds to and satisfies each of the identified goals of the development of the Resort Center set forth in the General Plan, as well as the permitted uses and goals of the MPD. He added that the clustering of density was always contemplated within the Resort Center to achieve those goals. He reminded those present that Utah law expressly requires the City's ordinances to be strictly construed in favor of allowing a property owner's desired use. In terms of a standard of review of a Planning Commission determination, Mr. McConnell explained that the appeal body is required to "interpret and apply a land use regulation to favor a land use application unless the land use regulation plainly restricts the land use application."

Mr. McConnell stated that PEG recognizes that this is a complex application that implicates a wide variety of interests, objectives, and standards some of which are at cross-purposes. He referred to earlier presentations on the need to balance the various interests. He applauded the diligence of the Commission in reviewing the applicant's submissions, Staff input, and public input. PEG has tried to listen to and respond to the expressed concerns and has significantly modified the proposal where possible without affecting project viability. He added that it is his belief that it is not possible to resolve every concern at the MPD level, nor does the LMC require them to do so. On behalf of the applicant, Mr. McConnell stated that this project advances the City's objectives as stated in the General Plan and LMC. He requested that the proposal be evaluated in accordance with the requirements of Utah law and scheduled for final decision.

Robert Schmidt from PEG Development introduced Emir Tursic from HKS Architects who addressed the Commission's questions regarding Parcel D. Mr. Tursic referenced the east façade (along Empire Avenue) on Parcel D at the corner of Silver King Road and Empire Avenue. He clarified that Parcel D was strategically placed to maintain the mountain views and create a new arrival experience. In addition, it would create a wide-open space that would be a continuation of the open space from the mountain and through the plaza. He presented a depiction of the views. Since last year, they made several modifications based on the feedback from the community and the Commission. One of the major changes was the relocation of the top floor. He reminded the Commission that the building on Parcel D was originally proposed to be five stories. They relocated that density to Parcel C.

Mr. Tursic explained that the other significant change to Parcel D was to re-grade the area to make it more inviting for the pedestrians. There used to be a significant grade change, which has been pushed back to open up the corner for pedestrians and allow the retail spaces to have more presence. He added that they slightly re-oriented the garage entrance and the loading dock entrance away from the arrival sequence. They also articulated the Empire Avenue façade. He adjusted the façade to address concerns that it was still too stark. He emphasized that the arrival experience and sequence does not occur at this façade but at the corner. Mr. Tursic acknowledged that while they want to improve the façade, the primary focus in this area is the view to the mountain.

Mr. Tursic presented the first option for the east façade, which would further reduce the building height along Empire Avenue. To achieve this, they stepped down the condominium building. He noted that the glass element they included to soften the massing is a stair tower that is required by Code for egress and must remain as designed. In addition, he explained that because they have exposed a gable area that tends to emphasize the mass of the building, in Option Two they pushed the massing further back but maintained the same number of condominiums and height on the other side of the stairs. This design results in a slightly different expression, where the mass pushes away from Empire Avenue and provides more variation and architectural cohesion. Mr. Tursic presented comparisons between the current design and the proposed options. He expressed that the architectural design team preferred Option Two.

Chair Phillips commented that he personally preferred Option One because of the exposed gable end.

Commissioner Thimm expressed his appreciation for the applicant's efforts in addressing the massing concerns. He opined that Option One appeared disjointed, and offered that the glass box at the stairway might not be the best solution. He stated that Option Two appeared more softened and provided a level of interest. His eye was drawn to the central area and the layering rather than the vehicular entry. He felt that Option Two was a better solution and would provide for a better entrance.

In response to Chair Phillips, Commissioner Thimm stated that Option Two satisfied the concerns he previously expressed. He noted that it provides the layering starting at the corner and moving back and brings interest toward the north and away from the vehicular entrance. Chair Phillips agreed that these observations made sense.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked if the mountain ridgelines, ski lifts, and open space were accurately depicted in the renderings. Mr. Tursic stated that they did their best to ensure that the backgrounds were depicted as accurately as possible. He added that they compared their software with Google Earth and went to great lengths to make sure this was as accurate as possible. He acknowledged there might be slight variations that are neither intentional nor intended to reduce the scale of the building. He represented that the buildings depicted in the renderings were accurately sized, but as far as the backgrounds, there might be slight variations from the actual sizing and position.

Commissioner Kenworthy referenced the public comment regarding views and scale as compared with the adjacent buildings. He expressed his desire to see accurate building heights so that they can visualize the scale in comparison to the neighborhood, which is a critical component as outlined by Mr. McConnell.

Commissioner Thimm appreciated the need and desire to have an absolute scale but noted that in addition to scale, there must also consider perspective. It is not an exact and precise science to look at the imagery and guarantee that this would be exactly what would be seen. Perspective is a difficult concept to include in the analysis. In response to a comment by Commissioner Kenworthy regarding expectations based on the rendering, Commissioner Thimm stated that it would depend to some degree on the location of the camera. He noted that there are various dynamics involved in creating the representative perspective to know if the view was absolutely accurate. With respect to other buildings in relation to Building D that could potentially block views of the mountain, Commissioner Thimm stated that if they asked for the camera to be set at a specific height and/or location and to include all the surrounding buildings to scale, the rendering should come in accurately.

Chair Phillips commented that he utilizes the same software for his work and agreed with the comments of Commissioner Thimm. He added that on these renderings, the camera is set at an elevated view and the illustration was created for the Commission to visualize the building. He stated that accurately sized buildings could be included within a Sketch-Up model that would include the surveyed terrain of the site, and then set the eye level of the camera. Terrain that could be imported within the software program would show the outline of the ridgeline.

Chair Phillips added that there would be complications in making these renderings look accurate. He thought there may be a way to achieve a better depiction, however, the question remains as to where they would want the camera positioned. He explained that different camera positions would show different views or blocked views of the mountain. He commented that this occurs everywhere. He queried as to whether the applicant would be willing to go through that process but noted that it could be a simple exercise to create a crude outline of the buildings and import the terrain. He referenced his own work in creating augmented reality, and although he would not expect that in this case, if the Commission wanted a specific perspective, they should discuss the camera location.

Commissioner Johnson referenced the Summit Blanc application and how that applicant used a drone to illustrate the adjacent buildings in context. His concern was ensuring that the depictions paint an accurate picture of the project's compatibility with the neighborhood. He asked if there was a way to include an actual photo depiction. Mr. Schmidt stated that this presentation intended to demonstrate their ideas to soften the end of Building D. They did not intend to get into a detailed discussion regarding the background photographs. He recalled that over the course of meetings on this application, they have gone over building size, volume, architectural comparison in relation to neighboring properties, cross-sections, and blocking, and massing. At the risk of getting stuck in an analysis-paralysis loop, Mr. Schmidt suggested that the applicant has presented a compelling case as to why this project merits the requested heights, how it compares to the 1998 Plan, how they preserved view corridors, and how they have responded to Commission requests. He saw no reason to re-open the discussion.

Chair Phillips agreed with Mr. Schmidt's statements and clarified that he was seeking to provide an explanation on some of the concerns raised. He opined that the purpose of the rendering was to show how the end of the building was softened and, to him, it was adequately demonstrated. His experience allows him to visualize the size and mass of the buildings on-site because that is what he does for a living. Chair Phillips stated that he feels comfortable that the proposed heights are in line, and he would not expect to see the ridge from every perspective. He stated that he does not need any more information to make his decision on this point.

Mr. Tursic appreciated the comments of Chair Phillips and Commissioner Thimm and stated that they are accurate. The elevation of the camera is higher than a person would be. They imported a photograph that would match as accurately as possible the terrain that is in the software program. He reiterated that it is likely not 100% accurate but opined that the depiction was in the high 90% for accuracy. He added that these renderings are not always created to show the street perspective and concurred with the statements that from a personal view, almost any building would block views from the street.

Commissioner Johnson expressed that he would like to see better photo simulations depicting the adjacent buildings. Based on the setback and building height exceptions requested, he stated that he does not feel comfortable with the exceptions until he sees a better context of what the buildings surrounding the development would look like with the new buildings. Chair Phillips agreed that this

is a valid concern and queried the extent of the request given that they have never made a similar request of an applicant. Due to the sensitivity and the exceptions sought, he agreed that it might be warranted for this application.

Commissioner Suesser agreed with Commissioner Johnson's concerns, particularly with regards to the existing buildings that would be remaining in the Resort Center. She would like to see a good depiction of the relation of the new development to Silver King and Shadow Ridge and the building along Manor that is occupied by Vail.

Chair Phillips requested the applicant to create a couple of different views to allow the Commission to see the scale of the adjacent buildings as well.

Commissioner Kenworthy reminded that he had asked for the exact same thing for Summit Blanc, from the intersection of the roundabout to include The Montage, Empire Pass, and the proposed development. He reiterated that he is not looking at this from a professional view and there have been concerns about these issues. He added that he asked Deer Valley to provide as much scale as possible with the surrounding neighborhoods.

Mr. Schmidt stated that he feels that, to a large extent, they have already provided this information. He expressed confusion as to what the Commission was requesting and stated that there have been three to four meetings on volumetrics and comparisons and felt that they keep going backward in time.

Commissioner Kenworthy expressed his understanding that the Commission would like the camera in a lower position that would show the relationship between the buildings to the left. This would give them an indication from a human scale of what would be seen as one walks or drives to the project. He offered that there could be several views from different angles and stressed that this is one of the critical issues in this very sensitive and complicated in-filling project. Commissioner Kenworthy continued by stating that he has not been satisfied with the information provided on volumetrics and stressed that they have to get the compatibility right.

Mr. Schmidt referenced the multiple revisions made on Parcels B, C, D, and E in response to the comments regarding compatibility. Commissioner Kenworthy stated that he needed to see it on a much larger scale from different angles now that it is coming together where he can evaluate it from a higher perspective. He stressed that they need to look at this with an equal understanding so that Staff, the Commission, the public, the applicant, and Vail all understand the exact same project.

Chair Phillips referenced the site visit with balloons and offered another site visit with balloons as an alternate solution.

Commissioner Van Dine expressed her understanding of the volumetrics and viewpoints; she would like to know how visible the ridgeline would be from the entry corridor, which she commented is the most important view they are considering. She expressed it would be difficult to believe that the extent of the view of the ridgeline, as depicted, was accurate. She suggested that showing the location of current buildings might help, but reiterated that this entry view corridor is important to maintaining the overall feel of the town and the Resort Center. She expressed an understanding that the view of the ridgeline is dependent on perspective; however, she stated from the current entry corridor, the entire part of the mountain can be seen. She referenced that people in Park City do not like change, and stressed the importance of maintaining things that are important to the residents.

In response to Chair Phillips' inquiry regarding a height exception on Building D, Mr. Schmidt responded that because they removed an entire floor, this building would be lower than what was approved in the 1998 Development Agreement. Chair Phillips commented that the 1998 DA must have contemplated a building of this scale when they set the elevations and suggested that this is what happens when buildings are clustered. In his mind, this affirmed that it would be an improvement on what was included in the 1998 DA because they are proposing a lower building. His position on building heights remained unchanged from those previously expressed.

Following Commissioner Van Dine's comments, Commissioner Suesser requested a visual of what it would look like for those in vehicles at the corner that borders the north end of the resort lot. Commissioner Johnson added that he would also like to see a similar view from 14th Street and suggested aerial drone shots to provide more information. City Attorney, Mark Harrington suggested starting with the one photo, and then for the October meeting, they could cull out what was previously provided so that the applicant would not be required to provide something already presented to the Commission. If the Commission still needed more information, they could address it then.

Planner Ananth confirmed her understanding that the Commission would like to see a photo-realistic visual at the corner of Building D from either a vehicle or human eye perspective that shows Building D in relation to the mountain and the proposed open space plaza. Commissioner Van Dine added that the applicant should include the Silver King building in the photograph for perspective and that the photograph should be of the entire view corridor and not just Building D. Commissioner Suesser added that Buildings C and E should also be depicted, and questioned whether Silver King could be included from this vantage point.

Commissioner Kenworthy agreed with these requests and stressed the importance of understanding the compatibility of the project as a whole with the existing buildings. The ability to see the mountains and lifts as one enters the resort was an important goal and he would like to see if this actually would achieve it.

Mr. Schmidt stated that they cannot show every perspective in every location; and agreed to provide a photograph from this location at eye level. He reiterated that PEG has made a compelling case in relation to the 1998 DA and neighboring properties that this would be a beautiful, viable quality project. He reminded those present that the proposal is 100 units under the allowed density, and they have been sensitive to the area. He confirmed that PEG would provide one perspective from street level at this location and Staff would explore what other materials had been submitted and make those available to the Commissioners.

Mr. Schmidt moved on to answer the questions regarding parking that were raised at the prior meeting. With respect to parking for sprinter vans, Mr. Schmidt stated that the first level of structured parking in Parcel E would have a clearance of 14 feet floor-to-floor, with a 13-foot garage clearance. He noted that average sprinter vans are 9.5 feet tall, so they could be accommodated in Parcel E. Mr. Schmidt added that there is plenty of space in this paid parking location. Commissioner Suesser asked if a sprinter van could fit in the other garages, which are 10 feet high. Mr. Schmidt stated that it would be too tight for a sprinter van to access the other garages.

Commissioner Thimm asked if the proposed skier drop-off areas would be located in garages with a 10-foot deck-to-deck dimension. When Mr. Schmidt answered in the affirmative, Commissioner Thimm expressed that this would not work, given the height of a Suburban with a Thule rack, and accounting for opening to access the skis. Mr. Schmidt presented a slide depicting the 10-foot floor-to-floor parking structure clearance for the standard parking stalls. They depicted a Suburban with

a Thule rack, which was measured to be 7'7" to the top of the rack; this configuration would provide 1-½ feet of clearance from the top of the rack to the bottom of the deck, which should be ample to open the rack to retrieve skis. Commissioner Thimm commented that in his experience, this would not provide enough room.

Mr. Schmidt stated that adding six inches or more, floor to floor, would not be sustainably responsible due to the amount of concrete, excavation, and carbon input to accomplish that. He added, however, that they would consider adding six inches to each floor if requested by the Commission. He further commented that they do not want to build something that their clients and customers would not be able to use.

Commissioner Thimm suggested that there should be a 9 ½ to 10-foot clear dimension between the lowest obstruction, and noted that the depiction did not show sprinkler pipes, plumbing, and other elements that would be dropped to the bottom of each deck. He added that if this is going to be a skier drop-off, which he is accepting as part of the solution, it must be functional. That would mean 9 ½ to 10 feet of clearance to allow a Suburban to pull in, open their Thule and remove skis and poles. Mr. Schmidt noted that they strategically place plumbing and clearances within parking structures. In the lower decks, they do not have plumbing above and they have the flexibility to consolidate the plumbing in drive-aisles. Commissioner Thimm agreed and reiterated that he would just like to see a functional solution.

Mr. Schmidt confirmed that they would agree to a condition that on the decks with skier drop-off, they would have 9 ½ feet of garage clearance. Commissioner Thimm agreed that this condition would be reasonable. Mr. Schmidt confirmed that other decks would be as depicted in the graphic, with 9-foot clearance from floor to bottom-of-deck. He further confirmed that they would be agreeable to adding six inches on the two day-skier drop-off levels in Parcels B and E.

In response to an inquiry from Commissioner Sarah Hall, Mr. Schmidt stated that he does not have the height measurements for sedans with bike racks. He stated that vehicles with bicycles would stage in the drop-off area along Empire Avenue before parking in the garage. It would be up to drivers to responsibly gauge whether they could enter the garage with bikes on top of their vehicles. Commissioner Hall reiterated that she was interested in ensuring feasible parking for bike users, and noted that it had become a bigger issue in the past few years.

Mr. Schmidt next addressed the questions regarding pedestrian accessibility, staging, and crossing at Lowell Avenue at the northwest corner of Parcel B. He explained the graphic presented to the Commission. He noted that there would be approximately 2,600 square feet of sidewalk in that location and explained that pedestrians would cross at the signalized intersection and the driveway. He noted that they could add more sidewalk area to the back if they needed to accommodate pedestrian staging. He stated that their plans show that 800 pedestrians per hour would cross at this location. In response to an inquiry, Mr. Schmidt noted that he highlighted the sidewalk in blue on the graphic and tied it into the 12-foot sidewalk along Shadow Ridge.

Planner Ananth added that the sidewalk juts out in that location to narrow the crossing. Mr. Schmidt reiterated that this detail would be addressed specifically at the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) stage but highlighted that this location is 66 feet from the staircase, with 25-foot setbacks around the corner. There would be ample room for the sidewalk, and ample room to increase the size as well.

Commissioner Suesser asked about the width of the road and whether it would accommodate the buses. Mr. Schmidt stated that the roadway is approximately 25 feet at a minimum. He also stated

in response to an inquiry that the pedestrian crossing is timed for a 1 or 1 ½ minute cycle. They estimate 30 – 35 buses an hour going through that intersection. Josh Givens, Hales Engineering, confirmed that there would be a bus every minute or so. They calculated approximately 13 pedestrians per minute and 17 pedestrians per cycle of the signal. That would result in 20 pedestrians or less waiting at a given time to cross, with very minimal vehicle conflict. Mr. Schmidt confirmed that the travel lanes would be 12 feet wide, and the buses would be approximately 8 ½ feet wide. The design is 25 feet curb-to-curb, which would allow two buses to go through the intersection side-by-side.

Mr. Schmidt noted that the graphic presented was a snapshot from the geometric plan already submitted as part of this application. He next addressed the drop-off plan and which they reconsidered after taking the concerns raised by the Commission into account. He explained the re-designed plan to the Commission with a graphic and reported that they decided to designate a drop-off staging area that would be in effect from 8:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m. The times and days could flex depending upon demand and it would be managed by the parking operator. Mr. Schmidt explained that vehicles could enter off of Shadow Ridge Road, circulate in a one-way fashion, and then stop to unload gear and children into a temporarily designated staging area. He stated that they would work with coaches and program organizers to meet their skiers in the drop-off and staging area, and once groups were gathered, they could depart together up to the hill. From inside the garage, there would be elevators and stairs on both ends. They could accommodate 20 vehicles in a queue. Ski lockers would be located one floor above this location.

Commissioner Johnson asked if this drop-off zone would include temporary parking as well. Mr. Schmidt stated they would have 30-minute free parking across all stalls in the garage, so any available stall could be used if needed.

Commissioner Suesser inquired about having elevators or stairs in the middle that would allow users to be brought to the crossing on the west side of Lowell Avenue. Mr. Schmidt reiterated that stairways and elevators would be located on the ends of the garage. He explained where pedestrians would exit the garage and stated that they could cross at the intersection just discussed, or walk to the mid-block crossing and then up through the ice rink plaza. Alternatively, they could come up through the fire alley.

Mr. Schmidt confirmed that this drop-off area in the garage would be a 9-½ foot clear height dimension. In response to an inquiry, he stated that the ski lockers on the level above would open onto the retail frontage side and would have a 9-foot clear height. Mr. Schmidt stated that at this location along Lowell Avenue, the floor at this level would be one level below grade. At Shadow Ridge, the entrance to the garage would be at grade, while at Empire Avenue, this section of the structure would be above grade.

Commissioner Suesser confirmed the route that ski students and instructors would need to take from the drop-off staging area.

Commissioner Johnson asked if the applicant could design a similar configuration in Parcel E since that garage has a 13-foot-high clearance. He noted that any ski team or competitive group would likely drop off in this location. It would also add drop-off area, as he opined that they would likely need a lot more than a 20-vehicle drop-off. Mr. Schmidt confirmed that they have structured a similar drop-off configuration in Parcel E that would include a temporary drop-off staging zone. Skiers could then make their way up to the plaza where they would be slope-side. He added that utilizing the portico on Parcel E for drop-off could also present another option.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked about the staging areas included in the drop-off zones. Mr. Schmidt explained that they would cone off the drop-off area at given times so that people could not park in the area. The areas would also be managed to move people through.

Commissioner Van Dine stated that this new design presented a much better option than the set-aside parking stalls; she also noted that having these zones at both locations was a significant improvement over the previous proposal. Commissioner Hall concurred with these sentiments and opined that this would work effectively by knowing exactly where the coach would be located. Chair Phillips and Commissioner Thimm also agreed that this design was a significant improvement.

Commissioner Suesser expressed concerns about having teams wait in the garage for their whole team to congregate and then having to walk to their destination. Commissioner Van Dine reiterated that this would work effectively as it is a short window of time. It was noted that younger children would most likely be dropped off in Parcel B, but Commissioner Van Dine felt that for the ski teams, she offered that this is a great adjustment.

It was noted by Commissioner Van Dine that most of the resort ski programs would likely use the Parcel B drop-off area, and this plan brings them closer than the current drop-off.

Commissioner Johnson expressed concerns about pick-ups. He further commented that he wanted a number to compare with the 267 projected drop-offs and ride-share number. He continued to have concerns as to whether ride-share was allocated into this plan.

In response to a concern expressed by Commissioner Kenworthy regarding the vertical parking of cars, Mr. Schmidt stated that the intent of the drop-off area is to accommodate the scheduled arrival of children and the efficient moving of cars in and out of the parking structure. He acknowledged that the afternoon hours present a different scenario because a parent could arrive 10 minutes early while their child is still on the mountain. Typically, vehicles pull in and wait to meet their children and there are stalls available for that in the afternoon.

It was noted by Commissioner Van Dine that part of the rationale behind the 30-minute free parking and the temporary staging areas was to allow parents to park and go meet their children. This would maximize day-skier parking, while still allowing plenty of spaces for pick-up. The program does need to be able to flex to see how it would all come together. She added that achieving the mode split would be critical, and much of their intent is to get families to come to the resort using transit. Commissioner Van Dine added that this drop-off plan would also cater to those children that ride the bus.

Mike Gore, General Manager of the Park City Mountain Resort, commented that from an operations standpoint, this plan is a significant improvement for parents and children getting to the resort. He noted that it is far more organized than the system in place today. He added that this plan allows them to work with the teams to organize their arrival and get them centralized in a better location. Today, some of the teams are moving their meeting areas daily, depending on their training and other factors.

In response to a question from Commissioner Suesser regarding vehicle exit after dropping off, Mr. Schmidt stated that they anticipated that they would temporarily block off these stalls during the designated drop-off time to effectuate a one-way circulation out of the garage. Commissioner Suesser asked who would be operating this parking garage so that this plan could be

accommodated. She noted that the applicant's Traffic Demand Management ("TDM") plan stated that they could not guarantee shared parking agreements and questioned how they could bind the operator of the garage in Building E to this plan. Mr. Schmidt stated that PEG Development and its' successors would be the owner of the parking garage. They would hire PCMR as a parking operator to specifically manage parking. He confirmed that the drop-off staging would be perpetual; what would flex would be the amount of vehicle availability they would need.

With regard to shared parking agreements and the TDM, Mr. Schmidt clarified that the comment in the TDM regarding shared parking agreements has to do with the inability to guarantee agreements with existing third-party owners already at the base. He added that they would have shared parking agreements amongst Parcels B, C, D, and E.

Commissioner Thimm confirmed with Mr. Schmidt that this would include all of the parking that is taking advantage of the shared parking analysis and that the management of the parking could be a Condition of Approval. Mr. Schmidt agreed that there could be a condition that there be active management of the parking facilities. Commissioner Thimm stated he would like to see this as a Condition of Approval, and if it were to change, then it should come back before the Commission.

The discussion next turned to mode splits and off-site parking. Andrew Erickson, Transit Planner with AECOM, identified himself and explained that he is working with Kordel Braley, AECOM. He was specifically tasked with looking at Quinn's Park and Ride. He stated that their goal is to look at the bus service with a planning horizon of five years to estimate the amount of transit service that would be needed to serve that area. Looking forward, they are looking at a 20% mode shift by 2028. He stated that they would be assessing the existing plans to develop a transit service plan by the end of October that outlines the revenue hours of buses and drivers. They would ultimately put together a technical memo.

He listed the key milestones as follows:

- Summer 2022: New electric buses would replace existing diesel buses;
- Late 2022: Completion of the Quinn's Park and Ride lot;
- 2023: Begin construction of the parking garage in Parcel B;
- 2028: Completion of the resort, and achievement of 20% mode split; and
- 2030: Implement an all-electric fleet.

Mr. Erickson addressed the Quinn's Park and Ride specifically, and stated that their technical memo would include routing, travel time (including layovers), and frequency of service. Ultimately, they would create a package that would include revenue hours, which equals costs and the number of vehicles and drivers. He stated that Year 1 of the planning horizon would look different than Year 5 as the different milestones are completed. Within this analysis, they would include the consideration of the replacement of electric vehicles.

In response to an inquiry from Commissioner Suesser, Mr. Erickson stated that they would be factoring in the Richardson Flat lot in the creation of their technical memo, which would include the consideration of how employee parking would work. Commissioner Suesser expressed her opinion that the Quinn's lot should be dedicated to visitors and locals who would be encouraged to ride public transit into town, while the Vail and PEG employees should use Richardson Flat as a permanent lot.

Commissioner Kenworthy explained that the reason he was shocked when he first saw the Park and Rides was because he recalled the discussions about choosing Ecker and Quinn's. He emphasized

that there are only 330 parking stalls available that can be controlled at Ecker and Quinn's. They have been using 200 additional spaces that belong to the development group CVMA at Ecker. These represent the only satellite parking lots available, and according to Carolyn Rodriguez, there are no other lots on the horizon. Planner Ananth confirmed the accuracy of this summary.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated that they have been using 424-500+ spaces on peak snow days, which results in a shortfall of approximately 150 spaces. The plan seeks to push those spaces that are already in use over to SR-248. They do not have any capacity to run buses over the next five years into SR-224. He emphasized that SR-224 accounts for 69% of the day-skier traffic to Park City Mountain and 74% to Deer Valley. The majority of those people are coming from Jeremy, Kimball, and the Wasatch Front. He stated that they would not only have to get people on the buses, but they also have to encourage people to travel to SR-248. Planner Ananth understood that current usage has resulted in a shortage in parking demand from the SR-224 direction, therefore, the applicant has proposed signage to direct people towards Quinn's where there would be 465 stalls to be constructed. Commissioner Kenworthy added that the additional 40 spaces at the Kimball Transit Center are node spaces and should not be considered satellite parking. He stressed that these spaces defeat the goal of "transit first," which is to capture people before they get to that intersection.

Planner Ananth agreed that the SR-224 Park and Rides are not as ideal as Quinn's would be, because you do not have to drive through major intersections when the goal is to capture people outside of those areas. She added that they have been modeling for peak days. Commissioner Kenworthy commented that the usage presented to the Commission by the County is that it is 80 – 90%; therefore, on peak days they have to transfer 100 – 150 cars from SR-224 to SR-248.

Commissioner Suesser commented that they were trying to get people to park at SR-248 because of the paid parking. More people are going to want to park out there, and the planning should not just be for peak days or worst-case scenarios. She emphasized that they are trying to encourage people to park out there all the time, not just on a peak day, and people would be encouraged to do so because of the cost of parking. Planner Ananth stated that this is what the City is doing to ensure that there is sufficient bus service for the Quinn's Park and Ride.

Commissioner Kenworthy added that they are not aware of any other satellite parking lots in the foreseeable future. Planner Ananth agreed and stated that it has been generally acknowledged that SR-224 has been underserved. Commissioner Kenworthy stated that if SR-248 were the main corridor, there would have to be a public/private deal to address employee parking, which is why they need Vail at the table. He recalled Mr. Gore's statement that they would provide the Commission with the number of daily employees. He questioned how they would condition approval if Vail removes all of their employees, or if Vail has a plan for all of their employees.

Mr. Schmidt reported that to achieve the required mode split on peak days, they would need to shift 956 people from their vehicle to an alternate mode. Of those 956 people, 83%, or 798 people would arrive by transit, while 158 people would arrive by alternate modes (walking, shuttle, bike, etc.). Lodging contributes to the mode split. He stated that 633 people would park off-site in Park and Ride lots, while 165 people will ride transit from a place where they can catch a bus. He explained that of the 633 people parking off-site on peak days, there would be a requirement for 422 parking stalls based on an Average Vehicle Occupancy (AVO) of 1.5 people per vehicle. These numbers are only applicable to day skiers.

Mr. Schmidt stated that 69% of the 422 vehicles would be coming from the north and using SR-224 as the entryway. The Park and Ride locations along SR-224 (Jeremy Ranch, Ecker Hill, Kimball

Junction) have a capacity of 220 stalls. Given the capacity, they anticipated having to shift 150 vehicles from SR-224 to SR-248 by the use of signage which would allow drivers enough time to decide to head to Quinn's Junction. As a result, approximately 140 of the 220 available stalls would be used along SR-224. Commissioner Kenworthy agreed with these numbers and added that the 140 would be needed at the Quinn's lot because they would be mostly the existing public.

Mr. Schmidt suggested that there would need to be a level of flexibility built into the overall program. He continued by stating that on the SR-248 side, 31% of the mode split would be approaching from the east. The Park and Ride location at Quinn's would have a capacity of 465 stalls. Therefore, the resulting demand on SR-248 would be 282 stalls or 60% of the available stalls. He reiterated that these numbers assume a peak day when employees would not park at this lot.

Commissioner Kenworthy reminded that it must be kept in mind that many Deer Valley day skiers and Old Town employees and visitors would also use these spots. Mr. Schmidt agreed that these spots would not be reserved. Mr. Schmidt stated that Richardson Flat has 650 unreserved stalls, but they anticipate it would only be used for employees, not guests. He summarized that of the 465 available stalls at Quinn's, they projected that on peak days they would need approximately 282 stalls.

Kara Bowyer from Vail Resorts addressed the employee numbers as requested by Commissioner Kenworthy, and the locations where Vail proposed to park their employees versus where they are parking today. She explained that they view Park City Mountain to include two portals: one on the Park City Mountain Village side and the other on The Canyons side. The entire resort has approximately 1,200 employees on a peak day.

She reported that approximately 40%, or 480, of those employees have their base location on the Park City Mountain Village side. Vail has done extensive surveys and has apps through their existing TDM Program; approximately 30% of their employees participate in that program. Therefore, of the 482 employees, 145 employees are currently part of the TDM Program and they have assumed that they would remain part of the TDM program.

Ms. Bowyer explained that based on the foregoing, they would need 335 parking spaces to accommodate Vail employees. Currently, there are 220 spaces in the Silver King lot that are used for employees on non-peak days; 30 employees park at Munchkin every day due to their work location. She confirmed that they move employees off-site on weekends and holidays. She reported that there are 10 spaces at Kingshop, which is located on the mountain, to accommodate the employees at their primary worksite, and there are 75 spaces in the Resort Center garage that are used currently for employee parking.

Ms. Bowyer explained that after development and the elimination of the Silver King lot, they would shift an additional 95 employees to Munchkin to fully park that 125-stall site. The parking at Kingshop and the Resort Center would remain unaffected by this development. Therefore, they would park 125 employees either at Richardson Flat or Quinn's, depending on the day of the week.

Commissioner Kenworthy anticipated they would need a Condition of Approval on PEG for Vail to park 85 on-site, 125 at Munchkin, and then in some fashion park the remaining employees at Quinn's or Richardson Flat. He commented that the Quinn's lot would be first-come, first-served, so they would likely be almost full before getting to anyone else in town. He added that Quinn's has not yet been built and they still need to address the issues with SR-248. He stressed that there needed to

be more on the public/private. The numbers presented showed him that the future Park and Ride is already full.

Mr. Schmidt stated that what they offered in the TDM and Parking Management Plan ("PMP") is that the use of Quinn's would be Monday through Thursday. Commissioner Kenworthy commented that because the lot is not yet built, he could not use it as a mitigation. Additionally, because it would be unreserved, there could be no guarantee that it would be available for employee parking. He emphasized the City's needs and the vehicles that would be re-directed to Quinn's from SR-244. Commissioner Kenworthy opined that the 465 stalls at Quinn's would be nowhere near what they need.

Mr. Schmidt stated that they would be willing to agree to a Condition of Approval that if they find that Quinn's lot is overfull on Monday through Thursday, then they would shift their employees to Richardson Flat on a full-time basis. He offered that there are systems that would allow them to monitor the usage of Quinn's. It was agreed that the goal is to shift cars off the road, especially during the peak hour. Mr. Schmidt expressed that they need to have the ability to flex and flow. Commissioner Kenworthy commented that they are not flexing at SR-224. He stated that SR-248 and Quinn's were discussed as transit modes in approximately 2018 and the City denied the plans of the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") to add additional lanes. When the City Council voted down UDOT's plan, it was argued that there would be no way to implement bus rapid transit without UDOT's plan. He stressed that three years ago, the City Council concluded that this site would not work for bus rapid transit.

Commissioner Kenworthy emphasized that historically, he has seen the problems with Quinn's, which was a leftover and chosen for this development because there were no other options. He stressed that there needs to be more of a public/private commitment from PEG and Vail. He added that he just read that PEG sold 42% more passes, which would translate into more traffic. He stated that he is not against the development; he is trying to be realistic and hold PEG and Vail accountable for mitigating this issue. He noted that the LMC requires this to be resolved at this stage and suggested that they continue to work to try and solve it.

Mr. Schmidt stated that they want this to be successful, with the most effective use of public transit. Commissioner Kenworthy stressed that all they have is one bus transit lane; all other buses would be stuck in traffic. Mr. Schmidt expressed that they want to direct cars to Quinn's on days when it would be less used, and they can do that by parking employees in that lot. That would be an effective use of the transit system because it means they do not have to put another shuttle on the road. He added that PEG already agreed to contribute to the cost and they are working to quantify what that cost should be. He added that they would move employees to Richardson Flat and shuttle them on the weekends to free up spaces in Quinn's, which would allow plenty of public access.

He also suggested that there were other flexible solutions. For example, there would be 1,200 parking stalls that would be under utilized from 4:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. that could be used for Old Town employees. From a Master Plan standpoint, he offered that they have identified the parameters of the plan to provide solutions. He inquired about the type of solution being sought by Commissioner Kenworthy.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated that as a community, they need to understand that they do not have the solution right now. He queried whether they would be able to "get by" for the time being, and noted that what has been presented could not be called a "plan." It assumes the parking lot at Quinn's will be built, without recognizing that issues could arise, and stressed that they must

minimize the risk. He clarified that they are in a completely different situation than they were three years ago and they have to address the fact that the City did not think bus rapid transit on SR-248 would not work. For this application, it has been proffered that SR-248 is the only alternative for the foreseeable future. While it was agreed that Quinn's would be built, Commissioner Kenworthy opined that it is not enough. He stressed that he is looking at not only what is good for the development, but also what is good for the residents of Park City. Knowing the realities, as they exist today, this issue is a major hurdle for this application.

Commissioner Kenworthy further stated that there must be a plan, with contribution by Vail, for this application to move forward. He appreciated Vail's presentation of the numbers and would like them verified. He emphasized that they were taking away the busiest corridor to achieve the AVO. Without the bus ridership, they would not meet the AVO. Planner Ananth clarified that paid parking and transit are the primary drivers of the AVO.

Chair Phillips focused on what they could do to mitigate conditions to ensure that they have all ends covered as best they can. He recognized Mr. Gore, who added that PEG has made every effort to answer the questions that have been asked. He offered that tonight's discussion felt like a moving target and asked for clarity moving forward on what is being requested.

Mr. Gore recounted that PEG was asked to come back with solutions and further detail on employee parking and guest demographics to tie it into the parking issue. He felt that the information provided was well explained, seemed workable, and responded to Commissioner Kenworthy's questions from the last meeting.

Commissioner Suesser asked about the capacity of the High School. Ms. Bowyer stated that based on their calculations, Vail would not need the High School to accommodate their employees. She reported that last season they did not park employees at the High School, primarily based on COVID-19 screening purposes; however, based on demand, their employee-parking plan was sufficient.

Ms. Bowyer confirmed that currently, they park 30 employees on non-peak days at Munchkin because it is near their job location; 220 employees park at the base lots at Silver King. On peak days, 95 employees park at Munchkin and the remainder find alternative transit. They would park employees at the High School if needed, but the analysis showed that in the future, they would not need to rely on the High School.

Commissioner Suesser commented that the increase in pass sales and mountain upgrades would result in increased traffic. They already have a traffic problem on SR-248 and part of alleviating that problem would be the construction of the Quinn's Park and Ride. Once that lot is built, there will be transit service to that lot that would encourage people to use it. She observed that it would not be a large lot, and would need to be shared by everyone. She further stated that the idea that Vail employees should park at Quinn's and use public transit instead of the general public does not make sense, since the general public cannot park in Richardson Flat. She emphasized that the public is not building Quinn's Junction for Vail employees.

Ms. Bowyer responded that if the use of Quinn's on non-peak days is problematic, PEG has stated it would be willing to look at that in the future and not use Quinn's for employee parking. Commissioner Suesser highlighted the impact of traffic on SR-248 every day of the week and suggested moving all employees to Richardson Flat, seven days a week, and shuttled by Vail. This would allow the general public to make use of the new Park and Ride and public bus service to alleviate the current traffic on SR-248.

Mr. Schmidt added that the suggestion to use the Quinn's lot for employee parking from Monday through Thursday would help the traffic situation because the employees would be using public transit. If they move all employee parking to Richardson Flat, they would be adding shuttles to the roadway system. He was not convinced that Quinn's would be full on a non-peak day.

Mr. Gore expressed his belief that there was a collective solution for those days when Quinn's would be filled. To suggest that employees in the community could not use public transit and Park and Ride lots is not the right answer. He offered that they should encourage everyone in the community to use public transit and Park and Ride lots, whether they work on Main Street, or a ski resort. Commissioner Suesser responded that the community could not use Richardson Flat, because it is not serviced by transit.

Mr. Gore acknowledged that a business could elect to park their employees at Richardson Flat and run a shuttle. Commissioner Suesser suggested that given the volume of Vail employees that do not park at the resort, Vail could shuttle more than three days per week. She reiterated that they are trying to create a shift and alleviate the traffic on SR-248 and the Quinn's lot was planned to be part of that solution.

Mr. Schmidt reiterated that their proposal seeks to be collaborative and utilize public facilities to their highest and best use from Monday through Thursday and not add additional shuttles to the road. If they find it is not working at Quinn's, they agreed to shift the employees to Richardson Flat full time.

Commissioner Kenworthy suggested that there would need to be approximately 10 buses an hour at the resort and this program would not work with 10 buses an hour. He implored people to stick with the math and asked whether 320 spaces would provide 30 buses an hour. He recognized that the resort would get buses from other sources, but this plan would not create the bus traffic need to make the 20% reduction work.

Mr. Schmidt deferred to AECOM and added that currently there are 24 buses per day to the resort; they have already presented the math that showed for them to achieve the 20% mode split reduction, they would need an additional 11 buses per hour. Those buses would come from all routes. Commissioner Kenworthy pointed out that the buses already come from all routes; the addition of the Quinn's lot would not provide the additional 11 buses per hour.

Commissioner Kenworthy reiterated that the math does not work and cautioned about the impact of the additional traffic on City streets. This program would not work unless they get people on the buses and get the extra 11 buses per hour. Mr. Schmidt reiterated that their plan calls for parking at Quinn's with the addition of buses and there would have to be additional ridership from within the City. He stressed that all of this would be collaborative, and at this point, he was unsure how to further answer Commissioner Kenworthy's questions. Mr. Schmidt stated that this project would advance the City's goals by allowing more efficient parking with the implementation of the TDM and PMP and by allowing a project that would generate huge amounts of tax revenue for the City to help pay for improvements being discussed.

Commissioner Kenworthy suggested figuring out where they would get the 11 buses needed to make this plan possible. Mr. Schmidt expressed that this is an administrative process and that Commissioner Kenworthy was driving at a solution that was not clear. Commissioner Kenworthy disagreed with this statement. Mr. Schmidt stated that he did not know where to go from here.

Chair Phillips suggested the Planning Commission drill down to determine areas of consensus to assist Staff and PEG in moving forward.

Commissioner Suesser commented that PEG has requested a 500 space parking exception and they have not adequately addressed employee parking. She opined that all resort employees should park at Richardson Flat 100% of the time and the resort operator should be responsible for shuttling them back and forth so that the community could utilize the Quinn's lot. She agreed that to achieve the 35 buses an hour needed for the mode shift, there would need to be a lot of off-site parking. Because they do not have that capacity at the SR-224 lots, they must look exclusively to the Quinn's lot and the employees should not fill up that lot to the exclusion of the general public. She added that they would need to look at a mitigation measure for PEG's requested 500 space parking exception that would involve a financial contribution to the City's transit plan.

Commissioner Thimm thanked Commissioner Kenworthy for his thoughts and questions. He queried whether AECOM should be commissioned to answer the questions raised by Commissioners Kenworthy and Suesser, in conjunction with what has been proposed, and present those findings to the Commission for its consideration.

Commissioner Hall would like to know how many buses would be needed to transport the 1,200 employees, and how many buses were currently running these routes. Mr. Schmidt clarified that not all of the 1,200 employees were currently using transit. Ms. Bowyer explained that there are 1,200 employees across the entire resort, and 40%, or 480 employees, are based on the Park City Mountain Village side of the resort. Thirty percent of those 480 employees use the existing TDM. She explained that the existing TDM utilizes vanpools, PC/SLC Connect, and other transit subsidies. She noted that 70% of the employees travel to the resort by single-occupancy vehicle. During non-peak times, there are currently 220 stalls in the Silver King lot for employees. Employees are moved off-site during peak times. She explained that Vail runs a private shuttle from Munchkin. It was clarified by Ms. Bowyer that there was not going to be employee parking in the new development.

Commissioner Hall referenced the 1998 DA that included paid parking and private employee shuttles. Ms. Bowyer confirmed that they run vanpools to Heber and Salt Lake City. Commissioner Hall asked whether now would be appropriate to discuss a fee-in-lieu. Planner Ananth responded that part of the reason that AECOM was retained was to assist in the development of the costs associated with the transit from Quinn's Junction to arrive at a fee-in-lieu number. She reported the Executive Department and the applicant are actively working on determining an appropriate amount. The persons from Executive that are working on this are David Everitt and Matt Dias.

Commissioner Suesser suggested that a Planning Commissioner or two be involved in those discussions.

Commissioner Hall expressed that she was generally in favor of the resort serving as a backstop for its' employees, but opined that the resort was underestimating the non-peak days. As a frequent user of this resort, she felt that every day was like a peak day. She suggested building in some language in the Conditions of Approval that if the public is being negatively impacted that they would automatically default employee parking into Richardson Flat.

Mr. Schmidt commented that the data received from Vail does not bear out the comments by Commissioner Hall regarding non-peak days. Commissioner Hall noted that she receives alerts on her phone 3 – 5 days per week that the base is full. Ms. Bowyer explained that the alerts are sent out before the lots are filled to give drivers time to re-direct their traffic patterns. She stated that what

they saw over the entire enterprise over the past season, with COVID-19, was that visitation was spread out across more days of the week. She stressed that the busy times during the week occur during a small window of time, and in terms of employee parking, there would be no difference in peak and non-peak days, except the possible switch between Quinn's and Richardson Flat. She added that in addition to emphasizing transit on peak days, the point of "transit first" is to bring those weekday skiers to the resort via transit.

Commissioner Hall reiterated her position that she would want a Condition of Approval that would automatically default employee parking to Richardson Flat if Quinn's becomes overfilled with employee parking. She also mentioned the option of increasing shuttles from Provo and Salt Lake City so that employee parking at Quinn's would not negatively impact the public.

Ms. Bowyer stated that the suggested Condition of Approval is already contained in the TDM. Mr. Schmidt affirmed that they agreed to that shift, so a Condition of Approval along those lines would be agreeable.

Commissioner Hall agreed with Commissioner Suesser's comments regarding dedicating Richardson Flat to employee parking but stated she is open to navigating this issue.

Commissioner Johnson echoed the observations of Commissioner Hall. He agreed with moving the employee parking to Richardson Flat every day of the week, with Vail providing the shuttling for these employees. He opined that the surrounding community would likely use Quinn's more than anticipated and struggled with justifying the use of Quinn's by employees. He understood the concept behind the plan but felt that Quinn's would be well used by the public. He would align with Commissioner Suesser and require that employee parking be moved to Richardson Flat every day of the week.

Commissioner Van Dine agreed with Commissioner Thimm and would like to see additional analysis from AECOM. She understood the reasoning behind the applicant's proposal and the suggestion that employees be permanently parked at Richardson Flat. She expressed general agreement with the positions already expressed by the Commission. Chair Phillips agreed with Commissioner Thimm and many of the other Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Suesser felt strongly about the Quinn's lot being available to the public. If someone could not find a spot because the lot was filled with employee vehicles, that would detract from the effort to shift behavior. Changing it after the problem arises would be inconsistent with the "transit first" plan to encourage people to use transit.

Commissioner Kenworthy offered to sit with AECOM as they prepare their analysis. He emphasized that the City does not have the parking stalls in the satellite lots to allow the bus program to even come close to hitting its goals. In response to a question from Mr. McConnell, Commissioner Kenworthy explained that he was referencing the level of ridership that AECOM and the applicant presented to the Commission. He stated that it is simple—they are losing parking—which raises the question of where the buses would deliver these numbers of people. When all of the different uses of parking lots are factored in, they are way short. He also stressed that the removal of parking within the City must be factored into the analysis. He referenced other developments that have purchased their parking spots. They need to get on the same page with the math for them to reach a solution.

It was suggested by Mr. McConnell that PEG offer to park employees at Richardson Flat only unless the City advises that the transit system needs more ridership from Quinn's. Mr. Schmidt was agreeable with that and stressed that they were just suggesting that they have flexibility to ensure the success of the transit system. He agreed that they do not want to add more buses to the system if they would not be running full.

Commissioner Kenworthy expressed that he was assuming that the AECOM study would conclude that Richardson Flat would be adequate.

Commissioner Hall liked Mr. McConnell's proposal and was persuaded by the remarks by Commissioner Suesser regarding the impacts of one bad parking experience. Commissioner Van Dine likewise agreed with Mr. McConnell's suggestion.

Commissioner Suesser liked the idea proffered by Mr. McConnell of having all employees park at Richardson Flat, and if there was significant excess parking at Quinn's as determined by the City, then they could allow the employees to park there. She was not suggesting that this would solve all of the off-site parking issues. She expressed that a fee-in-lieu would still be necessary for the 500 stall parking exception being considered.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated that it was critically important that the City define how many spaces they need for all the other uses. Commissioner Suesser commented that this goes to her point of requiring a fee-in-lieu to help solve these parking and transit issues.

Commissioner Hall agreed with Commissioner Suesser's comments.

Mr. Gore agreed that a bad experience at a Park and Ride lot would not serve anyone. A good, convenient experience is paramount for the success of this program. He suggested that if someone could not park at Quinn's they would likely go home, which would be a risk that falls on PEG and the resort.

Commissioner Suesser understood that if Quinn's were full, a user could drive to the resort and pay to park, which would belie Mr. Gore's statement that someone would turn around and go home.

Planner Ananth inquired whether the other nine issues previously highlighted have been resolved. Commissioner Van Dine suggested that they only really addressed the first four items.

Commissioner Thimm asked for more information regarding the plan for the connectivity to the mountain on the west side of Building C at the base of the mountain. Mr. Schmidt responded that they envisioned that area would be snow and a skiable surface. With respect to the summer months, there would be a trail improved with crushed granite or like material that would serve as a multi-use trail. Commissioner Thimm suggested defining the trail in the Master Plan as 12 feet wide with decomposed granite, and Mr. Schmidt agreed.

Commissioner Suesser inquired about the trail from the Shadow Ridge/Lowell Avenue corner to the ski beach. Mr. Schmidt responded that the trail would be concrete, and maintained during the winter. Commissioner Suesser would like to see a 12-foot wide multi-use concrete trail out to the north end of Building C at the intersection of Three Kings Drive and Silver King Road. Mr. Schmidt stated that their plan included an improved trail from that intersection up to the plaza and ski beach. He explained that from the intersection of Lowell Avenue and Shadow Ridge, a user could access the

ski hill by way of a 12-foot wide concrete sidewalk along the south side of Parcel C building, or by walking north along Lowell Avenue to the plaza between Buildings C and E to the ski beach.

Mr. Schmidt further stated that from the north side of Parcel E, there would be a concrete improved sidewalk from Silver King along the west side of Building E to the plaza and the ski beach.

Planner Ananth shared a visual of the pedestrian paths with the Commission. Mr. Schmidt noted that the path from the north side was depicted as a five-foot-wide sidewalk, however in reality it would likely be six to eight feet wide.

Chair Phillips recalled that the City Engineer felt comfortable at this stage with the snow storage plan, which could be drilled down at the CUP level. He is therefore comfortable with where that issue stands presently.

Commissioner Hall requested further information regarding the open space calculations. Planner Ananth clarified that the space on the mountain would be included in the open space calculation, but no area in Parcel A was included.

Mr. Schmidt explained the open space calculations of 64.2%, noting that they highlighted in blue those areas not included in the calculations. He added that open space is calculated as the area between the property line and face of the building, excluding the areas exempt from open space calculations. He stated that the LMC allows them to count plazas. Planner Ananth noted that the walkways to the townhomes were included in the calculation, but the driveways were not.

Commissioner Suesser requested that Mr. Schmidt identify what areas were included in the open space calculations. Mr. Schmidt agreed to provide this information to the Commission.

In response to a question regarding the helipad, Mr. Schmidt stated that its' location was still to be determined. The helicopter would land in areas determined to be safe by the pilot, and they were working on coordinating where those locations could be. He suggested that it might be in the landscaped area of Parcel E, on the mountain, or several other locations. He disagreed with Commissioner Suesser's suggestion that when the final location is determined, they should deduct that from the open space calculation because it would not be a designated helipad.

Planner Ananth added that the helicopter typically lands as close to the victim as possible, and oftentimes that could be on the mountain. Mr. Schmidt confirmed that the operational issues are variable and confirmed that there was currently not a designated area near the clinic.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hall regarding rooftop landings, Mr. Schmidt stated that given the current configuration, a helipad could go on top of Building E, but that would add additional FAA requirements. Mr. Schmidt suggested that in a future CUP, they might include a landing in either Parcel E or D if the helicopter was going to be landing in one of those two parcels.

Mr. Gore reported that they have approximately 14 landing zones on the mountain, which are areas that can be cordoned off and close to the patient. There have been instances where they landed in the base area, but they primarily land on the mountain.

Commissioner Hall added that when she worked at Deer Valley, they rarely landed helicopters at the base. Landings were also coordinated with AirMed or LifeFlight and those decisions were made at the time of the injury; it was a pilot choice based on weather, location, and crowd control. Oftentimes

they choose not to land at the base because crowd control is more difficult. Typically, there would not be a dedicated spot to land, especially in the base area.

Commissioner Johnson could not recall seeing a helicopter land anywhere other than near the clinic or at the drainage of Thanes Canyon. He suggested that many injuries occur near Parcel E and it might be advantageous to have a dedicated landing area in that location.

Planner Ananth agreed to provide the Commission with the requirements for helicopter landing zones at the next meeting.

Commissioner Suesser commented that they have not addressed items numbered 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. Mr. Schmidt reported that they are working with Staff of Item No. 4. He believed that Item No. 5 was addressed when they discussed sidewalks and setbacks. He noted that the setbacks at the corner meet the 25-foot requirement at ground level.

Chair Phillips' stated that his prior comments regarding Item No. 4 and the transfer of density remained unchanged. He stated that the City Engineer answered his questions regarding Item No. 8 (snow storage), and he affirmed his prior statements regarding that issue. He added that the loading dock on Parcel C has not been addressed and suggested that it should be addressed at the next meeting. Mr. Schmidt clarified that there would be no loading docks on Parcel B, only service bays. There is a loading dock on Parcel C for the hotel and supply for the mountain. There is also a loading dock on Parcel D for retail use.

Commissioner Suesser requested further discussion regarding setbacks for Building B in general, not just at the corner. She reminded the Commission that PEG has requested a height exception for Building B, and one of the requirements under the Code is an increase in setbacks on that parcel. She opined that the Commission could not grant a height exception and a setback on Building B, therefore she did not believe that any setbacks on Building B would be appropriate. She disagreed with the applicant's position that an increase in setbacks on other parcels justified setbacks on Parcel B.

Commissioners Johnson and Kenworthy agreed with Commissioner Suesser. Commissioner Thimm disagreed and expressed that the LMC states that it must be done if necessary to provide desired architectural interest and variation. He referenced prior meetings where they addressed setbacks parcel by parcel and the applicant responded accordingly by removing several requested exceptions. Along Empire Avenue, allowing the exception of five feet would achieve the desired effect and the reduction appears to be why such a setback exception is included in the LMC.

Commissioner Thimm expressed that it was difficult to understand any other reason for the inclusion of exceptions in the LMC other than to promote proper aesthetic problem-solving.

Commissioner Suesser tied the setback exception to the height exception and pointed to one of the criteria for the height exception to be an increase in setbacks on the parcel. She disagreed that an increase in setbacks on other parcels would be sufficient.

Mr. McConnell highlighted the language from the Code that the "increased setbacks and separations from adjacent projects are proposed." Commissioner Suesser stood by her interpretation.

Chair Phillips agreed with Commissioner Thimm and reaffirmed his prior statements on this issue. Commissioner Hall also agreed with Commissioner Thimm. Chair Phillips suggested continuing

these discussions to a future meeting to allow for public comment. Planner Ananth asked whether the Commission was ready for a public hearing for the October 20th meeting, and Commissioner Kenworthy responded that the transportation issues are critical and they are not all on the same page at this point. Planner Ananth confirmed that she would not notice the next meeting as a public hearing.

Commissioner Suesser suggested that the impact of Vail's mountain upgrades should be factored into the transportation analysis.

Commissioner Kenworthy suggested that Mr. Harrington lay out how they would condition Vail now that they have come to the table. He noted that it needed to be addressed so that they do not have critical failures of the City's streets. Mr. Harrington suggested that the focus should be on distinguishing what the applicant proposed and whether a fee-in-lieu is part of that exception request. It would ultimately be up to the applicant to amend their application after they have obtained the information from whatever partner they reach an agreement with. It is after that process that the Commission would determine whether the amendment still meets the two sets of criteria in the Code.

Mr. Harrington stated that the broader questions were only relevant to the degree that the applicant still chooses to rely on public systems as the justification for part of their parking exception. If they do not do that, then it becomes less of a question. He offered that the Commission would not need system answers from the City, but for the analysis of the direct parking exception, employee parking, and transportation as it relates to this project.

Chair Phillips opened public comment. He requested Co-Chair Suesser manage public comments in his absence.

Lisa Paul addressed the intent of the LMC and noted that its' provisions seek to protect and enhance the vitality of the City's resort-based economy, the overall quality of life, the historic character, and unique mountain town community. She stated that the parking and traffic should be better resolved. The LMC also seeks to protect and preserve the peace and good order and aesthetics of the City. She expressed that the building heights were still an issue and she would like to see the camera from a different angle. She has not seen anything that truly shows how tall the proposed buildings would be as compared with Silver King or other structures. The LMC also seeks to allow development in a manner that encourages the preservation and unique area of the community and is well planned in the pedestrian circulation of traffic. Ms. Paul implored the Commission to either conduct a site visit with balloons or require photographs from vehicle level. She has not seen what she needs to see. If the garages were put underground, that would lower the heights and then the garage in Building D would not be seen.

Ms. Paul stated that money is the reason the applicant does not want to put the garage underground. She suggested reviewing the 1998 DA regarding building heights and offered that Building D is 11 feet higher than contemplated. She also expressed that the applicant should not just pick and choose those elements they would like to take from the 1998 Development Agreement and added that the 1998 DA had put the hotel on Parcel A. She expressed that if the building height exceptions start doubling and tripling, you are re-writing the Code, which is not appropriate. The LMC must be followed.

Ms. Paul expressed concern about the items that are "close to" or "approximate." She wants to know how tall the buildings would be: she does not want guesswork because it's far too important. She implored those involved to keep up the due diligence. She stated she is not against development,

but wants to make sure this project would enhance the community and that the residents would still be able to get into town. She expressed concern about the fallout into the neighborhoods by those who will not park in the lots. She has not seen anything that helps the neighborhoods deal with traffic.

Commissioner Suesser asked Planner Ananth to add as an item of discussion the issue of overflow onto neighborhood streets for more than 15 days.

Shari Harding commented on compatibility and noted that the PEG development must be compatible with Park City. Compatibility means (1) with the existing resort buildings; (2) with the existing neighbors across the streets; (3) with historic Park City; and (4) with the mountain ridgelines. With respect to building heights and compatibility, Ms. Harding stated that the proposed heights are extraordinarily out of proportion and incompatible. Balloons would not reflect building heights, as the balloons could be moved by the wind, altering the height perception. She added that a balloon string does not capture building massing. Height and massing go hand in hand for a realistic perception.

Ms. Harding stated that the most accurate perception would come with a 3-D model, including the buildings within the existing resort, neighboring residents across the streets, historic four-story buildings, and real mountains. A 3-D model should address perspective from all directions. She believed that they should be able to see the perspective from all directions, not just one corner. She commented that a 3-D model was done for Treasure Hill, and the cost seems minuscule compared to the current struggle of trying to visualize this project.

Nicole Deforge focused on some of the legal issues and began by addressing the first two sentences of LMC Section 15-6-5 governing the MPD. She quoted as follows: "All Master Planned Developments shall contain the following minimum requirements. Many of the requirements and standards will have to be increased for the Planning Commission to make the necessary findings to approve the Master Planned Developments." She proffered that the developer has not met the minimum requirements contained in Section 15-6-5 and some of the requirements have been increased. The developer has stated that they have the right to develop and everything should be construed in their favor, but that is not what Section 15-6-5 states.

Ms. Deforge emphasized that the LMC sets forth minimums that must be met while allowing the Planning Commission to increase those minimums. She expressed that if there ever was a project where the minimum requirements should be increased, this is it. With respect to parking and traffic, Ms. Deforge stated that the healthy discussion tonight illustrated the lack of adequate parking and transit measures in these plans. She noted that everyone agreed that there were no easy solutions given the inherent constraints and challenges of the site, but there seemed to be confusion as to whose responsibility it was to find solutions.

She stressed that it is not the job of the Planning Commission or the City to figure out how to make these plans work. If the developer cannot ensure enough parking or transit, then the Planning Commission could not approve the plans as a matter of law. She added that if the parking and traffic cannot work, then the developer should scale back the project until it can work. She referenced Mr. Harrington's statements that if the plans work, then the Commission can approve, and if they do not, then they should not be approved. The Commission is not tasked with making the plans work. Ms. Deforge also addressed parking as it relates to the hotel and the prohibition of tandem parking pursuant to the LMC. She contended that since this is being relied upon in the parking count, then there would be even less parking than the developer has claimed exists. She again stressed that the Planning Commission must follow the law and the developer cannot tandem park the hotel.

She referenced the developer's reliance on the General Plan regarding traffic to suggest that those who live around the resort just have to live with the increased traffic and congestion caused by this project. She stated that the General Plan calls out Empire Avenue as a road where thru traffic should be limited. These plans push 60% more parking onto Parcel B than currently exists, with nearly every entrance being accessed by Empire Avenue and all exiting traffic going onto Empire Avenue. She offered that this does not comply with the General Plan. She stated that these plans would double the traffic that currently exists on Empire Avenue, which contradicts the General Plan. The residents should not have to just live with the increased traffic.

With respect to building heights, she mentioned that the LMC does not allow an increase in density. The developer correctly stated that the City found that it had vested rights under the 1998 DA with respect to the subject parcels, but the density granted in that DA was by parcel, not for the site as a whole. That density could not be shifted around parcels. The plan increases the density on Parcels B and C from what was allowed under the 1998 Development Agreement in exchange for their "transfer of development credits." She concluded that even if the developer were allowed the extra density for those parcels, it would not be the result of any "transfer of development credits." Therefore, any increase in density to any parcel dooms the requested building height increase for that parcel under the LMC.

Ms. Deforge explained that the developer could not have it both ways. It must either take what it was given or ask for an increase as an amendment. If the increase is approved as an amendment, then the Commission could not make a finding that there was no increase in density. With respect to increased setbacks from adjacent projects, Ms. Deforge questioned why the Code would require increased setbacks to approve a building height exception. She explained that the only possible reason for this provision is that the neighboring property owners would be directly impacted by double building heights. She concluded that it made no sense that an increased setback on another parcel could satisfy the requirement of obtaining a building height exception. Ms. Deforge stressed that a reviewing court would look at the intent of the Legislature in enacting the statute.

Even if this provision were construed as applying to adjacent projects (meaning anything around the perimeter of the site), there would still be no increased setbacks along Manor Way or Empire Avenue (except on the far corner). She stressed that there are virtually no increased setbacks along the entire stretch of Lowell Avenue. She stated that they look forward to reviewing the new plans regarding open space and evaluating the calculations. She urged that as the Commission considers the calculations that they look at public areas versus private areas (such as townhome front yards). She disagreed that the deck could be counted as a plaza since it is a structure. She explained that there is also a carve-out from open space for anything that is used for "commercial uses." She asked the Commission to look at that definition because it is very broad and argued that to the extent that any of these areas would be used for commercial uses, it should not be counted as open space.

Ms. Deforge agreed that these issues were not CUP issues because these findings must be made to grant the exceptions requested. She agreed with Commissioner Suesser's comments regarding the inquiries required under the LMC regarding reduced setbacks. She urged the Commission to keep in mind that the developer stated multiple times that they have requested these setbacks to ensure that they could include all the parking they want on the site. With those admissions, she could not see how there could be a finding that setbacks were necessary for architectural interest and variety. Ms. Deforge also could not see how the Commission could grant setback exceptions to allow the developer to meet other LMC requirements like façade variations. Ms. Deforge commented

that Vail is a party to the 1998 DA and if it were to be amended, Vail must be a party and be accountable.

Deb Rentfrow remarked that it is too early for a public hearing when not all of the information is available for the Commissioners or the public to adequately review. She added that there should be a final, complete copy of the 2021 Concept Master Plan before any such public hearing can be held. She noted that the public could not be expected to weigh in on a matter when they do not have all of the information. She stated that the plans for the Transit and Mobility Hub at Snow Park required adaptability for large events and competitions; she asked why that was not a requirement for PCMR. She also wanted to know why the expansion and flexibility capabilities were not being considered.

Ms. Rentfrow acknowledged that the drop-off zones were somewhat improved, but cautioned that not all lessons and schools happen at the same time. She added that many people without children are arriving at the resort at the same time in the morning, so the drop-offs would effectively cut into day-skier parking. She expressed concern that there would be a backup on Lowell Avenue. If any backup occurred, the only way out would be via Shadow Ridge, which has a garage entrance and an intersection. She stated there is a lot going on in the area, and was concerned about potential congestion.

The employee parking discussion ignored the fact that there would be an additional 530 new employees. Even though 161 of these new employees would live on-site, that would leave many employees that would need to parking. She referenced Vail's numbers that showed 30% of its' employees participate in the TDM and noted that although there is more than one person in the vehicle, the vehicle would still be coming into the area. Ms. Rentfrow stated that the front yards on the townhomes should not be counted as open space and expected that she could have a tailgate party without the threat of a trespassing citation. She requested the developer build a 3-D model to show how this project would look. She posited that there would be a 3-D model in their sales hut, and implored the applicant to prepare one for the community and the Commissioners to review.

David Gordon thanked the Commissioners and Staff for their time and effort in evaluating this application. He also thanked the public for their involvement in the project. He commented that these efforts were not going unnoticed as evidenced by the updated drop-off plan. He appreciated the efforts to hold the applicant to the requirements of the LMC. In September's meeting, it was stated that the various exceptions granted in 1998 were in exchange for direct benefits to the community, including skier amenities and facilities to support local day skiers and programs. He was disappointed that this application did not include similar benefits.

With regard to building heights, Mr. Gordon stated that the applicant has attempted to justify the requested exceptions based on the approvals granted in the 1998 Master Plan, which is expired and should no longer be considered by the Commission. He expressed that volumetrics should not be compared to the 1998 concept; rather the current LMC should be the starting point. Mr. Gordon stated that exceptions should only be granted when the conditions permitted in the current Code are met. Compatibility with adjacent structures should be a major factor in these considerations. The proposed size and massing of the proposed buildings would dramatically change the aesthetic of the base area. The applicant has also asked to reduce building height by redistributing mass and by taking parking below grade. He noted that it was not the duty of the Commission or the City to make exceptions to the LMC to support the applicant's economic interests. He urged the Commission and Staff to maintain focus on the community and the lasting impact that this development would have on the community.

Doug Lee reminded the Commission that he submitted a parking analysis last week showing how many spaces were truly available assuming current usage of the sites consistent with the statements of Carolyn Rodriguez. He referenced the number 58% and stated that of the 1,500 spaces available in Park City, Vail and PEG need 900 of them or 58%. If one assumes that more than 42% are currently occupied, there would be no spaces left. He next commented that the 31,000 square feet proposed for Parcel B is over the allocated square footage from the 1998 DA and Concept Master Plan. He was baffled why they are only discussing an over-allocation of density in Parcel C when it exists on Parcel B as well. He urged the Commission to add Parcel B to the discussions. He added that Parcel B was the most objectionable building to those in the neighborhood given its height and density relative to the neighbors.

Mr. Lee stated that 12,570 is the stated the current carrying capacity of the resort, and all of the traffic studies use this number as a basis. PEG has claimed that there were no plans for resort expansion and justified their parking exception based on this claim. He stated that it was learned this week that there has been an expansion, which would require an update to the Mountain Upgrade Plan. He calculated that the expansion would result in an additional 2,200 skiers, resulting in a current-carrying capacity of 15,000. He submitted that these new numbers needed to be considered in the calculations.

Chair Phillips was excused from the meeting.

8. REGULAR AGENDA

9. ADJOURN

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:30 p.m.