



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
SEPTEMBER 22, 2021**

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

EXCUSED: Doug Thimm

EX OFFICIO: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Rebecca Ward, Senior City Planner; Alexandra Ananth, Senior City Planner; Browne Sebright, Planner II; Makena Hawley, Planner II; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Phillips called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

The following written determination was read:

On May 19, 2021, 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. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

No hands were raised on Zoom and no eComments were submitted.

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken reported that the next PEG Meeting will be a Work Session and public comments will be taken at that time. There will also be a formal public hearing during the Regular Meeting on October 20, 2021. Chair Phillips explained that the Planning Commission previously set the timeline for the formal public hearing with the idea that the Findings of Fact discussions would be complete. However, the Commission had not yet completed those discussions.

Commissioner Suesser wondered what the difference was between a public hearing and public comment session. Chair Phillips explained that it is virtually the same, except that the public hearing would be noticed. Each Work Session allows public comments to be heard, time permitting, but a public hearing is a more formal process. Commissioner Suesser asked if the Commission was expected to vote on the PEG application following the public hearing. Chair Phillips denied this. Commissioner Suesser wanted to better understand the distinction between a public hearing and public comment session. City Attorney, Mark Harrington explained that a public hearing is noticed in a different way. It is a portion of the Regular Meeting that is specifically dedicated for public input at a designated time. It provides both published and additional written notice to the public. On the other hand, allowing for public comment during a Work Session is more of an informal process. It is allowed as time permits and is at the discretion of the Chair.

Commissioner Suesser asked if the comments during the public hearing will be limited to five minutes. Attorney Harrington explained that it is up to the Chair to manage the meeting based on participation. Chair Phillips stated that the five-minute cut-off is a general rule of thumb. In this circumstance, he would make sure that there was enough time for all those present at the Regular Meeting to share comments.

Chair Phillips reported that a timeline was laid out at the last Planning Commission Meeting. He noted that the Commissioners have a certain amount of say in how items are approached and suggested that at the next Planning Commission Meeting, the timeline be discussed as a Commission. Commissioner Suesser asked about the outline for the September 29, 2021, Planning Commission Meeting. Chair Phillips assumed that there would be a continuation of the previous PEG discussions. He also wanted there to be a discussion about the timeline. Director Milliken believed the Work Session would be focused on the issues raised at the previous PEG meeting. Chair Phillips hoped there could be discussions related to some of the language during the September 29, 2021, Planning Commission Meeting as well.

4. CONTINUATIONS

- A. 3805 Fox Tail Trail - Plat Amendment - The Applicant Proposes Creating One Lot from Parcel PCA-S-98-SEC-11 for a Single-Family Dwelling in the Estate Zoning District and One Parcel in the Recreation Open Space Zoning District. PL-21-04826. (A) Public Hearing; (B) Continuation to October 13, 2021.**

Chair Phillips noted that there was a Staff Report related to the Plat Amendment application for 3805 Fox Tail Trail that included a request to continue the item until the October 13, 2021, Planning Commission Meeting. City Planner, Browne Sebright, stated that there were no additional staff comments beyond what was outlined in the report.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Phillips closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to continue the application for 3805 Fox Tail Trail – Plat Amendment to the October 13, 2021, Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Van Dine seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- B. 3805 Fox Tail Trail - Rezone - The Applicant Proposes Reallocating the Estate and Recreation Open Space Zoning for Parcel PCA-S-98-SEC-11 to Create an 8.84-Acre Area in the Estate Zoning District for the Construction of a Single-Family Dwelling Outside of the Ridge Line Area and a 23.89-Acre Area in the Recreation Open Space Area to be Dedicated to Park City Pursuant to a Conservation Easement. PL-21-04865. (A) Public Hearing; (B) Continuation to October 13, 2021.**

Chair Phillips reported that there was a Staff Report related to the Rezone application for 3805 Fox Tail Trail. The report included a request to continue the item until the October 13, 2021, Planning Commission Meeting.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Phillips closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to continue the application for 3805 Fox Tail Trail – Rezone to the October 13, 2021, Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Kenworthy seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

C. 7 Perseverance Court - Plat Amendment - The Applicant Proposes Amending the Limits of Disturbance for Lot 8 of the Evergreen Subdivision in the Residential Development Zoning District. PL-21-04845. (A) Public Hearing; (B) Continuation to a Date Uncertain.

Chair Phillips reported that there was a Staff Report related to the Plat Amendment application for 7 Perseverance Court. Senior City Planner, Rebecca Ward, noted that the Staff Report included a request to continue the item to a date uncertain.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Phillips closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to continue the application for 7 Perseverance Court – Plat Amendment to a date uncertain. Commissioner Van Dine seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

5. WORK SESSION

A. Deer Valley Snow Park Proposal - Work Session With A Focus On the Application's Site Design, Density, Building Height, and the Transportation and Mobility Hub. PL-21-04811.

Chair Phillips reported that the Work Session will focus on the Deer Valley Snow Park proposal and specifically look at the application site design, density, building height, and the transportation and mobility hub. Chair Phillips explained that he would be unable to speak for the next hour or so, but would be listening to the presentation. He asked Commissioner Suesser to run the meeting in the meantime and noted that he would return between 7:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m.

Senior City Planner, Alexandra Ananth reported that there was an application to amend the Deer Valley Resort's Twelfth Amended and Restated Large Scale Master Planned Development Permit ("MPD Permit") with a New Thirteenth Amendment ("MPD") and a Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") for the proposed Snow Park Village parking structure, transit, and mobility hub, and overall site plan.

Phase 1 of the Snow Park Village Redevelopment will consist of the Snow Park parking lots and base area. Phase 2 would consist of the south parcel residential and hotel development. Phase 3 will consist of the north parcel residential and hotel development. Phase 2 and Phase 3 would be future applications. Planner Ananth reported that the next meeting on this item was scheduled to take place on October 27, 2021, and there would be discussions related to transportation, site circulation, and parking as well as utilities and construction mitigation.

Planner Ananth shared an overview of the Staff Report. She reported that Phase 1 of the MPD was for the south parcel of the parking lot. Phase 1 mostly included the parking structure upon which Phase 2 would later be built. In addition to the parking structure, there was the transit and mobility hub. This was all located south of Doe Pass Road. Planner Ananth shared a map of the proposed parking structure. It was mostly built into the grade. The vertical development that was included in Phase 2 would be built on top of the garage. A floorplan of the garage was shared, which showed the various levels. It was a four-story structure and the mobility hub and drop-off area were located against Doe Pass Road.

Staff noted at the last Planning Commission Meeting that an overall phasing plan should be submitted because much of the structures in Phase 2 would wrap a portion of the parking garage and change the way the structure looked. However, it was not known when Phase 2 would begin and how long it will take to complete. Staff asked for additional details from the applicant. Since this was a CUP application, more detailed information on landscaping, lighting, and snow storage for Phase 1 also needed to be submitted. Planner Ananth reported that the applicant submitted some updated elevations. She noted that the garage was mostly built into the grade. Floor Plans were shared to provide a better understanding of how the structure would be wrapped by those future buildings.

Exhibits 1 and 2 of the MPD identified the permitted density for the Snow Park Village as 209.75 Residential Unit Equivalents and 21,890 square feet of General Commercial Density. No Unit Equivalents or Density would be being used for Phase 1 as this would come in during future phases. For instance, Phase 2, the south parcel development, was expected to utilize 135.96 Residential Unit Equivalents and all of the Commercial Unit Equivalents. Phase 3, the north parcel, was expected to utilize the remaining 73.79 Unit Equivalents. The applicant was not proposing to exceed the maximum allowed density that was set out in the MPD. Planner Ananth shared a density chart to highlight some of the proposed developments. It included the parking structure and some residential, including a hotel and an event space as well as some commercial space.

Commissioner Suesser asked about the original MPD. Planner Ananth reported that there was no original MPD. There was the Twelfth Amended and Restated Large Scale MPD Permit, which only allocated density and governed the overall building heights allowed on the site. It did not address parking above or below. Commissioner Suesser wondered if there was rationale for not including any above-ground parking structures within the density allocated for the site. Planner Ananth stated that it came down to how the Land Management Code was written. She believed that parking structures do not count toward density, whether they are above or below grade. This would be clarified in the next Staff Report.

Planner Ananth reported that the Total Support Commercial proposed for the project was based on the residential development for the entire village and included the future Phase 3. The applicant requested taking the Total Support Commercial that they would be allowed in

Phase 3 and building that in Phase 2. That was an issue that the Planning Commission would have to carefully consider and review when it was time to discuss the overall phasing plan for the project.

Building height was overviewed. Planner Ananth stated that Exhibit 1 of the MPD identified the allowed building height for the Snow Park Village as 28 to 45 feet. Although the Phase 1 parking garage was generally built into the existing grade, Phases 2 and 3 would be limited to those maximum building heights. The Planning Director issued a grade determination to identify the existing natural grade prior to any construction activity. This would clarify the allowed maximum building height on the Snow Park parcels. The applicant submitted maximum building heights based on this interpolated grade. Planner Ananth explained that the applicant submitted 1955 and 2007 topography lines so the Planning Department was able to determine the original natural grade from which the building height would be measured. It would be 45 feet from the original natural grade, which was similar to the existing grade. The difference between the original natural grade and the existing grade was seven to eight feet. It was not overly significant and the full details would be in the next Staff Report.

Planner Ananth discussed the transit and mobility hub. It would consist of a transit station for the buses as well as a rideshare zone for pick-up and drop-off. Staff requested additional information on the transit and mobility hub from the applicant. For instance, how ADA access will work as well as a geometric plan to illustrate that the turning radius was sufficient for any buses that would be using the area. The applicant would address those concerns in the future.

Commissioner Suesser noted that Page 1 of the Staff Report stated that the applicant should explore maintaining the loop road for emergency vehicles. Planner Ananth explained that currently, visitors can drive around the parking lots. The applicant proposed changes to the site circulation where the loop would be closed. However, this could create issues for emergency vehicle response time. The applicant met with the Fire Department and they were now working on a scenario where emergency response vehicles would have the ability to use the loop in an emergency. That was not included in the current plans but the applicant was looking into maintaining the loop for emergency vehicle access.

Commissioner Suesser wondered if the applicant could walk the Planning Commission through the current circulation plans. She felt it would be helpful if the public understood why this particular circulation plan was being proposed as there had been comments related to increased traffic on Deer Valley Drive East. Planner Ananth stated that the applicant could address that topic at a high level during the current meeting, but the next Deer Valley Snow Park meeting in October 2021 would be focused entirely on transportation and site circulation.

Peter Pillman and David Nicholas from IBI Group were introduced. Mr. Pillman explained that the presentation would address some of the comments from past Planning Commission Meetings as well as comments made in the Staff Reports. During the current meeting, several topics would be addressed, including analyzing whether the entrance to parking level P1 would create congestion and how that could conflict with public transportation. He would also overview elevations for the parking garage as well as share details about the transit and mobility hub and the community event center.

Rendered building elevations and proposed exterior finishes were discussed. Mr. Pillman reported that a lot of the parking structure was buried below grade and a lot was also covered by future buildings. There were 17,626 square feet of building surface. Of that number 12,815 square feet were covered by a future building, which left them with 4,811 square feet or 27% of the garage elevation that would not be covered by a future building. Mr. Pillman stated that the materials proposed were high architectural materials and finishes that were consistent with Park City and Deer Valley. He shared some sample images. What was proposed was board-formed concrete, wood siding, and a blackened metal that would be used for accents and door trims.

Mr. Pillman further discussed the elevation of the parking garage. On the south piece, there was very little of the garage that would be viewed from the top, because that was where the grades were the highest. He discussed the west elevation and stated that it was high on one side, but a lot of the area was below grade. Mr. Pillman discussed the east elevation and stated that most of the garage was below grade, but the grade started to fall off as Deer Valley Drive East sloped downhill. The garage would become exposed in that area and the parking entrances would be seen. He pointed out that the section of the wall next to P4 was an area where future buildings would provide cover. Wherever there were exposed materials, the proposal was to use board-formed concrete and high architectural finishes. The intention was to coordinate the design with the buildings in later phases to ensure that there was a complimentary style and the buildings looked like they had been designed as a singular piece.

Commissioner Suesser asked about the service vehicle entrances. Mr. Pillman shared a plan that outlined the proposed locations for loading docks and service vehicle entrances. They were dispersed throughout the site and were located where it was more appropriate for the uses. For instance, the service entrance that came in off of Deer Valley Drive West was proposed to be the loading dock and service entrance for the hotel and condominium building. It would also provide access to the event center. He noted that all of the loading docks were proposed to be enclosed within the garages and they would not be visible to visitors. The doors would be closed unless they needed to be opened to provide access.

Mr. Pillman overviewed the other proposed loading docks. On the east side, there will be one that provides service to the back of home uses and there was also the existing service area at Snow Park Lodge that would remain for the lodge and venue loading. Mr. Pillman

explained that the idea was to disperse the loading docks and place them in appropriate locations where their uses made the most sense.

The transit and mobility hub was discussed. Mr. Pillman reported that it has six bus bays for the buses to pull into. He shared a plan that illustrated the transit and mobility hub building itself. It would act as a welcome center and have public restrooms, day lockers, transit information and skier information. In addition, there could potentially be a ski valet, changing rooms, a bicycle share station, and bicycle parking.

Mr. Pillman noted that rideshare staging in the zone was shown on the right side of Doe Pass Road. It was intended to be the waiting zone, where rideshares will wait before they are called to pick up a passenger. Drop-off for rideshares would be on the other side of the road as well as at the hotel entries. Commissioner Suesser asked about the extent of the rideshare area. Mr. Nicholas reported that there would be 12 parallel parking spaces along the north side of Doe Pass Road to accommodate that need.

Mr. Pillman made note of an earlier comment from Planner Ananth related to ADA compliance. The transit and mobility hub would be designed as an ADA compliant facility and there would be access to elevators to reach the different levels. The next step was to have a meeting with the City and various transit groups about their desires for the use and function of the transit and mobility hub. Planner Ananth noted that the Planning Department could organize that type of meeting.

Commissioner Van Dine asked about the current Deer Valley shuttle drop-offs. Mr. Pillman explained that the transit and mobility hub could accommodate shuttles but there was also room for a shuttle drop-off at the existing Snow Park Lodge. There were multiple locations where the shuttles could drop off visitors. The arrival and departure of shuttles would need to be managed as part of the Traffic Management Plan.

Commissioner Suesser noted that the expectation was that with paid parking, more visitors would take buses. This would likely lead to more shuttles and rideshare services being used. She wondered whether the plans accommodated this increase. Mr. Pillman believed there was a solid framework in place and there were several zones that could be utilized in different ways to solve any transportation issues. For example, there were drop-off areas in front of the hotels, the transit and mobility hub, and a roundabout drop-off area at Snow Park Lodge. There were many different ways to solve potential problems as the process moved forward.

Mr. Pillman reported that there had been a request to look at the geometry of the transit and mobility hub. He shared exhibits to illustrate the geometry for 40-foot buses, which were the existing lengths for Park City and High Valley Transit buses as well as 60-foot articulated buses. The 40-foot bus could come down from Doe Pass Road, enter the transit loop, pull into any of the bus bay zones, and then continue out onto Deer Valley Drive East. The

geometry supported all of the buses and the various turning movements. Commissioner Suesser noted that it did not appear the articulated buses could move out onto Deer Valley Drive. Mr. Pillman explained that this was not anticipated. An articulated bus would come in on the transit priority road and leave via the transit priority road. Commissioner Suesser wondered if it could do the circulated loop. Mr. Pillman explained that he could speak to the civil engineer and ask him to look at that scenario as well. Michael Demkowicz from Alliance Engineering explained that the primary transit route was Deer Valley Drive West. An auto-turn exhibit had not been provided for Deer Valley Drive East as a result. However, that exhibit could be prepared ahead of the next Planning Commission Meeting.

The event center was discussed. Mr. Pillman stated that the concept included 20,000 square feet of event space. They viewed this as flexible space that could have either a large room or be subdivided into multiple rooms and used for various sized events. The 20,000 square feet would use 20 Equivalent Units. Approximately 8,000 square feet was planned for pre-function space and then there were 10,000 square feet of back of house space. There would also be a service dock and service corridor along the back of the event center. Mr. Pillman reported that there was a planned deck, which would provide cover for the transit and mobility hub. Commissioner Suesser asked whether there would be additional event space on that deck. Mr. Pillman believed it could be used to hold outdoor events. He shared a concept image with the Commission.

Mr. Nicholas outlined the Active Transportation Plan. The pedestrian connectivity and Active Transportation Plan had been shared with the Planning Commission previously, but some additions had been made. The plan showed trail connectivity to the existing trails in the local vicinity as well as the mountain trails, regional trail system, and the multi-purpose pathways around the Deer Valley Drive loop. To maintain that loop, on-street bicycle lanes had been added. There were also proposed shared bicycle lanes from the Doe Pass Road/Deer Valley Drive intersection. The combination of 8-10-foot multi-purpose pathways surrounding the village, the connection to the existing trail network, and the on-street bikeways would provide a significant amount of connectivity. It would also provide opportunities for recreation and active users throughout the area. Mr. Nicholas explained that there were a number of bicycle share and bicycle station locations proposed throughout the area.

Mr. Pillman made note of an earlier comment from Planner Ananth about maintaining the loop for emergency vehicles. He stated that one of the prime goals was to create a pedestrian-friendly environment and separate the conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. That was the reason for the elevated plaza deck, which acted as a pedestrian environment. Mr. Pillman reported that there had been discussions with the Fire Department and there was a desire to maintain connectivity through the site for fire trucks and emergency vehicles to drive through as needed. The intention was to continue to develop this concept and share more detailed plans in the future.

Commissioner Suesser had a question about the proposed circulation plan. She wondered if passenger vehicles, which are the most common vehicles driving up and down Deer Valley Drive, will be able to go around the loop rather than doubling the number of passenger vehicles on Deer Valley Drive East. She felt that Deer Valley Drive West might be underutilized in the proposed circulation plan. Mr. Pillman noted that the intention was to make this a transit first plan. As a result, they did not necessarily want to reward private vehicles and make it preferable to use transit. Having the traffic pattern move along Deer Valley Drive East would also allow there to be right turns into all of the garages. Signage would be used to direct visitors.

Mr. Pillman stated that the current drop-off area is a reflection of the fact that it was a long-distance between the parking lots and the resort. If the project was executed well, the majority of visitors would not need to use the drop-off areas. Steven Issowits, Vice-President of Real Estate and Resort Planning for Deer Valley Resort, supported the comments made by Mr. Pillman. He believed they would be able to design a thoughtful, well-lit, and spacious garage that was efficient and would create a positive arrival experience. The intention was to find a way to make it an easier transition from vehicles to the resort itself. He stated that the goal was to improve that interface so there would be much less of a need for a drop-off area. Mr. Pillman believed that a lot of the issues, such as traffic and gridlock, would be improved. At the last Planning Commission Meeting, there was a presentation by Fehr & Peers and they stated that the level of service on the roads during heavy times could be dramatically improved through this type of circulation plan. The whole area would move better and have higher levels of service, even with all of the development taking place.

The parking levels were outlined. Mr. Pillman shared an exhibit that illustrated the four different parking levels. P1 has 406 parking stalls and will have a 50/50 split between parking for the condominium and hotel and the ski area parking. It would be last use parking with limited access to control and mitigate conflicts with transit. Mr. Pillman explained that P1 could be closed off for public access until off-peak times to prevent any conflicts with transit vehicles. P2 would be accessed from Deer Valley Drive East and has 368 day skier parking spaces available. There would be a second entrance on Doe Pass Road, which allows them to let traffic in and out as needed. Mr. Pillman believed this would add more flexibility.

P3 was primarily for day skier parking and a small component would be utilized for condominium parking. The level also had a second access point. Mr. Pillman reported that there had been meetings with the Deer Valley Ski School to discuss how the program functions and to understand their short-term parking needs. Part of the floor would be used for that purpose as well. P3 would have primary access off of Deer Valley Drive East. The last floor, P4, was the smallest and will connect to the existing Deer Valley tunnel. There was an opportunity for visitors to walk through the tunnel and come into the existing Snow Park Lodge building. He explained that P4 was seen as more short-term parking, where

drop-offs could take place, but this floor could also be a short-term valet hold as well. There were only 131 parking stalls on this level.

Commissioner Suesser asked if someone would need to enter the garage to access the tunnel, which Mr. Pillman confirmed. She wondered if the tunnel would be accessible from the turnaround. Mr. Pillman clarified that the turnaround was at the plaza deck, so a visitor would walk from the turnaround onto the deck and either go into Snow Park Lodge on the left or into the plaza on the right. Commissioner Suesser was pleased to hear that the tunnel was staying.

The drop-off area was discussed. Mr. Pillman believed there had been some discussions related to this item during the last Planning Commission Meeting. There was a section contemplated to be a valet zone, a section contemplated to be a 10-minute drop-off zone, and a section contemplated to be a rolling drop-off zone. There was also a center area where a tour bus could be parked and waiting for passengers. Mr. Demkowicz had done radius studies to show that buses can do the drop-offs as needed. If there was no bus present, that area could be used as a bypass so visitors could cut through if needed. There was a lot of flexibility as it related to the utilization of the drop-off zone. Mr. Nicholas reported that they had also started to look at strategic locations for resort identification, monument signs, directional signs, and informational signs. He shared an exhibit that outlined some of the possible locations.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked about the ski locker areas. Mr. Issowits reported that they were still trying to determine the exact locations. Mr. Pillman stated that they would likely place lockers in areas where visitors may be waiting or queuing as well as above the transit and mobility hub. He reassured Commissioners that the ski lockers would be in the right spots and that there would be above adequate numbers to ensure that the resort experience was exceptional.

Commissioner Hall asked about the idea of a gondola eventually replacing one of the two current lifts. She wondered if it would be feasible or desirable to have it start lower to facilitate easier transportation. Mr. Pillman shared example images with the Planning Commission and stated that the proposal was to look at pulling Carpenter Express down a bit further and then moving Silver Lake Express down much further into the village. The idea was that this would lengthen the ski village.

Mr. Pillman discussed gondolas and stated that a gondola would provide an alternative transit method up to Silver Lake so people that wanted to go from Snow Park to Silver Lake could do so on a gondola instead of having to use a vehicle. There had been studies to examine pulling the gondola further down into the village but there were some significant issues with that concept. For instance, the amount of structural support needed would be disruptive to parking and would impact the number of stalls. It would also create zones where visitors could not walk or ski because of the chair lifts or gondola cars passing

overhead. This would interrupt the pedestrian flow. Through studies and discussions, the proposed location was determined to be the most suitable. It would not impact the parking efficiency and the layout would allow for better pedestrian flow through the village. Commissioner Suesser believed a gondola was an appealing option and could act as an alternate transportation method.

Commissioner Suesser made note of the highlighted issues in the Staff Report. She agreed that an overall phasing plan should be submitted. Additionally, a Preliminary Lighting and Landscaping Plan, as well as a plan for snow storage areas, service, and delivery, should be submitted as part of the MPD. Commissioner Suesser felt there needed to be further discussions about allocating the Support Commercial from the north parcel to the south parcel. She wanted to better understand the rationale for adding Support Commercial to Phase 2 of the project.

The applicant's legal counsel, Wade Budge, explained that there would be Support Commercial where it would be best utilized. Throughout the MPD process, they would make sure that the City feels secure that there would not be an overallocation of Support Commercial. Mr. Budge reported that he had some preliminary discussions with Staff about how to do that. He noted that the north parcel was a key part of the project and they wanted to make sure it was very clear in the MPD that the Support Commercial was being allocated to support the entire project. It would be integrated and operated as a whole and would be located where it would best be able to function. Commissioner Suesser wondered how much Support Commercial would be transferred from the north parcel to the south parcel. Mr. Budge did not view it as a transfer because it was one project with different phases. He offered to share a breakdown of the numbers with the Commission at the next meeting.

Commissioner Kenworthy wanted to see 3D renderings that included the surrounding buildings to better understand the scale of the development. He asked for those to be provided at the next meeting, if possible. Commissioner Kenworthy also had a question for Planner Ananth. He wondered whether it would be possible to share a list with Commissioners that outlined any Phase 1 variances. Planner Ananth stated that the only exceptions the applicant was asking for from the Land Management Code related to the shared parking waiver for some of the commercial and residential uses.

Planner Ananth asked that the circulation map be shared. She wanted to know how the circulation would work for the dead end. Mr. Pillman stated that the road would be closed, except for access to the residential development. It would essentially become a private driveway for those residents. Planner Ananth asked whether there was a plan to restrict drop-off parking on Deer Valley Road West in front of the hotel and residential areas. Mr. Nicholas explained that in the site plan, there was a gate proposed. This would allow visitors to use the hotel drop-off circle, but prevent them from continuing further south. The gate could be accessed by anyone that needed to access their unit, Park City personnel,

emergency service vehicles, and Deer Valley employees and personnel. However, the general public would be prevented from using the western road dead end as a drop-off area.

Commissioner Suesser asked how things would work at the Y intersection. Mr. Pillman noted that this would be discussed at the next Planning Commission Meeting. Mr. Nicholas stated that signage would be the primary way to control traffic through the Y intersection. The intention was to reconfigure the intersection to promote day skier use around the east side of the site.

Mr. Nicholas reported that there would be a center lane up Deer Valley Drive East. In busy times, if there was a backup into the P2 entry or the P3 entry, the middle lane could serve as a temporary way for visitors to avoid some of that back up and reach the drop-off areas or some of the higher entries to the parking garage. The design was intended to encourage visitors to enter the parking garages sooner. Encouraging visitors to come in from the east side would cause a significant number of vehicles to pull directly into the parking garages.

Discussions were had about the entry into the parking garage. Mr. Nicholas explained that there could be three lanes in the morning when the majority of visitors are entering the project area. There would be two lanes to enter the parking garage and a middle driveway lane. In the afternoon hours, that middle lane could be an exit lane as well to promote efficiency in leaving the parking garage. Mr. Pillman stated that there should not be a queue at the parking entrance because visitors will either pay on their way out or it would be tied to their ski pass. This meant there would be very little impact on the traffic on Deer Valley Drive East.

The civil construction plans were shown to further illustrate the entry driveway into the parking garage. Mr. Pillman explained that the approach into the garage was the same approach that is on Deer Valley Drive East. There were three lanes, which included a flex lane in the center. Mr. Demkowicz stated that the middle lane would not have directional arrows as it would be best utilized as a dual-purpose lane. Chair Phillips felt it was important to have flexibility with the middle lane. This would create room to allow cars to pass, which was critical to prevent traffic backups.

Mr. Issowits stated that the parking garage would be best compared to the current operations. There was one lane going in each direction and separate entries into each of the parking areas. As one lot filled up and it was time to move on to the next one, staff was available to direct and control the traffic flow. What was proposed was similar in the fact that there would be signage to let visitors know where parking spaces were available and there would be staff there to help control traffic. It should work similarly, but the new design would increase overall efficiency.

Commissioner Van Dine asked for clarification about the three lanes going into the parking garages. She wondered if there were one or two flex lanes. Similarly, she wondered if there

was a flex lane on Deer Valley Drive East. Mr. Demkowicz reported that the driveway entrance would have one middle flex lane. There would be a dedicated entrance lane, a dedicated exit lane, and then a middle lane between the two to act as a flex lane. Deer Valley Drive East had three drive lanes to promote efficient egress in the afternoon, where the middle lane could be used as a flex lane.

Chair Phillips asked if they had considered cars pulling out of the garage and crossing traffic. It may be possible for drivers to be forced to turn in a certain direction upon exiting. Mr. Demkowicz explained that the middle lane would provide merging opportunities for those pulling out. He did not believe they wanted to make everyone turn in a certain direction after leaving the parking garage. This was because forcing a right turn would promote all of the traffic to move to the skier drop-off circle. That could cause some unnecessary clogging. The purpose of the flex lane in the middle was to allow visitors to pull into the lane between any sort of traffic movement. Having staff available during certain seasons and times of day to assist with traffic direction would also increase efficiency.

Mr. Issowits noted that there had been some questions about tickets for parking. He reported that they were still looking at the best way to operate a paid parking system with a garage consulting firm. The best practices would be studied to determine how the parking system should be implemented. Chair Phillips asked that the results of those studies be shared with the Planning Commission in the future.

Commissioner Hall asked if there would still be on-street parking on Deer Valley Drive East. Mr. Pillman explained that the idea was that the parking on Deer Valley Drive would be accommodated within the parking structure. Vice-President of Development, Rich Wagner, confirmed this. They were working with Staff to configure special event parking, which would be done through a permit process and may require some on-street parking. However, the overall goal was to remove the on-street parking on Deer Valley Drive East. Planner Ananth pointed out that there were approximately 140 on-street parking stalls currently and those stalls are accommodated in the new parking garage. Mr. Wagner believed it was important to remember that the overall goal was to reduce traffic and encourage visitors to use transit. This would result in a more incremental flow of traffic in and out of the Deer Valley Resort.

Commissioner Hall had a question related to the dead end on Deer Valley Drive West. She asked how trash pickup will work in that area and how buses will be able to turn around. Mr. Pillman commented that the road would be gated off and closed to traffic after the hotel. Emergency vehicles, Deer Valley service people, and residents of the nearby subdivision would be permitted access. In terms of the turnaround, there would be a hammerhead turnaround. Chair Phillips asked that the gate be added to the exhibit drawings in the future for further clarity. Mr. Demkowicz believed that without the gate, visitors would continue to use the west side to drop off family members. Additionally, they did not want people parking along the dead-end road as it could cause a number of different safety issues.

Discussions were had about sidewalks for bicyclists. Mr. Demkowicz stated that there would be a sidewalk connection into the plaza so that visitors could ride their bicycles safely into the plaza area. This would allow for pedestrian circulation. The sidewalks would be kept clear of snow during the winter season. He added that a new sidewalk was proposed on the east side of Deer Valley Drive East. It likely would not be an 8-10-foot-wide sidewalk and would be a traditional 4-5-foot-wide sidewalk instead due to the grade. There would need to be a landscaped stone rock wall in that area.

Chair Phillips opened the public comment session.

Kim Tessiatore stated that she was a resident at Powder Run. One concern that she had related to the building height for the proposed development. It would be determined from the historic natural grade, but the Code stated that height should be determined by the existing grade. Planner Ananth mentioned that there was an approximately eight-foot difference between the two. The Code stated that the intention of the provisions had to do with the obstruction of views from adjacent properties. A difference in the grade would significantly impact the views from the Powder Run property. Ms. Tessiatore pointed out that some of the buildings were set further back than the 25-foot setback requirement. However, the building that would be located where there was the biggest difference between existing grade and natural grade would have only a 25-foot setback. She hoped the Commission would look into these issues before any approvals were granted.

Jim Bauer expressed concerns related to the function of the transit and mobility hub as well as the dead-end street design. The proposed dead-end street was the way that those at the existing adjacent properties, such as Powder Run, Black Diamond Lodge, and St. Regis entered and exited their properties. Mr. Bauer had spoken to a Deer Valley Resort representative previously and brought up the Park City Mountain Resort and Sundial Lodge. What was proposed for the transit and mobility hub was essentially a duplicate. The Deer Valley Resort representative assured Mr. Bauer that Deer Valley would be more successful at managing the hub. Mr. Bauer believed that a poorly designed, poorly located, and heavily used mobility hub would be difficult to manage.

Parking concerns were also shared by Mr. Bauer. He stated that there was no place to park except for the paid parking at Deer Valley Resort. The parking lot in upper Deer Valley costs \$30 per day per vehicle, year-round. At Solitude, there was free parking after 2:00 p.m. He hoped that Deer Valley would consider taking the same approach. Mr. Bauer also felt that the public transportation system should not be burdened with private resort guests. He suggested that Deer Valley Resort consider creating free off-site parking for guests and a shuttle service to move those guests onto the resort.

There were no further comments. Chair Phillips closed the public comment session.

Commissioner Suesser believed that Deer Valley should consider some sort of connection between Deer Valley Drive East and Deer Valley Drive West. There was an elevated plaza with parking underneath and it seemed feasible to have some sort of connection through there. Commissioner Suesser pointed out that the applicant had promoted flexibility in the plan. However, the idea of the dead ends and the gate did not seem to be as flexible as the rest of the plan. She felt that should be explored further.

Commissioner Van Dine agreed with the items listed in the Staff Report that required additional information. She also pointed out that the Commission had not heard the rationale for additional Support Space in Phase 2 or what would happen if the next phase was not completed. Commissioner Van Dine looked forward to seeing more traffic studies to illustrate how the dead ends would function. She did not necessarily agree with Commissioner Suesser about the connection between Deer Valley Drive East and Deer Valley Drive West. This could discourage what the applicant was trying to do, which was create a transit first plan. Commissioner Van Dine appreciated the addition of the bicycle lanes and keeping Deer Valley bicycle-friendly.

Chair Phillips noted that there had been a comment about a parking exception. He explained that no exception was being requested because a reduction of parking was written into the code. The applicant needed to demonstrate the ability to provide a modal split to be granted the reduced parking, but it was written into the code that way. It was a City priority to utilize transit more in the future. Chair Phillips appreciated all of the additional information that had been shared during the Work Session.

6. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. 1061 and 1063 Lowell Avenue - Plat Amendment - The Applicant is Requesting to Subdivide Lot 1 of the Northstar Subdivision with an Existing Duplex into 2 Lots. PL-21-04872. (A) Public Hearing; (B) Possible Recommendation for City Council's Consideration on October 28, 2021.**

Planner II, Makena Hawley presented the Staff Report on the Northstar Subdivision Lot 1 – Plat Amendment application for property located at 1061 and 1063 Lowell Avenue. The applicant was proposing to subdivide Lot 1 of Northstar Subdivision into two lots. Planner Hawley reported that the property was located at the top of Lowell Avenue and was a unique part of the HR-1 District due to more historically sized lots on the east side and larger lots on the west side of the road. Images were shared with the Planning Commission to provide additional context.

The duplex on Lot 1 was constructed in 1983 with an approved building permit. Currently, on the property, there was a 15-foot access easement, which was for Lots 1, 2, and 3 as part of the Northstar Subdivision. There was a private drive that was not maintained by the

City. This private drive would remain. Planner Hawley noted that the original plat was completed in 1977 and the deed line was done in 1999.

In 2008, the Northstar Subdivision recorded a Notice of Noncompliance against Lot 1, because the lot was not compliant with the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions ("CC&Rs"). The CC&Rs had prohibited the subdivision of lots. The parties reached a settlement, which resulted in the removal of Lot 1 from the Homeowners Association and Declaration of the Northstar Subdivision. In 2010, the Northstar Homeowners Association recorded a Notice of Removal of Protective Covenants, removing the Lot from the Northstar Homeowner Association.

Planner Hawley stated that there was still an existing duplex and the owners were proposing to create a lot line down the center of the lot to create two legal lots of record. The 15-foot access easement would stay in place. The existing duplex would remain as existing non-compliant, which meant that it could be used and maintained, but not moved, enlarged, or expanded. Since the intent of the plat was to redevelop, the new development would need to comply with the current HR-1 District requirements.

A single-family dwelling was an allowed use in the HR-1 District and a duplex was a Conditional Use for lots greater than 3,750 square feet. The proposed lots, 1A and 1B were approximately 9,742 square feet each. The lots would meet the Land Management Code requirements outlined in Chapter 2.2 – HR-1 District, for use, density, setbacks, height, and parking. Redevelopment would require Historic District Design Review ("HDDR") approval and possibly a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit as well.

Planner Hawley reported that there needed to be good cause to approve a Plat Amendment. Good cause could be found in the application since any new development would be held to the HDDR standards. This would encourage the construction of historically compatible structures. The Plat Amendment would also resolve the existing non-conforming use and non-conforming deed line. Additionally, the proposal fit with the character and compatibility of the lots and would preserve the neighborhood character.

Staff made some recommendations to provide mitigation on the lot. The first related to the access easement. The City wanted to confirm that the previous release waiver and agreement would be upheld. Secondly, the City wanted to confirm that if one side of the duplex was torn down, both parties would redevelop at the same time.

The applicants, Stacy and Jeremy Head, were present. Ms. Head explained that their current home was located at 1010 Lowell Avenue. That home was small and could not be renovated. As a result, they had been looking for a property on the same part of Lowell Avenue. When the property and 1061 and 1063 Lowell Avenue was listed, they were interested, but later found that it was one lot of record rather than two lots of record. Everyone in the past had treated it as two different properties. Ms. Head stated that they

decided to purchase the property with the hope that it could be divided. The goal was to sell the smaller home, demolish the duplex, and built something new.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Phillips closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Kenworthy moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for consideration on October 28, 2021, for the Northstar Subdivision – Lot 1 Plat Amendment, subject to the following:

Findings of Fact

1. On August 18, 2021, the City received a completed application for the Northstar Subdivision – Lot 1 Amended Plat amendment.
2. The property is located at 1061 and 1063 Lowell Avenue within the HR-1 District. The subject property consists of lot 1 of the 1977 Northstar Subdivision.
3. A deed line bifurcates the existing platted lot with a duplex structure on it (Parcels NR-1 & NR-1-A) however this was never subdivided and sanctioned by Park City Municipal Corporation.
4. On July 19, 1977, the Declaration of Protective Covenants for the Northstar Subdivision was recorded.
5. 7.4 of the Declaration prohibits further re-subdivision of Northstar Lots.
6. 8.1 of the Declaration limited development on each Northstar Subdivision Lot to one Single-Family Dwelling or “one double family dwelling.”
7. The 1980s LMC permitted a Two-Unit Dwelling as an Allowed Use in the HR-1 District.
8. In 1983, the City issued a building permit for the Duplex on Lot 1 of the Northstar Subdivision.
9. In 1985, a party wall agreement for the shared wall of the Duplex was recorded with Summit County.
10. The deed line created on Lot 1 was a violation of the Associations Protective Covenants.

11. On July 19, 1977, the Northstar Homeowners Association recorded a Notice of Noncompliance with Protective Covenants.
12. On January 14, 2010, the Northstar Homeowners Association recorded a Notice of Removal of Protective Covenants, removing the lot from the Northstar Declaration of Protective Covenants.
13. According to the survey, the lot is 0.44 acres or approx. 19,484 square feet.
14. A single-family dwelling is an allowed use in the HR-1 District.
15. A duplex dwelling is a Conditional Use in the HR-1 District for lots with a minimum area of 3,750 square feet.
16. Currently Lot 1 contains 19,484 sq. ft. with a legal non-complying duplex on it which has an approved building permit from 1983 (when the code allowed duplex's in the HR-1 zone).
17. The current duplex would be described as a non-complying structure, which is defined in LMC §15-15-1.172 as "a structure that legally existed before its current zoning designation; and because of subsequent zoning changes, does not conform to the zoning regulation's Setback, Height restrictions, or other regulations that govern the Structure." Though this lot has not been designated as a duplex lot the non-conforming structure that was lawfully constructed with a permit prior to a contrary change in the LMC may be used and maintained, subject to the standards and limitations of Chapter 15-9 'Non-Conforming Uses and Non-complying Structures'.
18. According to recorded documents from 2008, Northstar HOA voted to remove Lot 1 from the HOA due to lack of compliance issues continuing on the lot, which included the duplex and the deed line which was put through the center of the lot.
19. This application is a request to subdivide Lot 1 of the current Northstar Subdivision and create two (2) lots of record.
20. Existing on the lot is a (15') foot non-exclusive Access easement to access Lot 1, 2, and parts of Lot 3 of Northstar plat.
21. The proposed subdivision has the ability to meet code requirements under Land Management Code (LMC) Chapter 2.2 Historic Residential (HR-1) District for use, density, setbacks, height, and parking.

22. 2 or more lots will require a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit per 15-2.2-6.
23. A duplex dwelling will require approved conditional use permits.
24. If two (2) lots are created from the plat amendment, the HR-1 building footprint is 2817.5 square feet, maximum based on lot size.
25. The HR-1 Front and rear yard setbacks are 15 feet minimum and 30 feet total.
26. The HR-1 Side yard setbacks are 5 feet minimum and 18 feet total.
27. The HR-1 building zone height requires no Structure shall be erected to a height greater than twenty-seven feet (27') from Existing Grade.
28. The HR-1 zone requires that Final Grade must be within four vertical feet (4') of Existing Grade around the periphery of the structure.
29. The HR-1 zone requires that a Structure shall have a maximum height of thirty-five feet (35') measured from the lowest finish floor plane to the point of the highest wall top plate [...].
30. The HR-1 zone requires a ten-foot (10') minimum horizontal step in the downhill façade [...].
31. The HR-1 zone roof pitch must be between 7:12 and 12:12 for primary roofs. Non-primary roofs may be less than 7:12.
32. The City does not enforce any Subdivision Covenants, Conditions, & Restrictions (CC&Rs).
33. The Northstar Subdivision was platted in 1977.
34. The density of the Northstar Subdivision was originally one Unit per lot but has since changed to allow duplexes within their subdivision (it is still a Conditional Use per the LMC 15-2.2-2 (B) LMC).
35. Staff finds the proposal complies with HR-1 purpose statement C: "encourage construction of Historically Compatible Structures that contribute to the character and scale of the Historic District and maintain existing residential neighborhoods."

36. Staff finds that the two (2) smaller lots would be able to read more alike to the homes and lots north of their lot and on the east side of the street. Purpose, statement D to “encourage single family Development on combinations of 25' x 75' Historic Lots” the proposed two (2) lots would maintain the compatibility that already exists on the west side of Lowell Avenue.
37. The proposal of two (2) smaller-sized lots can be viewed as a compatible design and lot size when looking to the North and East side of Lowell Avenue and to the purpose statements of the Historic District.
38. The proposed two (2) lots would not increase or decrease the compatibility of existing lots on Lowell in terms of lot size and density and would create more consistent structures within the Historic District Design Guidelines as future houses would be more compatible in width, size, and general massing.
39. If the plat amendment is approved, each lot will maintain 9,742 square feet which allows each lot to pursue a Conditional Use Permit to build a duplex per lot. Should this plat amendment be approved, the opportunity for the applicants to pursue two additional units on this lot (resulting in four (4) units total) is a possibility.
40. The Planning Commission must make a finding of Good Cause prior to forwarding a positive recommendation for City Council’s consideration.
41. LMC § 15-15-1 defines Good Cause as follows: Providing positive benefits and mitigating negative impacts, determined on a case by case basis to include such things as providing public amenities and benefits, resolving existing issues and non-conformities, addressing issues related to density, promoting excellent and sustainable design, utilizing best planning and design practices, preserving the character of the neighborhood and Park City and furthering the health, safety, and welfare of the Park City community.
42. This plat amendment would allow for additional density with the pursuant of two Conditional Use permits per lot.
43. Increasing the density by two (2) per lot, for a total of four (4) lots would require extensive additional impact mitigation than what has currently been considered for maintaining the current density.
44. Among other items, water, sewer, and fire access would require reevaluation and the private road easement above Lowell that allows access to the duplex would need to be reassessed.

Conclusions of Law

1. There is Good Cause for the Northstar Subdivision – Lot 1 Amended Plat because it resolves non-conformities, resolves the existing non-conforming deed line, preserves the character of the HR1 neighborhood, and does not increase density.
2. The Northstar Subdivision – Lot 1 Amended Plat is consistent with Land Management Code Section 15-7.1-3(B), Section 15-7.1-6, and Chapter 15-2.13.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the Northstar Subdivision – Lot 1 Amended Plat.
4. Approval of the Northstar Subdivision – Lot 1 Amended Plat, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval

1. The City Planning Director, City Attorney, and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat for compliance with Utah law, the Land Management Code, and the Conditions of Approval prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The Applicant shall record the plat at the county within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.
3. City Engineer review and approval of all lot grading, utility installations, public improvements, and drainage plans for compliance with City standards is a condition precedent to building permit issuance.
4. The property owners are to assume all obligations under the Release, Waiver, and Agreement by such an amendment in a form approved by the City Attorney, to be recorded prior to recordation of the Plat Amendment.
5. In the case of one owner of the duplex intending to redevelop their lot, both lots would require agreement and be subject to demolishing the duplex in conjunction.
6. The Building Footprint for each Lot is 2,818 square feet

Commissioner Hall seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

B. Land Management Code Amendments - Park City Historic Sites Inventory - The Planning Commission Will Consider Amendments to Land Management Code Section 15-11-10, the Park City Historic Sites Inventory, to Update Address Changes to the Landmark Historic Sites on Rossie Hill Drive and Update the Status of 1302 Norfolk Avenue, Formerly Under Appeal. PL-21-04939. (A) Public Hearing; (B) Possible Recommendation for City Council Review on October 28, 2021.

Planner Ward reported that the Land Management Code Amendments were related to three Rossie Hill Drive properties and the status of 1302 Norfolk Avenue. No substantive changes were proposed. Planner Ward explained that the Lilac Hill East Subdivision had subdivided the three Rossie Hill Drive historic properties into five single-family lots. Since there was a private drive that accessed the rear lots, there would be new addresses. The first amendment would update the Rossie Hill Drive properties to reflect the new addresses, while also citing the previous addresses.

The second amendment related to 1302 Norfolk Avenue. Planner Ward reported that it was a Significant Historic Structure and was currently owned by the City. The Planning Department nominated the structure to the Historic Sites Inventory. The property owner then applied to demolish the structure. Staff denied the demolition permit, pending Historic Preservation Board action on the determination of Historic Significance of the home. The property owner requested a review by the Utah Property Rights Ombudsman to determine whether the structure could be demolished and the advisory opinion found that the demolition permit was entitled to approval. To prevent the demolition of the structure, the City purchased the structure. Planner Ward stated that the second amendment would clarify that the property was no longer under appeal and that it was a Significant Historic Structure on the Historic Sites Inventory.

The Historic Preservation Board reviewed the proposed amendments on September 1, 2021, and unanimously forwarded a positive recommendation for Planning Commission consideration. Staff recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and considering forwarding a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Chair Phillips closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for consideration on October 28, 2021, for the Proposed Land Management Code

Amendments, as outlined in the Draft Ordinance. Commissioner Van Dine seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

7. ADJOURN

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to adjourn. The motion was not seconded and there was not vote.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: _____

Approved 10.13.2021