

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
JANUARY 20, 2020

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair John Phillips, John Kenworthy, Laura Suesser, Doug Thimm, Christin Van Dine

EX OFFICIO: David Everitt, Deputy City Manager, Alexandra Ananth, Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Jessica Nelson, Planning Analyst

The Planning Commission meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom.

The public was able to submit eComments during the meeting.

NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC MEETING & HOW TO COMMENT VIRTUALLY:

Chair Phillips read the Public Notice for Electronic Meetings and Exhibit A: Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk.

This meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location as permitted by Utah Code Open and Public Meetings Act section 52-4-207(4) as amended June 18, 2020, and Park City Resolution 18-2020, adopted March 19, 2020. The written determination of a substantial health and safety risk, required by Utah Code section 52-4-207(4), is attached as Exhibit A. Planning Commission members will connect electronically. Public comments will be accepted virtually as described below.

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

Exhibit A: Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk

The Commission Chair has determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Utah Code section 52-4-207(4) requires this determination and the facts upon which it is based, which include:

- Statewide COVID cases and hospitalizations remain high.
- Based on metrics established by the statewide COVID-9 Transmission Index, Summit County moved to the High-Risk designation on October 22, 2020; and
- Park City is a resort community continually hosting visitors from areas which may be experiencing rapid COVID-19 spread.

This determination is valid for 30 days and is set to expire on February 20, 2021.

Dated: January 20, 2021.

Comments from the Mayor and Commissioners

Mayor Beerman assumed that everyone had heard that Bruce Erickson passed away this weekend. He noted that the Planning Commission more than anyone worked very closely with Bruce. His death is sad and is certainly felt across the organization and across the City. Mayor Beerman stated that Bruce has not only been a long-time local, but he was also aggressively engaged in the community. Bruce spent a decade and a half on the Planning Commission, he was a volunteer at Recycle Utah and very involved with Glenwood Cemetery. He was a close friend and neighbor to many in the community. Mayor Beerman remarked that there is a lot of sadness across town, and many people are disappointed that they were not able to say good-bye. Mayor Beerman stated that when Bruce's health started to decline, he was very adamant in asking the small group who knew that they respect his privacy. It was Bruce's nature, and he was very stoic on certain things. He did not want his health to be made public. Mayor Beerman was certain that Bruce knew that everyone supported him and cared for him and he did not need it reaffirmed.

Mayor Beerman stated that he spoke with Bruce's son, Justin, yesterday and offered condolences on behalf of all the organizations. Justin said he was overwhelmed by the number of people in the community who reached out to him and who put up posts telling stories about his father. He was feeling very proud of his dad.

Mayor Beerman was unsure what Bruce's family was planning regarding a memorial service. Mayor Beerman noted that because of Covid gatherings are not appropriate right now, but when it is safe to gather again, the City will find an appropriate way to celebrate.

Mayor Beerman announced that Gretchen Milliken was hired as the new Planning Director. She will be starting in two weeks and the Planning Commission will have the opportunity to meet her and work with her. He had the opportunity to speak with her a few times and he believed she would bring great energy to the process. Ms. Milliken will never replace Bruce, but she will add a new dimension and keep things moving forward.

Chair Phillips stated that Bruce's death affected all of them hard. He was a library of knowledge and he always unloaded that knowledge in the different hats that he wore.

Bruce was a mentor to a lot of people, and he considered himself one of them. Chair Phillips stated that Bruce passed on his knowledge to many people, but everyone together would still not have all the knowledge that was in his mind.

Chair Phillips stated that he had the pleasure of working with Bruce at the Glenwood Cemetery, which helped ground him with his roots in Park City. He got to know his ancestors better and it gave him more pride in his community. Chair Phillips remarked that one of the biggest things Bruce did for him was to set an example and teach him about being a good citizen. Bruce will be dearly missed.

Commissioner Thimm echoed Chair Phillips. He appreciated what Bruce brought to the Planning Commission and also what he brought to the City. From a personal standpoint, Commissioner Thimm stated that he and Bruce would quip back and forth, and he came to appreciate his sense of humor. He also appreciated his wealth of knowledge, and more importantly, the true love that Bruce had for the community. It truly is a better place because of what Bruce brought to it. Commissioner Thimm stated that he thanked Bruce on a number of occasions for his mentorship for the young planners that were part of the Staff and really blossomed with him. That part of Bruce will continue on both in this community as well as other communities.

Mark Sletten, who recently resigned from the Planning Commission, stated that Chair Phillips had invited him to make a few comments about Bruce. He echoed what Mayor Beerman had said about Bruce's commitment to the community. Mr. Sletten stated that his paths crossed with Bruce through the industry at Snow Engineering. After he heard of Bruce's passing, he reached out to Tim Beck who was President of Snow Engineering at the time. Mr. Sletten wanted to quote what Mr. Beck said about Bruce, "Park City will miss all of Bruce's institutionalized knowledge and the pragmatic approach he took. He will be missed." Mr. Sletten echoed Mr. Beck's words.

Commissioner Kenworthy offered these words, "Rest in peace. You were our Captain and you served with great honor".

Chair Phillips stated that on behalf of the Planning Commission they all send their condolences to Bruce's family.

ROLL CALL

Chair Phillips called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present except Commissioner Hall, who was excused.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

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

STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

David Everitt, City Deputy Manager, was sitting in on the meeting but he had nothing to report.

REGULAR AGENDA - DISCUSSION/PUBLIC HEARINGS/ POSSIBLE ACTION

- 4.A. 4.A. Park City Mountain Resort Base Parking Lots - MPD Modification - 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. This Hearing Will Focus on an Update on the Applicant's Circulation Scenarios, the Applicant's Updated Architectural Plans, Building Height and Setbacks. (Application PL-20-04475).**

Planner Alexandra Ananth reported that this item was the Base Resort Development and the application to replace Exhibit D of the Development Agreement, which is the 1998 Base Area Plan, with a new plan known as the Park City Base Area Lot Redevelopment Master Plan Study.

Planner Ananth stated that on the line this evening was the City Engineer, John Robertson, Senior Transportation Planner, Julia Collins, and the City's Transportation Consultant, AECOM, represented by Laynee Jones and Kordel Braley. Robert Schmidt was also on the line representing PEG Development, as well as their traffic consultant, Hales Engineering, and Pete Williams from SE Group, another consultant for the applicant.

Planner Ananth stated that the agenda this evening was more like a work session format because they wanted to provide an update and have the opportunity to discuss it with the Planning Commission before the Staff comes back with a final recommendation for circulation in February. Planner Ananth explained that they will be presenting what has been done to date on Transportation and Circulation and emphasized that they will be back with a final recommendation in February and a full analysis of the applicant's final proposed circulation scenario with regards to the MPD requirements.

Planner Ananth stated that the goal is to have the best transport first circulation solution for the Resort base that complies with the LMC and the other regulatory plans and minimizes impacts on the surrounding neighborhood. This is a generational opportunity

to improve conditions over the congestion that exists now and to facilitate increased transportation options and transit trips at the base for the long term.

Planner Ananth provided a brief overview of the framework for the City's report that was contained in her Staff report. Julia Collins will speak about the City's transportation priorities for the base area, as well as an update on City Transportation initiatives. AECOM will review the potential circulation scenarios they have been working with to date. Finally, the applicant will present updates on transportation, as well as some of the updates on architecture. Planner Ananth reported that the next meeting on this project was scheduled for February 17th.

Planner Ananth stated that as laid out in the Staff report, on July 8th the Planning Commission determined that the applicant's site plan was considered a substantive modification to the MPD and would justify review of the entire master plan and development agreement. Without limiting the Planning Commission's review of the full MPD, the Staff was expecting the Planning Commission to focus on unit density, the new site plan, perimeter setbacks, building height exceptions, parking, traffic and transportation mitigation, affordable housing, and phasing.

Planner Ananth stated that there are three primary review paths for the requested MPD modification, including no material change. If the applicant is consistent with the original MPD and development agreement and the current LMC criteria, they would decide there is no material change. The second path is newly applied for, as in the case of the proposed new site plan, the request for exceptions for perimeter setbacks and building height, as well as parking, transportation, and phasing. The third path is the substantive amendment path, which allows for new review of the proposal using more of a blended analysis of the original MPD and the current LMC criteria. Planner Ananth stated that the proposed density shift towards Parcel C and the affordable housing plan are examples of aspects of the application that was taking this amendment towards the blended path.

Planner Ananth thought it was important to note that because there was partial execution of the original MPD which remains in effect, there is some relevance to the underlying MPD and Development Agreement approvals in all three of the different review paths. The Planning Commission can employ different levels of review, prioritizing, and balance in these three paths. Planner Ananth stated that in the no material change path, the original MPD and Development Agreement is the primary review document and the LMC criteria is applied to the specifics of the particular development proposal to implement the original approval in a manner that mitigates any impacts consistent with the applicable criteria or development agreement requirements. In the newly applied path, the current LMC criteria is the basis for the new

determination, and the overall MPD is secondary. In the substantive amendment path, the evaluation of the change is a blended approach with the original approval and the LMC criteria both relevant. However, the Planning Commission at its discretion can reevaluate proposed changes consistent with the overall goals and mitigation requirements of the current LMC.

Senior Transportation Planner, Julia Collins, provided an overview of the City's transportation planning goals and initiatives as it relates to the Resort Base Area Development. She stated that in October of 2020, as part of the long-range transportation master plan update the City Council identified a modal hierarchy framework, which Ms. Collins presented to the Planning Commission last Fall. She noted that the hierarchy prioritizes bikes, pedestrians, and transit over parking and vehicles.

Ms. Collins stated that also coming out of recent planning efforts, such as the Vision 2020 and the long-range and short-range planning, has been a transit first philosophy. Last Spring the Vision 2020 effort identified finding innovative transportation solutions as the biggest opportunity for Park City over the next decade. Ms. Collins emphasized that the City Council identified transportation as a critical priority. She stated that all the guiding Vision documents and philosophies mark a paradigm shift to give people more options for more sustainable modes of travel. They rely on expanding transit and multi-modal options.

Ms. Collins stated that the Park City Base Area is one of the four major destinations within Park City. People, employees, visitors, and residents travel to and from both locally throughout the region and from the State. She remarked that this destination is important and regionally significant. This developed is an incredible opportunity and if they can accomplish the principles of improved transit circulation and provide multi-model options, they can move the transportation needle in Park City.

Ms. Collins noted that the City asked the applicant to take a lot of these principles forward to improve the transit circulation and to think about how this impacts their development and site planning.

Ms. Collins presented a slide showing the detail General Plan objectives that outline specific goals for the Park City Resort development. These General Plan objectives echo much of the documents and philosophies she laid out, and they will provide the Planning Commission with the framework for their decision-making. The objectives include increasing opportunities for public transit to the base area; consideration of a dedicated transit lane; circulation improvements for the user arriving and leaving the resort; implementing alternative parking locations with transit connections; implement

travel demand management strategies to decrease the amount of vehicles going to and from the site; improve multi-modal connections to major destinations; decrease the resort impacts on the surrounding residential communities; discourage resort through traffic on Three Kings Drive. Ms. Collins reiterated that these objectives are identified in the General Plan and they have been shared with the applicant and the Resort.

Ms. Collins outlined the critical initiatives that the City was doing that has an impact on the regional transportation network, which includes long and short-range transportation planning efforts that are currently underway. Park City is transitioning to a regional transit service under Summit County. This will allow the City to focus on managing the transit services within the City and provide more improved services and have more flexibility and control over its transit service. Park City was also advancing transit initiatives on both gateway corridors in partnership with UDOT and Summit County. Ms. Collins reported that in Spring and Summer of 2021, they were building a westbound shoulder running bus lane on SR248. Currently, there are shoulder running bus lanes on both sides of SR224 between Kimball Junction and the Canyons. This allows buses to operate in that shoulder and bypass traffic. Ms. Collins stated that in the longer term they were advancing a dedicated transit only lane called Bus Rapid Transit between Kimball Junction and Park City. Under the SR224 work in partnership with UDOT, they were looking at transit priority options for the intersection of Empire/Park Avenue/SR224/Deer Valley Drive. Ms. Collins remarked that they also have a regional park and ride strategy of over 1700 parking stalls in partnership with Summit County. Ms. Collins stated that while the City is implementing frequent reliable transit service with dedicated lanes on the Gateway corridors and controlling its transit service, they will also have satellite park and ride lots outside of the City to connect users through major destinations throughout Park City.

Ms. Collins remarked that establishing this comprehensive transportation network gives people more transportation options. It prioritizes transit and multi-modal transportation all working together to establish the transportation network.

Ms. Collins provided a snapshot of the current Resort conditions. She stated that the current conditions for transit circulation stand to benefit from any improvements. The bus often gets stuck in existing traffic flow, and there are many chokepoints where the bus is navigating its space with taxis, shuttles or other cars. Ms. Collins remarked that the current bus stop itself lacks adequate passenger amenities of not providing sufficient bus bays and stalls that are servicing the area. It does not have a transit shelter, great lighting for nighttime access, safe crossings, and nearby bathrooms and other passenger amenities. Ms. Collins stated that under the current normal transit service, 26 buses per hour service this site; and with the development of the gateway corridor transit connections that could grow. In normal traffic conditions it may take six

minutes for the buses to circulate the Resort loop. However, under holiday, event, or peak times it can take significantly longer, which gives the user a very poor experience riding transit. People who take the bus want it to be on time and not be stuck in traffic. People rely on buses the most during peak times and they need to be as fast, if not faster, than a car going to their destination.

Ms. Collins reiterated that this development creates an incredible opportunity to implement the transit first principles. Prioritizing people, transit, walking, and biking over the current conditions will significantly impact the transportation network and move the needle on what they are trying to accomplish in Park City.

Laynee Jones with AECOM reviewed statistical stats. She noted that PEG Development worked hard to develop people-based numbers. Ms. Jones stated that the transportation industry does a good job of counting cars, and they asked PEG to dive deep into counting people because they want this to be a people-first site.

Ms. Jones reported that on peak days approximately 20,000 people go to the base area of the ski Resort. That means in a peak a.m. hour condition, over 7,000 people are going to the site, and currently 75% of those people arrive in some type of vehicle and either park or get dropped off. Approximately 13% either walk or take the ski lift. The remaining 12% take a bus or shuttle.

Ms. Jones stated that in terms of pedestrian conditions, everyone who arrives on the site today turns into a pedestrian at some point, unless they take a ski lift and start skiing right away. Under current conditions and under the first scenario that PEG Development evaluated, approximately 2500 people cross Lowell Avenue. Ms. Jones remarked that the number could go up or down depending on which scenario they look at. The point is that there will be a significant amount of pedestrian traffic across Lowell Avenue.

Ms. Jones clarified that the numbers she presented were winter conditions. She thought they needed to look at summer peak conditions as well.

Ms. Jones stated that this redevelopment provides the opportunity to build infrastructure that will be in place for a long time. She pointed out that future generations will be more tied to transit, walking and biking, automated vehicles, Uber and Lyft, etc. There are a lot of disruptive trends going on in the transit industry right now. Ms. Jones remarked that Covid has impacted transit, but AECOM believes that public transit will rebound after Covid. Ms. Jones commented on the City goals Ms. Collins had outlined. She intended to expand on the opportunity to reduce the parking onsite. With all the factors, there is an opportunity to reduce the number of vehicles circulating at the site. Ms.

Jones presented a slide where she had outlined the scenario of reducing the number of cars parking on site by 400 parking spaces. The numbers were included in the Staff report and she flushed out what that would mean. It could reduce the number of people arriving via car to 60%, increase the number of people walking or taking lifts to 20%, and people take the bus and shuttle to 20%. She believed those numbers were more in line with the City's goals. Ms. Jones thought this was a feasible option to look at as they look at different scenarios. Ms. Jones presented a chart showing the comparison in modes that are more consistent with City goals. She clarified that currently there is no agreement on the option of reducing parking onsite, but she wanted to show it as an illustration.

Ms. Jones stated that AECOM had a collaborative process with PEG. They had a lot of workshops with the City and PEG to identify ways to get transit priority and pedestrian and walking priority on the site. She recalled that 10 options were outlined and those were included in the Staff report. Ms. Jones remarked that AEMCO and PEG narrowed the options to two or three. She presented the evaluation criteria they initially used to narrow the criteria.

Ms. Jones summarized that the goal is transit first, how to get buses to move more quickly through the site in a reliable fashion and improve the transit rider experience; and at the same time maintain roadway flow. Ms. Jones stated that after agreeing on these criteria collaboratively with PEG, PEG and their consultants generated the scenarios that were included in the Staff Report.

Kordel Braley presented a slide of a concept that was originally proposed by PEG Development when they were last before the Planning Commission. It entails one-way circulation going across Silver King, down Lowell, down Manor Way, and back up and around. It essentially turns the existing two-lane road into a one-way circular road that circles around on the site. Mr. Braley stated that the analysis PEG did showed that from a traffic operation standpoint, this concept works well moving cars in and out of the Resort, but it does not provide any transit priority. For that reason, this alternative was no longer under consideration.

Mr. Braley remarked that several alternatives have been proposed. He presented Scenario 3b that goes further into the process. It has an above grade bus loop on the north end of the site going around Building D, which is the proposed building between Empire and Lowell just south of Silver King. Mr. Braley noted that this alternative would still have one-way circulation around the entire site, but it would have an exclusive bus lane that would loop around Building D with a stop somewhere within the Building D footprint. Mr. Braley remarked that this alternative was removed from consideration because the bus stop is further away from the destinations that some of the other

alternatives. Everyone who arrives by transit would still need to cross Lowell creating the pedestrian/vehicle conflict. Some of the other alternatives were able to put passengers on the west side of Lowell to eliminate that conflict. As they try to get more and more people to the Resort by transit, it would be great if they do not continue to have that conflict. Mr. Braley pointed out that this alternate also had signals.

Mr. Braley presented Scenario 2b. He noted that this option does not have one-way circulation around the site. This alternative would provide transit only lanes along Silver King that would turn down Lowell. There would be an enlarged bus loop in the same location as the current transit stop. They still need to work on making sure the buses can turn around, but this alternative could accommodate the quantity of buses they anticipate. Mr. Braley pointed out that this alternative would have two-way circulation, bi-directional traffic on Empire for regular vehicles going to the neighborhoods and going into the Resorts. This alternative would also allow southbound traffic on Lowell Avenue. This was included to still provide pickup and drop-off for people arriving through other modes out in front of the proposed hotel on the west side of Lowell Avenue and the Resort. It would be another way for people to get in there in the morning. There would be no northbound traffic on Lowell between Shadow Ridge and Silver King. There would be southbound traffic only, and no through traffic would be allowed between Shadow Ridge and down to Manor Way. There would potentially be a loop on the south side for general purpose traffic, then the transit loop, and in the middle just west of Building B between Shadow and Manor is an area where pedestrians could cross with no conflicts. Emergency access could still be provided in this area with some method to allow emergency vehicle access, but it would primarily be a pedestrian thoroughfare.

Mr. Braley pointed out that PEG Development provided a higher-level concept analysis of traffic volumes. He presented a slide and noted that the red arrows indicated the possibility that traffic volumes could exceed capacity. He noted that most of the traffic in Alternative 2b is essentially on Empire and there is no ability to widen Empire to accommodate additional lanes. That was the reason for showing a red arrow in the a.m. peak and the p.m. peak.

Mr. Braley summarized that in addition to the bus lanes, Scenario 2b proposes 4 new traffic signals, as well as one pedestrian hoc signal between Silver King and Shadow to allow pedestrian crossing. There would be one-lane drop offs on Lowell and two-way traffic on Empire. Mr. Braley commented on the advantages of Scenario 2b. It provides better transit service than what currently exists. The developer laid out a concept that would accommodate eight buses at the turnaround based on AECOM's recommendation. It also provides car free crossing on Lowell. Mr. Braley stated that

one of the big concerns with this alternative is the congestion on Empire Avenue since all the vehicular traffic coming in and going out would be on a two-lane road.

Ms. Jones stated that if the site is going to have exclusive transit lanes it would be difficult to come up with a scenario that will not have a small section of roadway that will fail. She pointed out that this will be a concern with many of the alternatives and the applicant and the City are working through those issues. Ms. Jones remarked that one advantage of reducing the amount of parking on site is that it reduces the number of cars traveling on those small narrow sections of road. She believed the applicant was leaning towards Scenario 2b.

Mr. Braley stated that all the maps showing traffic volumes were based on current existing conditions. They do not account for the potential parking reduction or for mode split, which are people switching from vehicular modes to transit modes. This was the purpose of the graphics that Ms. Jones showed earlier that demonstrates how providing the amenities and experience through transit opens it up to something that people are more willing to do that will shift some of the traffic. It would also affect some of the numbers in the preliminary analysis. The focus is to push for making transit a higher priority. Mr. Braley believed that building the right system would help promote transit.

Mr. Braley presented Scenario 3a. He reported that iterations were still being considered with this scenario and different options were still being looked at. Mr. Braley stated that Scenario 3a keeps the one-way circulation for vehicular traffic in place, southbound on Lowell and northbound on Empire. However, instead of transit coming down Lowell to the existing transit site, it would come west on Silver King all the way back behind Buildings E and C and would travel south on the back side. It would then come back to Shadow Ridge, travel east on Shadow Ridge, and back north on Empire. Mr. Braley remarked that Shadow Ridge and Empire would have exclusive transit lanes in this scenario. One of the benefits would be the ability to put a transit stop closer to the Resort and closer to the destination people are trying to go. Mr. Braley stated that one option with this scenario would be to put the transit only lane on the backside of Buildings D and E underground. If transit is located on the backside below ground, a few sub-options would be to have the bus stop below grade or have the stop closer to the intersection of Lowell centrally located between the development. Mr. Braley stated that another option with Scenario 3a would be to have the bus route on the backside be at grade at ground level behind the ski resort. Grade would be less of an issue this case. There were also options where the bus stop is located. Another option would be instead of the exclusive lane coming out on Shadow Ridge and up Empire, the transit lane could come back up Lowell and over on Silver King.

Commissioner Suesser commented on the 3a Scenario and asked about the entrance to the underground area. She asked if Mr. Braley had a picture of how that would work. Mr. Braley replied that it was not developed enough to have any renderings. He noted that the grade is traveling uphill to the south in that area. The bus would start going down, but the grade goes up at the same time.

Ms. Jones pointed out that there is underground parking in the building so there would be an entrance for vehicles. This concept was expanding the entrance to allow for a bus.

Chair Phillips stated that he was trying to understand the impacts of traffic lights and the number of traffic lights. In one of the scenarios there were four traffic lights. He asked Mr. Braley to explain how the number of traffic lights impacts the traffic flow. Mr. Braley replied that traffic lights slow down traffic. Traffic lights also handle conflicting movements. In trying to cross transit across heavy traffic flow on southbound Lowell, a traffic signal would provide an advantageous and safe way to allow traffic crossing. It will slow down traffic on Lowell, but it also provides an opportunity for traffic to cross. Mr. Braley stated that something to keep in mind with traffic signals as opposed to other forms of traffic control is that a signal can allow for transit signal priority. Technology is already in Utah that allows certain buses and snowplows to get priority at signals. He remarked that a signal opens up a lot of technology that can play to the advantage of prioritizing transit.

Chair Phillips understood that a well-placed traffic lights would help manage the conflict of pedestrians and traffic, as opposed to the conflicts without a light where pedestrians just cross at will. Mr. Braley answered yes. He noted that the hoc signal for pedestrians is another example of a signal that will stop cars and provide benefit to the site.

Ms. Jones noted that the applicant would need to do a full analysis to see if signals are actually warranted.

Commissioner Van Dine noted that one of the scenarios mentioned a hoc signal. She asked if there would potentially be a hoc signal across Lowell between Buildings C and D as well, or if that would be free crossing. Mr. Braley was not sure why a mid-block signal was not shown in Scenario 3a. He thought it would come down to making sure they understand how many pedestrians are crossing at each location.

Ms. Jones remarked that Scenario 3a was outlined in a way that all the people getting off the bus would be dropped on the slope side and would not have to cross Lowell.

Commissioner Dine stated that if the intent is to filter people into the plaza area with a transit stop before the turnaround, pedestrians will still be forced to go up to the lights to cross. Mr. Braley agreed. He had not noticed that before and he assumed the developer would explain why that occurs. He offered to look into it further. Mr. Braley stated that in the end, where there are heavy conflicts between pedestrians and cars, this is one tool they can use to help make it safer.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked Julia Collins if the bus lanes would connect to the park and rides all the way through as restricted bus lanes only. Ms. Collins stated that her intent for giving the summaries of the plans for SR224 and SR248 was to show how they are working with their partners at UDOT, who own and manage those corridors along with Summit County, to work towards a transit priority solution. The idea is to connect those destinations served with high frequency transit service and dedicated transit lanes. Ms. Collins noted that they have made progress with the shoulder running bus lanes on SR224 and soon on SR248. Currently, the focus is on SR224 and connecting a southern terminus in Park City along the SR224 corridor to Kimball Junction. Ms. Collins remarked that a study is underway with UDOT at the intersection of SR224/Deer Valley Drive/Park Avenue to identify short-term, such as signal technology or quick design fixes that would help with transit priority in the near term; and in the long-term thinking about the BRT and giving transit priority once the buses hit that intersection and come up to the Resort. Ms. Collins stated that they were still working on answering all the questions and a lot of things are in motion.

Commissioner Kenworthy thought the elevated view of how the public/private works together was critical. If this is a standalone and the buses are stopping and starting all the way along from these proposed park and rides, they will have the same situation and they will not meet their goal of improving the ingress and egress.

Mr. Braley stated that it is a massive problem when looking at the entire region or the City. However, when they have an opportunity with this type of redevelopment, they do the best they can in this spot and then look for other opportunities. He noted that it will not solve everything but doing the best they can on this site is just one piece of the puzzle that will not need to be solved later. He agreed that the buses will get stopped in other places around town, but at least with one of these options they can achieve something better for this small part of the City than what exists today.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated that Park City is famous for doing studies, and many of these studies wanted this development and wanted to explore the east-west connections. He asked Mr. Braley to talk about the possibilities for 14th and 15th Street. Without those solutions he questioned whether they really were making an improvement. Mr. Braley thought there would still be a bottleneck at Deer Valley and

Park Avenue, but the bottlenecks they currently have at the Resort would be resolved by one of the alternatives that were outlined. He understood Commissioner Kenworthy's concern, but he was not prepared to talk about other solutions for problems outside of this development area.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated that in reading the General Plan and the old studies, they all encouraged looking at the east-west solutions at 14th and 15th Street. He understood that it was not Mr. Braley's purview, but he asked if AECOM had looked into those options or had those discussions. He like the different options presented this evening. Some options seemed very workable and there were pros and cons to each one. Mr. Braley understood that there is a desire to keep a lot of the traffic off of Park Avenue. He was concerned that creating better connections on 14th and 15th would undermine the intent to keep traffic off of Park Avenue.

Ms. Jones clarified that these options were the applicant's designs, and AECOM was working for the City to just evaluate them. Hales Engineering is working for the applicant and AECOM has made suggestions. Ms. Jones personally thought 14th and 15th Streets might be options for pedestrian connections, which is why they asked the developer to look at where pedestrians were coming from. It might be possible to send buses up Park Avenue and up 14th and 15th, but they had not asked the applicant to explore that option.

Commissioner Kenworthy remarked that the applicant had created a view corridor and a plaza, and he suggested going further and possibly looking at a cabriolet. He stated that Snow Engineering recently completed an aerial study for the entire City, and they found a doable but expensive way of making this work. Commissioner Kenworthy wanted a public/private partnership to be the number one goal because it is the guiding principle of the General Plan. He pointed out that all the studies from the past ten or fifteen years talk about circulation through the entire RDA area.

Commissioner Kenworthy liked the options and the fact that the applicant was willing to be flexible and come up with different options; but the public part needs to go alongside with it. Julia Collins agreed with Commission Kenworthy. She noted that they asked and encouraged the applicant to consider all of these plans and projects and to look at the General Plan and the foundational planning principles that guides the transportation decisions for the City. This was the foundation the applicant used to come up with each scenario. Ms. Collins clarified that the scenarios presented were proposed by the applicant. They are not scenarios the City is proposing. It was a collaborative process, and these were the scenarios the applicant brought to the table.

Ms. Collins pointed out that the City was also working on short-range and long-range planning efforts. Pivoting off the Resort development, the City will look at where the applicant had not mitigated development impacts and make the proper connections and look at what needs to be done. Ms. Collins remarked that the City sees these initiatives as a collaborative partnership, but they were relying on the applicant to look at the impacts from a people perspective with bikes, pedestrians, transit and automobiles.

Planner Ananth stated the current thinking is to protect 14th, 15th, and Three King Drives from being used as cut-through roads to access the Resort. However, one of the fundamental problems the 1200 cars coming and going twice a day because of the number of parking spaces. Unless that is changed, it is difficult to reduce congestion simply by making a road slightly more efficient. Planner Ananth remarked that they do not want to widen the roads or prioritize vehicles, and one option that will come up is whether they should be looking at decreasing the amount of parking on site to lessen the congestion and potentially expand off-site parking strategies. Planner Ananth believed that trying to keep vehicles out of the City is key when looking at ways to improve congestion over the existing conditions.

Commissioner Kenworthy agreed with looking into those options and the sustainability of transit first. However, when he reads the report going back ten years, he was unsure where the City was coming up with the plan to protect the neighborhood between Park Avenue and the Resort. He understood Three Kings and he was adamant that it not be used as a corridor; but all the others were called out as potential solutions in all the studies. Commissioner Kenworthy thought they should keep 14th and 15th Streets in whatever mode options the talented transportation engineers came up with and he was not in favor of taking that out of their vision. He wanted the applicant to use 14th and 15th as the General Plan specifically states.

Chair Phillips agreed with Commissioner Kenworthy and he liked some of the new scenarios in thinking about alternatives. Chair Phillips thought an unintended consequence of reducing parking is the impacts on the surrounding neighborhood because they always talk about how the neighborhoods are strained with people parking on those streets. If they consider a parking reduction, they will need solid and strategic methods to mitigate parking impacts on the immediate neighborhood.

Commissioner Suesser agreed that the parking should be reduced at this site. She favored the idea of going from 1200 spaces to 800 spaces. Commissioner Suesser liked the idea of looking at more off-site parking to encourage people to park away from town and taking mass transit to the Resort. She believed that was key and should be encouraged. Commissioner Suesser also supported express buses from Kimball

Junction and Quinn's Junction to the Resort. She thought people would be more willing to use transit if they can get to the Resort faster.

Commissioner Suesser wanted to know who would control whether the 800 parking spaces at the Resort is paid or unpaid parking. She believed more people would use transit if it was paid parking at the Resort. Commissioner Suesser suggested doing an analysis of how much parking would be required if it becomes paid parking. She thought it would reduce the need a great deal.

Commissioner Suesser commented on Scenario 2b. She asked if the exclusive bus lane was on the exterior and would then come around. She also asked if there would be three or four lanes going up Silver King. Mr. Braley stated that Scenario 2b showed 4 total lanes, one general purpose lane in each direction and one transit lane in each direction. In terms of coordinating with the nearest bus stop, it would be difficult to have a bus stop on the outside and then make its way into an inside lane. Commissioner Suesser noted that there is a bus stop on Empire before Silver King, and it is highly utilized. She pointed out that this was an issue because the bus cannot not be cutting across the general traffic. Mr. Braley stated that this is where a signal could play a part. He identified a few options that could be explored. Commissioner Suesser noted that there is a bus stop on Empire between Silver King and Shadow Ridge, which is also highly utilized, and the proposed route in Scenario 2b does not service those people.

Regarding Commissioner Kenworthy's comments regarding 14th and 15th Streets, Commissioner Suesser stated that those are very steep streets and general traffic coming out onto Empire from those streets causes a lot of problems on Empire. A lot of cars have trouble going up those streets in the winter and currently creates traffic problems on Empire. Commissioner Suesser thought pedestrians and bikes should be able to utilize 14th and 15th with sidewalks and bike lanes, but she questioned whether they should be directing general traffic down those side streets. Commissioner Suesser liked Commissioner Kenworthy's out of the box ideas for a cabriolet and other things but using 14th and 15th for general traffic was not a good solution.

Commissioner Suesser raised other issues with Scenarios that she thought the developer should keep in mind. She thought they were seeing an increased number of shuttles coming to the Resort from various places in town, and those shuttles are now taking up a quarter of the upper parking lot. The shuttles are not circulating. They are standing in the lot waiting for people. Commissioner Suesser did not see accommodations for shuttles in any of the plans presented and she suggested the possibility of considering a lot specifically for shuttles based on what is currently occurring. Commissioner Suesser liked the idea of moving the bus drop-off for people getting off. However, she thought there would need to be improved infrastructure to

make the user experience getting to the Resort nicer than it would be if people were currently being dropped off in the new location proposed in Scenario 3a.

Chair Phillips agreed with Commissioner Suesser on having a plan for the shuttles.

Commissioner Thimm agreed with most of the comments, particularly the shuttles. He also thought a public/private solution was imperative. Commissioner Thimm was generally not opposed to signalization, but in looking at the proximity between signal devices he thought they appeared to be close to each other. He asked if an analysis was being done along Silver King Drive to see whether queuing would work properly with the expected volume of traffic so one light is not affecting the other. Mr. Braley replied that it still needed to be look at as they move forward. The development team had started doing a preliminary analysis, but they were not to the point of being able to comment on how well traffic will operationally work with the signals. Commissioner Thimm stated that where they were telling people to come up the greenway needs to be closely looked at in terms of the crossings and conflicts being created.

Planner Ananth provided a preview of the upcoming meetings. In February the City will come back with final recommendations and analysis on the applicant's preferred alternative. The City may have its own alternative or they may agree with the applicant's choice. That was still being determined. Planner Ananth expected the February meeting to also focus on parking and the applicant's Transportation Demand Management Plan. For the March meeting, she expected a final Traffic and Parking Management Operation Plan from the applicant, Construction Phasing and Mitigation plans, as well as proposed landscape and open space calculations.

Planner Ananth had included a chart in the Staff report that she would touch on after the applicant discusses their architecture. The chart goes over the 1998 plan, the square footage and the proposed design. She was also able to obtain parking above grade information that was also included in the comparison table, as well as building heights. She was very clear on the applicant's proposal peak building heights, which was measured from how height is currently measured which is roof elevation over existing topography. She clarified that these were peak heights on each parcel. Planner Ananth stated that she took the peak heights for the old plan from the 1998 plan volumetrics. She noted that those heights are not always taken from existing grade, so while they look very equivalent, some of the 1998 buildings are a bit taller because they are not referencing existing grade. She would continue to refine the building height comparison table as they move forward.

Commissioner Thimm referred to Planner Ananth's comments about coming back in February to discuss circulation and transportation and that the Staff may or may not be

in agreement with the applicant. He requested that every effort be made that whatever is presented to the Planning Commission and to the public represents a consensus if at all possible. Planner Ananth replied that it was the goal.

Robert Schmidt, representing PEG Development, offered their condolences on the passing of Bruce Erickson.

Mr. Schmidt addressed some of the comments and questions that were raised in the traffic presentation this evening. He appreciated the hard work that went into all three scenarios. Mr. Schmidt stated that PEG Development preferred the 2b Scenario. They believed this scenario has many advantages and there are practical reasons to go in that direction, recognizing that there are still many details that need to be worked out.

Mr. Schmidt commented on Scenario 3a. The applicant had prepared a conceptual site plan and a plan of profile of what an alignment would look like and he had that available. However, it is very technical, and he was unsure whether it would be much benefit. Mr. Schmidt noted that the Staff had those plans, and they could review it and provide their assessment to the Planning Commission. Mr. Schmidt stated that providing sufficient room for loading and off-loading of buses causes a squeeze on the site plan and it eliminates the open space plaza between Building C and E. In terms of on grade or below grade, they feel like an on-grade alignment of that option is a safety issue. It is not a good planning idea to have a bus running between the bottom of a ski hill to a plaza where people will be crossing multiple times a day. In terms of below grade, Mr. Schmidt stated that there are significant grade issues to get a bus from below grade back up to grade at the intersection of Lowell and Shadow Ridge. There is approximately 40 feet of grade difference within a few hundred feet.

Mr. Schmidt stated that the applicant would like to resolve the issues and allow them to focus on one option moving forward. He noted that one of the options presented this evening was removed from consideration. If they can reach agreement on one option, they would be able to move ahead.

Mr. Schmidt asked if the Planning Commission was interested in seeing the technical details of the plans that were submitted to the Staff. Chair Phillips thought it was better to wait and see which direction they gravitate. Commissioner Thimm suggested making it an exhibit to the next Staff report.

Mr. Schmidt referred to a question about shuttle staging and arriving of shuttles. He noted that there was a plan for shuttles in Scenario 2b on the south half of Lowell on the other side of the loop. It was labeled a potential shuttle and condo drop-off area. The intent is that it becomes a condo arrival for condo guests on Parcel B, and a shuttle

drop-off. There is also access for the lodges in that location, a fire lane, and other access needs for the upper base. Mr. Schmidt believed there was enough room to provide a dedicated shuttle drop-off zone to help alleviate some of those concerns.

Mr. Schmidt commented on the question regarding the proximity of signals to each other. He stated that they had started an analysis of the streets. They started with Scenario 2b in terms of signals, queuing, and those types of things. Mr. Schmidt pointed out that a lot of details still needed to be worked out, but they had started the process.

Mr. Schmidt responded to questions related to parking and the ideas of parking reduction. He stated that Pete Williams with SE Group was on the line. Mr. Williams had provided an analysis in a previous meeting centered around parking and parking demand needs. It also included discussion around capacities. Mr. Schmidt pointed out that parking will be paid parking onsite. They believe that will have a significant effect in terms of encouraging people to ride the bus and use other modes of transportation.

Mr. Schmidt stated that the developer is on a schedule and they want to move forward. He asked how and when these offset improvements occur to make the bus more convenient. From a practical standpoint, he wanted to know how they could have assurance that it happens and that guests will use the bus more. Mr. Schmidt remarked that there is a certain element of managing or controlling their own destiny. He understood the concerns that the number of vehicles create traffic impacts; however, he also knows that some of the changes being made in terms of transit improvements and charging for parking will have a significant impact on the increase in bus ridership. Mr. Schmidt was very concerned about losing 400 stalls.

The Commissioners had no further questions on traffic or transportation at this time.

Mr. Schmidt moved to the architectural presentation and introduced Emir Tursic, the project architect.

Mr. Tursic noted that the Planning Commission last saw the architectural design in November 2020. At that time, he went through the overall requirements that the project will be evaluated against that goes beyond just a comparison to the 1998 plan. He also looked specifically at the building height exception and setback exception criteria, and how the project basically meets the criteria.

Mr. Tursic stated that the purpose of the presentation this evening is to provide an update on Parcel B design and the Fourth Street corridor in particular. They understood

from the last meeting that this was an important part of the original master plan that needed to be maintained, and they made major modifications to the design to accomplish that. Mr. Tursic stated that the other part of the presentation will focus on the comparison to the 1998 plan, specifically regarding building height and the massing. To clear up confusion at the last meeting, they developed visual diagrams to help the Commissioners understand how the building height is measured and the comparison between the two plans.

Mr. Tursic commented on the Parcel B design. He stated that the original master plan identified two major view corridors. One was basically the arrival view corridor from the intersection of Empire and Silver King, which is a major part of their design and an improvement over the 1998 plan. The second view corridor was the 14th Street corridor that maintained the pedestrian and the mountain view connection.

Mr. Tursic stated that since the last meeting they looked at ways to maintain that pedestrian connection across the site. He reminded everyone that they were providing generous sidewalks that will provide access around Parcel B that do not exist today. In addition, they were now providing a pedestrian connection across the site. He pointed to 14th Street and noted that they were providing a new public grand stair at the terminus of 14th street that would provide access to the elevated passel across the site down to Lowell Avenue. Mr. Tursic remarked that in order to do that they had to reduce the amount of parking on that level to make the connection. They made up for that loss by adding more parking below grade.

Mr. Tursic stated that the area shown in white on Parcel B was the publicly accessible space coming across Parcel B, and there will be an additional elevated deck that will act as an amenity deck for the condos. Mr. Tursic reiterated that additional parking will be provided completely below grade to make up the lost parking stalls from the top level to provide the connection. He stated that the connection is important not only because of allowing more flexibility for pedestrians to cross and to maintain the view corridor, but also in terms of massing. He showed the elevation that was presented in November with three-story townhomes cascading down Empire and continued into the affordable housing building. It was a continuous facade. There was a lot of horizontal and vertical articulation but there was no break in the massing. The community expressed that concern repeatedly. Mr. Tursic noted that the pedestrian connection also allowed them to provide a major break in the massing of about 80-feet along Empire.

Mr. Tursic outlined three major elements on Parcel B; the three-story townhomes, the affordable housing building that continues along Shadow Ridge and wraps the corner of Empire, and the condo building beyond. In response to a request at the last meeting to demonstrate what the mountain view corridor would look like, Mr. Tursic had created a

photo realistic rendering standing on the corner of 14th Street and Empire Avenue. He indicated the stop sign and moved to public space with a public stair that allows people to go up to the pedestrian passel. They were also adding a new elevator in that location to make sure the connection is accessible for everyone to use. Mr. Tursic pointed to additional landscaped area for people to enjoy summer or winter. Mr. Tursic liked the potential being created by the elevated deck. He pointed out how much of the mountain will be visible. He would later compare it to the original master plan and what was proposed in 1998.

Mr. Tursic reported on a work session with the residents last week and they walked through the changes on Parcel B. A number of people wanted to see what the connection would look like from the opposite end. Mr. Tursic presented a perspective from Empire Avenue to show what that connection would look like.

Mr. Tursic provided a quick comparison to the 1998 plan. He presented the elevation from the original 1998 plan looking from Empire against the connection. He noted that the original master plan called for a minimum 30-foot opening. If they extrude the volumetrics that were approved and the building height, the aperture is a lot smaller than what is being proposed today.

Mr. Tursic remarked that the changes were a major rework of Parcel B to not only create a pedestrian connection, but also to provide a much wider mountain corridor compared to the original master plan.

Commissioner Suesser asked Mr. Tursic to again show what the connection looks like on Lowell Avenue and what the access across Lowell to the Resort would look like. Mr. Tursic pulled up the rendering and indicated the two major entrances into the parking garage. He stated that the pedestrian connection being proposed would align with one of the entrances into the garage.

Mr. Schmidt pointed out that with the traffic and transit plans multiple options are in process and that will affect how the crossing occur. For example, with Scenario 2b there would be a signal at the intersection of Shadow Ridge and Lowell, which would provide a protected pedestrian crossing at that intersection. There would also be an at-grade dedicated pedestrian crossing between the bus loop and the shuttle loop. Mr. Schmidt clarified that there were still discussions and plans still needed to be worked out.

Commissioner Kenworthy thought the updated plan for Parcel B was a fabulous improvement from the previous iteration; however, it was missing the pedestrian overpass. He needed to be convinced as why they could not engineer a bridge from the

upper staircase straight across into the existing Resort Center. Commissioner Kenworthy referred to studies that were done in 2012 and 2014 that included a pedestrian overpass in that same location. He noted that the previous Resort owner, with City cooperation on the Resort Center, had planned for an overpass. Mr. Schmidt agreed that the elevated plaza presents opportunities for an overpass and it was something they would consider.

Mr. Tursic noted that the applicant had submitted a narrative that was attached to the Staff report that looked at the proposed plan and compared it to the original 1998 approved plan, specifically related to the program of each parcel, density, open space, and building height and massing. Mr. Tursic provided a more visual comparison between how the original plan compares to the new plan.

Mr. Tursic presented slides of the sections from the original master plan. Parcel B was envisioned as a residential building and varied in height between three to six stories, and it was sitting on a three-story parking structure. The building had 191 residential units. Mr. Tursic stated that PEG Development was proposing a similar residential program on Parcel B that varies from three to six stories. The proposed plan provides more parking than the original plan. All the parking is clad with residential units; therefore, the parking structure is only exposed at the major entrances into the parking structure on Manor Avenue. Currently, the program is comprised of approximately 56 condominium units and 73 affordable housing units. Mr. Tursic remarked that the plan residential program has been refined in accordance with the current LMC to provide affordable housing that the original plan did not contemplate or provide. It also includes the affordable housing for the first phase, which was completed but never provided the affordable housing.

Mr. Tursic commented on the building massing of the original plan. He heard a lot of references to the original plan and how it was composed of four different buildings. He presented the original plan with two large courtyards that served as entrances into the residential buildings. He pointed to the pedestrian connection that goes across Parcel B. Mr. Tursic noted that from the Empire perspective the building is more continuous and perceived as two or three different masses rather than four masses. The four different buildings are only recognizable in the plan. Mr. Tursic stated that in PEG's proposal the building is comprised of three different massing, which include the townhomes, the affordable housing units, and the condominium units.

Mr. Tursic presented some of the original diagrams of the approved building heights and volumetrics that were presented last time. He pointed out that the original master plan measured the building height from the established datum point and not necessarily from finished grade. In this particular case the building that was on the corner of Manor Way

and Empire was measured from elevation 6951, which was the ground level elevation. The two buildings at the opposite end at Shadow Ridge were measured from 6941. Mr. Tursic stated that in an effort to compare the building heights, they modeled the original approved volumetrics. He presented a slide looking from the corner of Shadow Ridge and Empire Avenue, and the approved massing from the 1998 plan. Mr. Tursic had color coded the diagram showing the pitched roof zone in yellowish green. The pink area below was the approved building enveloped. Shown in blue was the extra height that goes from the established datum point all the way to finished grade, which is how building heights are measured today, and it was not accounted for in the diagrams. Mr. Tursic explained that what was showing as 78' was not 78' from the finished grade, but instead 78' from the elevation of 6941.

Mr. Tursic stated that they overlaid the current massing over the approved volumetrics from 1998. There was no dispute that the plans are very different. Mr. Tursic explained why the building height in general across the site is very compatible in both plans. He compared the proposed massing with the massing that was approved in 1998. Regarding open space, Mr. Tursic reviewed the original plan and compared it to the open space in the proposed plan. In terms of setbacks, the original plan approved 20' setbacks on all four sides of the building. The applicant was requesting a setback exception on three sides along Empire, Shadow Ridge, and Lowell. Mr. Tursic explained why the setback exception was necessary in order to create the architectural variation and reduce the perceived scale of the building.

Mr. Schmidt commented on the setback exhibit. He specifically pointed to the townhome portion along Empire that poke through the 25' plane. He stated that those are basically a portico, which is a small section of each townhome that provides architectural variation and defines each unit with strong architecture. On Shadow Ridge he noted that the white portion that pokes through the 25' setback was a portion of the facade that provides strong horizontal articulation. He noted that Mr. Tursic talked about the perceived scale of a building and how he was using the horizontal articulation to reduce the perceived scale. Mr. Schmidt stated that in theory that section of the building could be pushed back to 25' and still have the same height, but it would feel taller and more massive. Providing horizontal articulation is necessary to provide the architectural interest and variation they were trying to achieve and what the LMC suggests. Mr. Schmidt emphasized that the applicant was not asking for an across the board 20' setback. They were asking for a limited 20' setback to provide architectural variation.

Commissioner Suesser asked about the building between the townhomes and the pedestrian walkway. Mr. Tursic replied that it was one of the entrances/exits into the parking garage. He noted that they were providing three separate accesses at three

different elevations of the parking structure to maximize the flow and avoid bottlenecks. There was an entrance and exit on Shadow Ridge, along Empire, and along Manor Way.

Mr. Tursic compared Parcel C with the original 1998 plan. He noted that the original master plan considered Parcel C to be another residential building rather than a hotel, which is one of the major differences between the original plan and the current design. The building was approximately six stories in height and stepped down as it approached the street. It was sitting on top of a three-story parking structure with an entrance to the parking garage on Lowell. Mr. Tursic presented the volumetric of the residential building. The building height was measured from the ground level elevation of 6921, and everything below it along the plaza was not counted in the building height.

Mr. Tursic had modeled the approved volumetrics of the original plan using the same color scheme and overlaid it over the proposed building. He pointed out that there was an obvious difference in the massing and articulation. The original design was more of a two-wing configuration that stepped down. Mr. Tursic remarked that some of the design was driven by the realignment of Lowell that was proposed at that time but is no longer feasible today. Mr. Tursic stated that despite the different configuration, the building heights were generally maintained in the proposed plan.

Mr. Tursic stated that based on the feedback from previous meetings, the residential building on Parcel D was reduced by an entire floor, and it was added to the wing closest to the mountain to mitigate the impact on the adjacent residential neighborhood. He presented a slide showing the proposed massing for Parcel C.

Mr. Tursic commented on the major differences in programming between the original plan and the proposed plan. The original plan proposed for Parcel C was a residential building, and it had a learning center fronting the plaza in the center. PEG Development was proposing a four-star hotel on Parcel C. He thought that was an important difference because they were trying to provide a variety of lodging as opposed to providing only condos. A four-star hotel would become the epicenter of activity. It would provide additional retail and a variety of new housing options that does not currently exist at the base of the resort. Mr. Tursic remarked that the proposed design has more support and accessory space because a hotel has more back-of-house and support functions than a residential building.

Mr. Tursic commented on open space and presented a view of the plaza of the original master plan to give a sense of the Lowell realignment that was proposed. It created a much larger Parcel E and a much larger Parcel D.

Mr. Schmidt explained why the Lowell realignment would not be feasible today. Their analysis shows that Lowell has existed in its current alignment for decades and there are a lot of utilities within Lowell. Most recently the City's raw water line was added into that alignment. Mr. Schmidt stated that from a practical standpoint it made more sense to leave Lowell in its current alignment. He noted the 1998 plan showed Lowell realigning and connecting at or very near to the intersection of Empire and Silver King. However, the 1998 plan provided no details as to how that would work from a traffic standpoint. Mr. Schmidt stated that separating the intersection of Lowell and moving further away from the intersection of Empire allows them to manage the traffic load and circulation more effectively and reduce congestion. PEG Development was not proposing to realign Lowell for the reasons stated. Mr. Tursic stated that there is also a major elevation difference between the existing mountain and Lowell Avenue.

Mr. Tursic indicated a large open space area that created a new lower base for the Resort between Parcels C and E, which was maintained in the proposed plan. Unlike the original plan which provided only a learning center and skier services, the proposed plan provides significantly more retail to truly activate the plaza. They were trying to create a sense of place and a new lower base that will revive the identity of the Park City Mountain Resort and match its reputation as one of the best resorts in North America. Mr. Tursic reviewed the plaza elevation which included a grand stair that overcomes the elevation difference, as well as accessible ramps that come across. Mr. Tursic pointed out two-story retail on both sides. In addition to retail at the plaza elevation, the hotel restaurants also help activate the plaza.

Mr. Tursic stated that the original master plan had an exception for 20' setbacks along Lowell in limited locations. It asked for a minimum 30' setback along the private road. The PEG was asking for a very subtle encroachment in almost the same locations along Lowell. In a couple of instances, they encroach to 20', but for the most part, they actually exceed the setbacks.

Mr. Tursic remarked that the Parcel D footprint is a major difference between the 1998 plan versus what was being proposed today. He noted that the original Lowell realignment eliminated a portion of Silver King Drive, which enlarged Parcel E and made Parcel D a lot smaller. It was another residential building three to six stories in height with approximately 60 residential units. Mr. Tursic stated that the current design was proposing 40 units. In the original plan the ridge height was approximately 60' measured from the ground level elevation. He provided a visual comparison and point out how the proposed massing fits within the approved envelope with the exception of the ridge height. If that was modified slightly it would be within the approved building height. Mr. Tursic pointed to a pavilion that the applicant was proposing to support the

open space as a community amenity that was not part of the original master plan. Mr. Tursic provided views of Parcel D from different sides.

Mr. Tursic understood the applicant was proposing a different plan in terms of massing, but they were also trying to demonstrate that it is also compatible with the 1998 plan. He remarked that the plans vary due to programming, utilities and road perspective. Mr. Tursic noted that the original master plan provided a lot less open space on Parcel D because it was a smaller footprint, and the residential building took up most of the site. It had a 20' setback approval along Lowell, and 15' setback approval on the south side against the existing condominiums, which is no longer an option under the current LMC.

Mr. Tursic stated that PEG took the opportunity of the extra space to improve the sense of arrival at the roundabout and to maximize the mountain view. They looked at Parcel D as an opportunity to transition from the Resort scale and use to the residential neighborhoods. The open space would be year-around community space. The retail envisioned in Parcel D would serve not only the new but also the existing residential neighborhoods. Mr. Tursic reviewed the setback diagrams.

Mr. Tursic moved to Parcel E. He stated that because of the road realignment in the original plan, this parcel deviates the most from the 1998 plan. The original master plan had a much larger footprint than the current Parcel E plan. The original building was three to six stories high with 91 residential units. They were currently proposing 46 units. Where possible they were stepping it down to a two-story building and increasing the setbacks. He stated that along Silver King in particular, there is not enough space to do the same kind of stepping of the building that was done in the original plan. Mr. Tursic presented another view, noting that some of the massing was pushed to the plaza and the building was stepped down to alleviate the impacts on the plaza. Mr. Tursic stated that the setback on Parcel E was approved at 20'. He indicated where on the proposed plan they needed 20', but beyond that they were well within the 25' setback envelope.

Mr. Schmidt requested time at the end of the public comment period to respond to any comments or concerns that may arise.

Chair Phillips appreciated the visuals that were presented this evening. He referred to page 63 of the presentation and asked for clarification of a piece that was sticking out of the setback line. Mr. Tursic stated that a small portion of the stair tower and the articulation below that extends beyond the 25' setback. He would fix that issue.

Chair Phillips referred to the visual showing the view corridor on page 57. He thought they were deceiving. He understood how someone would interpret that the building is

supposed to fit within those boxes. Mr. Phillips wanted everyone to understand that they have the setback parameters, as well as the height parameters, which is simply a volumetric. Chair Phillips referred to page 32 of the presentation. He thought it was helpful when Mr. Tursic showed the extra datum heights. He thought combining all three of the exhibits with the building envelope was very helpful. Chair Phillips was interested in seeing the visuals because it confirmed what he thought. If those buildings were made of rubber and filled with air, and they pushed the buildings within the setback, the buildings fronting on Empire would be taller and the building on Manor Way would be a vertical flat wall.

Chair Phillips stated that personally he was comfortable with the requested setback reductions because it is being done for good reasons and allows for architectural variations. He thought the applicant had done a great job with the 14th Street corridor and he believed it aligns with the vision of the original documents.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing.

Nikki Deforge, representing RRAD, thanked the Staff and the applicant for the progress they made on improving the plan in many areas. However, RRAD had continuing concerns that they hoped would eventually be addressed. Ms. Deforge stated that a number of the remaining issues would need to be addressed before this development could be approved. Ms. Deforge stated that she had not intended to discuss the framework for the review based on the Staff report; however, some of the comments made in the slides presented this evening made her realize that they still do not fully understand the framework. Ms. Deforge noted that the Staff report outlined the three paths that the different aspects would be viewed through; the no material change, the newly applied for, and the substantive amendment. She remarked that a chart above those in the Staff report specified which of the different issues are reviewed under which standard. Ms. Deforge believed that was generally correct, but one of the screens that was shared showing the framework pulled in a number of things into the newly applied for category that was not shown on the chart and was not correct. Ms. Deforge stated that the only newly applied for items are the perimeter setbacks and building height exceptions. Most everything else is a substantive amendment because it is not newly applied for. She wanted to make sure there is not that disconnect moving forward in terms of the framework, that they are consistent in approaching it, and what they see presented at each meeting is the same as what they see in the Staff report.

Ms. Deforge had prepared a PowerPoint presentation. She commented on the transportation and connectivity issues. She stated that RRAD endorses the idea of transit first, and that needs to guide the design and the development rather than being dictated by the design and development. She thought the plans presented were more

of a secondary consideration. The developer has designed first, and based on that design, is trying to fix the transit and transportation issues created by the design. To the extent that it cannot be fixed, they throw up their hands and say Empire is a disaster, all of the parking is concentrated in one corner with all the pedestrians and vehicles, but there is nothing they can do about it. They work with that design and then accept the transportation mess. Ms. Deforge recognized that the applicant tries to mitigate it as much as possible, but they do not try to change the design to fix any of those issues. She sees that continuing on the transit issue with the plans that were presented that are not showing crosswalks, sidewalks, bike lanes, or all the driveways. These considerations appear to be secondary and because of that, they will end up not with a public/private partnership, but rather the private design dictating the public transportation issues and problems.

Ms. Deforge agreed with the Planning Staff that this development is a generational opportunity, but she felt like the City was being reactive to the developer's plans rather than proactive in making sure the plans work for the community. Ms. Deforge stated that if the design creates untenable transportation, transit and pedestrian situations they cannot accept the design. It would be far more optimal to work with the developer at this stage and require them to make the necessary adjustments. Ms. Deforge thought Parcel B was a good example. The applicant made some improvements, but it will still create a traffic nightmare because 65% of the day skier parking is on Parcel B. It is where most of the pedestrians would be and where cars will be coming and going, and it pushes all the traffic under Scenario 1b on to Empire. Ms. Deforge remarked that according to the Staff report, Empire capacity is 800 cars per hour. Under the plan preferred by the developer they will see 1200 cars per hour on Empire, which is a residential street. In addition, almost 2700 pedestrians will be crossing Lowell in a single a.m. peak hour. Ms. Deforge did not believe they had enough information to see the impacts. They were given vehicle numbers but not pedestrian numbers, and they cannot see where they are concentrated. Ms. Deforge thought some of the estimates were low regarding pedestrians. She pointed out that the tables provided indicate 2800 housing units within a quarter mile, and 2.4 people walking per unit which equates to 6700 pedestrians per day. To say that only 2600 pedestrians will be crossing Lowell is not accurate.

Ms. Deforge commented on parking, particularly the day skier parking in Parcel B. She noted that the Development Agreement required 1800 underground day skier parking spaces. This developer reduced that parking to 1200 space, which are currently taken up by 9:30 a.m. every day of the week even with Covid, limited passes, and lack of snow. Ms. Deforge pointed out that they were now talking about reducing the parking to 800 spaces and pull 400 spaces off site. She remarked that the 1800 spaces required in the DA was based on the density in the development at that time. Ms. Deforge

stated that if they intend to pull parking off this site, they need to go back and look at the numbers originally required and think about why they were agreeing to a loss of 1,000 parking spaces on the site. Ms. Deforge stated that moving some of the parking off of Parcel B would go a long way in fixing the transit, circulation and transportation issues. It will separate the pedestrians and it will separate and disburse the traffic. It will keep a lot of the traffic off of Empire because cars all of the cars will not be using the three or four parking garages and entrances on Parcel B. It will require the traffic to disburse over Empire and it will be consistent with the DA. Ms. Deforge recommended thinking outside the box and think of solutions rather than just accepting the developer's design and a circulation and transit situation that does not really work to accommodate the design.

Ms. Deforge remarked that RRAD needed additional information in order to evaluate this development, many of which were mentioned in the Staff report such as updating the vehicle counts to match the current plans and show where the pedestrian traffic is concentrated. As of now, the pedestrians will be over on parcel B. They need to update the calculations of the hotel rooms and the parking spaces to match the current plans, and consider the transfer of 14,000 sf from Parcel D to the hotel on Parcel C. She pointed out that no one had discussed the impact that would have on transportation and connectivity. Ms. Deforge stated that they also need to include the sidewalks, crosswalks, bike lanes and driveways, including the townhouses on Empire. Without that information they cannot analyze the plans well enough to end up with a good plan for the community.

Ms. Deforge stated that these were RRAD's initial thoughts regarding transportation and circulation. As they get more information, they will be able to provide more substantive feedback. They hoped the City would look at this as an opportunity, but that it will not be dictated by the design to potentially create another bad situation around the Resort.

Regarding the design updates, Ms. Deforge pointed out a number of issues that still need to be addressed. She noted that the proposed maximum building heights are currently 74' to 80' above grade, which is more than double the 35' allowed under the LMC. They should not lose sight of the significant increase over what the LMC allows. Ms. Deforge thought it was even more apparent when they look at this development with boots on the ground. They talk about grade, but because of the slope, in some places they are talking about 100' above the grade. Ms. Deforge referred to comments in the Staff report about these heights being consistent with the adjacent properties. She did not believe that was true. The residential houses on Empire and in the Resort area are all two to four stories with the exception of one building. She disputes that these six, seven, eight story buildings are consistent with the Resort area properties. Ms. Deforge pointed out that the only building taller than four stories in the entire area is

the Marriot Mountainside. That building was intentionally to keep the height against the mountain and away from the adjacent properties and away from the street. The building steps up significantly at multiple levels until it reaches the peak height up against the mountain. Ms. Deforge stated that the drawings presented this evening were completely unlike the Marriott Mountainside. In the PEG Development, the heights are the highest where the setbacks are reduced the most. They are right up against the streets and right up against the neighborhood homes. Ms. Deforge stated that it is important to go back to the LMC requirements and look at what is actually required for the Planning Commission to grant a height variance. There are six conditions and each one must be met. The first is that the increased height does not result in increased square footage or building volume. The second is that the buildings need to be positioned to minimize visual impacts on adjacent structures. It also addresses the stepping issue and these plans do not step. Ms. Deforge remarked that the developer seems to think that stepping means adding a little architectural variation. She pointed out that stepping requires minimizing the visual impacts on the street level and on the adjacent neighborhoods. The building should be significantly pushed back from the street and properties to minimize the height, but that is not shown in the proposed plans. Ms. Deforge provided examples to support her comments about the buildings not being stepped. The third condition is adequate landscaping and buffering. She pointed out that landscaping plans have not been submitted so they were unable to know if that condition was met. Ms. Deforge stated that the fourth condition is crucial because it requires increased setbacks and separations from adjacent projects in order to grant height variances. Ms. Deforge noted that there are no increased setbacks along the portions of the project where the heights are the highest, and they often have reduced setbacks while doubling the maximum height. When one end goes up higher, the other end needs to be reduced, but they are not seeing those reductions. Ms. Deforge provided examples to support her comments. Ms. Deforge stated that the fifth condition is that it must result in more than a minimum amount of publicly accessible open space. She agreed with the Staff that the developer still needed to provide updated calculations based on the updated plans. They need to know what the developer is claiming as open space and what is publicly accessible as opposed to private amenities. Ms. Deforge noted that the sixth condition is that the additional building height must be designed to provide a transition in roof elements in compliance with Chapter 15-5 of the LMC. She believed that would implicate the stepping issue as well.

Ms. Deforge reiterated that all six conditions need to be met before the Planning Commission can grant a height variance. The burden is on the developer to show the six conditions are met, and the Planning Commission needs to make findings that all six are met. She stated that the Planning Commission cannot make those findings based on the plans as currently proposed.

Ms. Deforge noted that the developer has asked for setback reductions throughout the project. The Commissioners cannot just grant the setbacks reductions. The standard is only if setback reductions are necessary for architectural interest and variations. Ms. Deforge stated that a setback reduction is not necessary for architectural interest and variation just because the developer proposes to go taller without it. She pointed out that they would not have the right to go taller because the height must meet the 35' maximum. Ms. Deforge remarked that when a developer comes in with an application, they are required to work within the building envelope, the height maximums, open space requirements, facade variation requirements and many other requirements to meet. It is not a justification for the developer to say they cannot comply with all the requirements of the LMC without setback and/or height exceptions. Ms. Deforge emphasized that the City does not owe this developer and they cannot ignore the provisions of the LMC without good reason. She pointed out that the developer implied that there are no setbacks less than 20' in the plan; however, the Staff said there is. The LMC does not provide any discretion to the Planning Commission to allow those and RRAD hoped the final plans would be free of any such setbacks.

Ms. Deforge commented on affordable and employee housing. She noted that the Staff had suggested moving employee housing off site and RRAD agreed with doing that. They believe that all the affordable and employee housing should be moved off site, and shuttles should be provided for the employee house. It would go a long way towards addressing some of the issues. Ms. Deforge stated that RRAD agrees with the Staff that the updated calculations are needed, and that clarifications are needed as to what is being claimed as publicly accessible.

Ms. Deforge appreciated the improvements and the work that was being done, especially by the Staff, in evaluating the project. RRAD hoped that the traffic issues would be looked at more critically and less reactively. They wanted to make sure that this generational opportunity results in something that works for the community instead of a development that was foisted on the community because they liked the developer's plan. In the end, they need to think about the residents that live in this area and their interests need to take priority.

The following speakers raised their hand on Zoom and were unmuted to make comments.

Sherie Harding, heard why PEG dispensed with the realignment of Lowell Avenue. She stated that the realignment was a key component of the 1998 concept master plan which highlighted the gateway to Park City Mountain, as well as numerous other benefits they were just beginning to recognize. Ms. Harding stated that this realignment

is very appealing as they consider site circulation. She pointed out that Julia Collins talked about transit first, a dedicated transit lane, and a BRT. Ms. Harding agreed that Scenario 2B looked like the best option and it advances Park City's objectives. Ms. Harding remarked that with realignment, the Lowell/Silver King traffic light could disappear, leaving three new signals rather than four. Secondly, with realignment the dedicated transit lane delivers skiers and shoppers directly and more quickly to the south Lowell transit center. The road is on the diagonal. Also, with realignment more space is available on Parcel E to resolve those disturbingly abundant issues of pedestrian safety, height, setbacks, shadows, etc. Ms. Harding stated that the decreased footprint is not an advantage on Parcel E. It is an excuse for a monolithic structure. Ms. Harding remarked that with realignment, underground parking under Parcel E could actually be entered sooner. Ms. Harding asked the Planning Commission to at least consider the realignment of Lowell. It is a brilliant piece of the 1998 plan, and they should incorporate that option into the traffic and transit studies. Ms. Harding thought the aerial views of the project that were presented this evening points out the improvement offered by the realignment of Lowell Avenue. She emphasized that the realignment needs to be reconsidered. Ms. Harding stated that utilities can be moved, and more dramatic things have been done with other developments in Park City.

Angelica Palank-Harlet stated that she and her husband own Unit 30 in the Snowflower which is immediate to Parcel E. They have had a lot of concerns about traffic flow and other impacts from this development on their property, the property values, and the pleasure of their use of those properties. Ms. Palank-Harlet absolutely opposed traffic option 3a, at least on grade. She stated that if an entire transit lane can go undergrade, why could they not put pedestrian lanes undergrade or pedestrian catwalks to keep pedestrians and vehicles from interfering with each other. It would provide better flow and better safety all around. Ms. Palank-Harlet commented on the variances and exceptions being requested, and she agreed with Ms. Deforge that no developer has an authorized right to an affirmative vote from the Planning Commission or anyone else because they give a pretty picture. She noted that they have all seen situations where developers come in with pretty pictures, get their rights vested, and then sell off to someone else who gets the exceptions but builds a different picture. Ms. Palank-Harlet stated that having the 88' height next to her windows is offensive. Without at least a landscape plan that shows the ability to screen the vast majority of the building from her view, it is not an acceptable approval. She stated that the building heights do not have to be that height just because it is what the developer wants. Ms. Palank-Harlet stated that if the developer is going to consider running a traffic pattern between Building E and the Snowflower, she would find that exceedingly offensive and unacceptable. If the developer needs to marry Parcel E to Parcel D across the way, they will need to figure out something different. If they were to go in the traffic pattern between Parcels E and

C and then loop back behind D, they would not be interfering with any other buildings. Ms. Palank-Harlet believed more creative solutions could be explored. She also did not think they should be eliminating parking spaces. There should be a charge for parking and the parking should be expensive because it encourages people to make a dollar decision to take mass transit rather than impinge upon the residents parking. She was concerned that Snowflower would need to hire someone to make sure those going to the Resort do not try to use their limited parking. Ms. Palank-Harlet asked the Planning Commission to consider those who were there before and who helped create the value in this property that the developer is now enjoying. She had no problem with it being developed, but it needs to be done in a way that does not reduce their value in order for the developer to make a profit.

Deborah Rentfrow stated that with regards to the circulation, AECOM had pointed out 2500 plus pedestrians crossing Lowell per hour. She remarked that the way the building is currently designed for Parcel B, they are more than doubling the number of parking spaces on Parcel B as of today. Ms. Rentfrow thought it was important to understand that the 2500 pedestrians is grossly understated for what it would be with the new development. She believed that needs to be taken into consideration when they look at the various scenarios. Ms. Rentfrow stated that because they were only looking at this in terms of what exists today, she asked if it takes into account the 249 hotel rooms and the 150 additional condos, the affordable housing and the employee housing in their figures.

Planner Ananth stated that the scenarios shown this evening all include the proposed plans. It was not the existing conditions, but the additional parking on Parcel B, as well as the number of trips created by the development. Chair Phillips clarified that the developer had accounted for full buildout in all the scenarios.

Ms. Rentfrow referred to Scenario 2b. She stated that the section where Empire is failing both north and south is between Shadow Ridge and Silver King. She recalled at one point the developer talked about a one-way loop that went all the way around. She asked if any consideration was given to making that two lanes northbound, one-way only between Shadow Ridge and Silver King. She noted that 14th Street is south of Shadow Ridge. People who live on Empire and Lowell could travel up Park Avenue or Woodside and come up 14th Street and head southbound to get to their homes. Even emergency vehicles use 14th Street because she saw one use 14th Street last night. They made a left turn and went up Empire and over to the Marriott Mountainside. Ms. Rentfrow stated that emergency vehicles would have another alternative besides going through Silver King, 15th Street, around the loop in order to get there. In addition, three of the main buildings that have the majority of the residences are Powder Point, Edelweiss, and Snowblaze front both Empire and Woodside. All of their dumpsters are

on Woodside and the garbage trucks do not have to travel down Empire. It would only be that short section. Ms. Rentfrow stated that she had not discussed her idea with anyone else, but she thought it might be worth considering because of the failure on Empire in that short stretch.

Ms. Rentfrow stated that her primary concern with Scenario 3a is when the bus comes out from underground. They talked about it being in a couple different places and she wondered how it would impact the NAC drop-off, parking, etc. She had grave concerns about the potential negative impact on the NAC if they go with that scenario. Ms. Rentfrow did not understand why there was not a hoc signal for Scenario 3a. She also did not understand why there was no light at Empire and Shadow Ridge. Ms. Rentfrow stated that she is very pro dedicated bus lanes. However, she agrees with Commissioner Kenworthy and others about fixing it from far out. If it still takes 25 minutes to get from the high school satellite parking lot to the corner of Empire/Park Avenue/SR224, the 25 minutes sitting on the bus will discourage people from using transit.

Ms. Rentfrow commented on building design. She thought the 14th Street corridor was a great improvement. Ms. Rentfrow remarked that parking data was not included with each parcel in its programming. She thought this was a problem because it goes to building height and massing, and the setbacks requests. She pointed out that a lot of the massing is attributed to the parking and that information needs to be included in order to do a complete assessment. Ms. Rentfrow noted that the Staff had suggested that the developer consider a payment in lieu to move a floor of affordable housing. She agreed and pointed out that the 1998 Development Agreement had employee housing off site. She was in favor of having the developer making a payment in lieu to move all of the affordable housing off site. This would allow the developer to spread the 73 condos across the parcel and reduce the height of the entire parcel. As to the parking that is causing some of the additional building height, Ms. Rentfrow stated that the highest level of parking in the 1998 plan was at 6940. PEG's highest level is at 6952. That is one level above grade at the corner of Lowell and Manor Way, which is the highest point of the entire parcel. It then goes clear across the whole parcel. She stated that eliminating that one level of parking they could bring the whole building down a level. If they do the payment in lieu for affordable housing, the result would be a significant reduction in height and massing for that parcel. Ms. Rentfrow stated had an issue with stepping on the majority of the parcels. Manor Way and Empire goes from three to seven stories. Shadow Ridge and Empire is six stories. She pointed out that Shadow Ridge across the street is only four stories and it goes downhill.

Ms. Rentfrow commented on setback exceptions. She noted that the developer was not requesting a setback exception on Manor Way. She pointed out that there are no

residences that face Parcel B on that end of the building, yet that is the only end where they are not requesting an exception. She agreed with Ms. Deforge that if they are going for additional building height, they must have increased setbacks, and if should definitely be done on the residential sides of the parcel rather than the side that does not have residences opposite from it. Ms. Rentfrow noted for Parcel C the developer talks about having excessive setbacks on the backside of Parcel C, which is towards the mountain. However, on the front side they want reduced setbacks. She did not understand the logic. Ms. Rentfrow noted that Parcel C still exceeds the square footage. It is a six-story building with very little stepping on the north end. Ms. Rentfrow stated that the loading dock will have an impact with any plan they choose because that loading dock is on Lowell and it requires the vehicle to back in. It is not a hairpin turn. If trucks need to unload, they will need to actually pull in and back into the loading dock, which will certainly stop traffic. Ms. Rentfrow noted that the northeast side of Parcel D does not step down. It is a five-story building across from existing three-story buildings. Ms. Rentfrow stated that Parcel E is monolithic and unappealing. The developer talks about how wonderful it is on the plaza side, but they need to also consider the adjacent properties. In comparison to the Three Kings Condos and Snowflower, it is absurd. She did not believe the smaller parcel was justification for excessive building height or setbacks. Ms. Rentfrow stated that she looked at the square footage table and found that the developer cut the resort accessory use square footage by over 50%. She looked up what is included in resort accessory use, and it includes ski patrol and medical clinic. She noted that they have yet to hear any plans specifically addressing those items. A medical clinic and a helicopter pad are very important. This issue cannot be overlooked and must be addressed. She thought it was interesting that the developer was cutting the square footage for that type of usage in Parcel E.

Ms. Rentfrow stated that the developer keeps talking about activating the lower base, but there needs to be connectivity to the existing base. She had not seen any drawings that shows how the developer plans to connect the two. Ms. Rentfrow referred to a comment by Mr. Tursic about not realigning Lowell at Silver King and Empire and how currently when you approach that intersection you see a snowbank and parked cars. She asked if they intend to regrade that parcel to almost a street level grade to get the benefit of that view.

Justin Keys appreciated the time the developer has taken to meeting with him and others to discuss their concerns. He represents the Three Kings HOA. Mr. Keys stated that he had submitted a written letter for the last traffic discussion, and he believed those same points still resonate. He found it disturbing that some of the issues still need to be addressed. Mr. Keys appreciated the efforts to try to address public transit because it is an important issue; however, some of the plans do not work well. He definitely opposed the 3a plan because it would direct all the public transit up Silver

King Drive, which is very narrow in front of Building E. There is not enough room to expand it to the number of lanes necessary for dedicated transit lanes and still have residential access. It is one of the primary accesses to the Three Kings community. He has not seen a study indicating that there is enough room to expand to four lanes in that section. Mr. Keys thought it would also create an unworkable scenario in that junction of Three Kings Drive and Silver King. Buses would be turning into the traffic circle at the same time that other buses, which were not accounted for in the study, are coming down Three Kings Drive because it is currently on the public bus route. There is an existing bus stop across the street from the proposed Building E that many skiers use. Everything would need to be coordinated to funnel into whatever dedicated bus route would be running behind Building E.

Mr. Keys did not see where they had addressed pedestrian and bicycle use. As stated in LMC 15-6-5(G), when looking at these types of projects they need to see whether there is adequate internal vehicular/pedestrian/bicycle circulation. Mr. Keys heard a lot of discussion about vehicular circulation, but there was nothing about other types of movement. Many residents within Three Kings walk every day across the street to access the mountain. He appreciated that the developer was proposing an actual path behind Building E, which the Three Kings residents have a right to use via a prescriptive easement. However, he was unsure how that would work if buses were running over the same exact path as shown in Scenario 3a. Mr. Keys was uncomfortable as to what is truly being proposed when everyone ranging in age from 9 to 90 will be crossing at that point. Mr. Keys stated that in his very first meeting with PEG Development they talked about the need for a plan of how people will cross that section and access the mountain. At this point, there is still not even a crosswalk or talk about painting stripes on the road. Mr. Keys pointed out that in a previous public hearing he had said that Building E in this section of Silver King was somewhat overlooked by the traffic patterns proposed. He appreciated that it was no longer overlooked, but what they have is more traffic being pushed that road. It is the primary access to the mountain for emergency services and he assumed that would continue to be the case. There is still the loading dock and commercial uses that are still unaccounted for in any of the studies would also be coming up Silver King Drive. Mr. Keys stated that a worst-case scenario for Three Kings residents is a circumstance where they could have all the public transportation coming up Silver King Drive, which is a two-lane road, in addition to all the commercial traffic to service Vail, and another 440 days skiers who will be parking under Building E. They would all be using the same two-lane road that the Three Kings residents use to access their homes. Mr. Keys thought it was important to fully address that situation, as well as pedestrian and bicycle uses that are prevalent in that location.

Mr. Keys thought Scenario 2b was a better approach, but there were still outstanding concerns about pushing a lot of traffic up Building E without a specific plan. He

understood that the developer has talked about putting a dedicated turning lane to avoid a log jam of traffic at that light that would prevent the Three Kings residents from accessing or leaving their homes. He has not seen a dedicated turn lane in any of the plans and he thought it might be impossible under some of the proposals presented.

In terms of massing, Mr. Keys agreed with Ms. Deforge and others who said what was being proposed is a monolithic structure as it relates to Building E in particular. He noted that the building directly across the street is two stories. He had not seen a shadow study, but he believed if a shadow study is done, given where that building is located directly to the south and being 88' above a grade that will be higher than the current grade, that building is likely to spend most of the day shaded. He pointed out that the Code discourages that type of construction, which is why there is supposed to be a transition into surrounding uses. One way to do that is to step the building back. He thought it was ironic that Building E steps, but it steps on the south side away from the plaza, the hotel, and the internal side of this development, rather than stepping away from the existing residential uses. He believed a better architectural look would be to account for the surrounding low-density residential uses by stepping away from those uses. He would like to see a proposal addressing that issue. Mr. Keys understood the developer's predicament in terms of the cost to reroute Lowell, including moving all the utilities, but he agreed with Ms. Harding that it would result in a better project. He pointed out that the Code states that the project should be designed to fit the site. The site should not be modified to fit the project. He remarked that the developer was trying to squeeze a lot of density into a very small space because their footprint was cut back. He thought the developer has acknowledged that Building E was the most dramatic change from the original approved site plan. Mr. Keys appreciated that the developer did cut back on the residential density in that building, but based on his reading, he believed other density was added in that building. Some of the residential reduction was exchanged for retail uses in the lower section on the south end facing the plaza. He understood the reasoning, but it needs to be acknowledged in the density discussion.

Mr. Keys stated that everyone at Three Kings understands the developer has the right to construct this development and they are excited to be their neighbors. They appreciated the developer's time to meet with the residents and listen to their concerns, but they would like to see changes in the proposals to address those concerns. The concerns were expressed directly to the developer, they were submitted in writing, and he has raised them in the public hearing.

Doug Lee, a resident on Empire Avenue, thanked Mr. Schmidt and the entire PEG team for having listened to the community and taking some of their concerns to heart. Mr. Lee agreed with all the comments from the previous speakers. Mr. Lee commented on

setbacks. He stated that as they know from Woodside II, there is a strong legal precedent that the setbacks must be necessary for architectural interest and variation. Setbacks are not necessary to help the developer fit their square footage within the building envelope. Mr. Lee noted that the developer continues to make that argument, but his response is if they want to include the articulation, they should shrink the perimeter of the building five feet, which would give them room to project five feet wherever they want it. Mr. Lee believed this could be accomplished by moving some of the mass more internal. It is a simple solution. Mr. Lee was encouraged that Planner Ananth had included accurate FAR square footage calculations for the entire project on page 116 of the Staff report. As talked several times over the last few months, the project continues to be well over the permitted maximum FAR in the DA and MPD on Parcel B and Parcel C. They are 25,000 square feet over on Parcel B and 31,000 square feet on Parcel C. There is not only a prohibition on shifting density, but the square footage currently proposed violate the maximum permitted square footage numbers in the Development Agreement and the MPD.

Mr. Lee commented on traffic. He stated that in looking at Scenarios 2b, 3a, and 3b on pages 13, 14, and 15 of the Staff report, there is a lot of red ink on the page. Red ink is a failing grade. Page 71 of the Staff report, which is the final page of the Hales study, shows that intersections are labeled with a grade of F. These are failing intersections. It includes the current scheme as well as Scenarios 2b, 3a, and 3b. Mr. Lee pointed out that there are extensive comments in the General Plan, in Vision 2020, and in the Development Agreement that the traffic from any new project must improve circulation, improve the user experience, and decrease the impact on the surrounding neighbors. He stated that with failing grades on multiple streets in each scenario, they do not have a plan that is workable, feasible or approvable.

Deborah Hickey agreed with Mr. Lee. She also agreed with all the comments by Ms. Deforge. Ms. Hickey noted that they opened the meeting this evening stating that transit is the key that makes this project work. Through the vision statement, one of the mandates is that the transit must work. In her opinion, these designs are not working. They are a response to the developer's choice for where to place the buildings even though this is an amended situation. Ms. Hickey believed this project was at a roadblock, and they redesigned the project to fit the transit problems. She thought it appeared that they would be taking away more access from local people who would normally park there by adding employee parking, reduced ownership parking, condo parking, and hotel parking. All of those new initiatives have taken precedence over giving the local people access to reach the Resort. Ms. Hickey questioned the loops that were created in the scenarios. She lives in the Silver King and it seems like everything is being directed up and around Silver King and Shadow Ridge without consideration for those residents who are surrounded by the traffic flow. Ms. Hickey

thought there must be better ways to disseminate the traffic amongst all the streets that surround the Park City base area. Nobody wants the traffic, but it cannot only be concentrated on Lowell.

Ms. Hickey stated commented on other user groups that use Parking Lot C this winter and she wondered where those people would go when that area is developed. Ms. Hickey was in favor of moving employee and low-income housing off site in an effort to reduce the size of the buildings. She stated that the developers added the Shadow Ridge buildings on the map, but she questioned whether they were drawn to scale because they still feel dwarfed by the enormous heights surrounding the Silver King. She was certain that large shadows would be created and there will be icy walkways. Ms. Hickey remarked that the entire project needs to be reconsidered with access and traffic as a priority. Then they can see what fits for the density the developer is proposing, and what fits to have a beautiful and comfortable route for people to enjoy skiing. She stated that if it is too difficult to take the bus, people will be deterred from coming to the Resort. Ms. Hickey was adamant that the Planning Commission consider all these aspects. Traffic is key as the Vision Plan has stated, and they need to redesign the project to make it easy for people to get to the Resort so everyone can live there comfortably and still enjoy their location.

Chair Phillips closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated that he specifically invited Pete Williams from Snow Engineering Group to attend this meeting. He thought they would be remiss if they did not allow Mr. Williams time to speak. Commissioner Kenworthy explained that Snow Engineering recently completed the aerial study for the gondolas. Snow Engineering is working for Deer Valley. They are also working for Mayflower and they have worked for the City. Snow Engineering is the consultant for the applicant. In terms of mountain resort design and engineering, Snow Engineering is extremely experienced, as is AECOM. Commissioner Kenworthy was interested in hearing Mr. Williams ideas regarding parking and transit first. The Planning Commission was asking for final considerations of this transportation plan at the Resort Center, and he would like AECOM and Snow Engineering to independently come back to the Planning Commission with all the wisdom and experience they have both internationally and locally. It would give them the velocity to go ahead and accelerate their reviews and suggestions.

Based on Ms. Deforge's suggestion, Commissioner Kenworthy asked if AECOM and Snow Engineering would uncuff themselves from the contracts where they are working for the City, for Vail, and for the developer, and use all the tools in the toolbox to take one last look at this and try to figure out the most efficient way to do this. He would like

to give them a blank canvas because it is their number one concern for the community. It can either be the biggest net gain for the community or it can be a disaster.

Pete Williams with Snow Engineering was willing to take an object look and discuss some of the issues. Mr. Williams noted that a lot of discussions are going on and there are a lot of different players, but there has not been a comprehensive look at ways for people to move around the entirety of the area, and how many people per hour they want to move from one site to another. He thought it would be interesting to look.

Mr. Williams stated that from the standpoint of these specific opportunities at the base area, he felt comfort in the analysis that unless something big changes, such as a gondola or something else that could deliver 3,000 plus people in the morning access period, it is important to have those total parking spaces. Regardless of how you run the numbers, those spaces are used. Mr. Williams remarked that large numbers of people access Park City Mountain Resort on a big day through that portal. The question is where those people are coming from. As the situation stands right now, the 1200 surface lots, parking at the Resort Center, and parking in other places are all being used. Without something to replace that parking, it is difficult not see that demand. On the other hand, the math does not show a demand for a larger number of needed parking. It is based on looking at the demand of the numbers of people on the mountain now and projected to be in the future.

Mr. Williams acknowledged that there are issues with capacity, traffic, pedestrians, and other things. It would be fantastic if they could find a way to get those skiers into the Resort Center and up on the Mountain. A long-term goal for everyone is to have less cars coming into town, but the current demand is definitely still there.

Mr. Williams appreciated the discussion of looking at it with a clean slate and he was very interested in doing that.

Chair Phillips asked Mr. Williams if anything stood out to him from the discussion this evening. Mr. Williams replied that nothing in particular stood out. All of those methods would legitimately provide access for skiers to get onto the Mountain. The Park City transit system is a very critical way for people to get to the Resort and maintain a clear route for them to get on the Mountain. Mr. Williams thought transit first was a great way to encourage people to use transit. He believed all the proposed techniques will get people there. Mr. Williams stated that a benefit of the plan is that 700 skiers will not have to drive to the Resort. They can get on an elevator, put on their skis, and head up the Mountain. He remarked that any time they can reduce the demand for people coming in by car via any another method will be a benefit. Any and all techniques are

beneficial from the standpoint of efficiency for getting people onto the Mountain and reducing the congestion in the base area.

Commissioner Kenworthy appreciated that Mr. Williams was open to an independent review. He did not think the Planning Commission would get two better opinions given the years of experience and the wisdom of both AECOM and Snow Engineering. If they do it independently, it will be interesting to see where they overlap. He asked if AECOM and Snow Engineering would be able to do the work and report back on February 17th. Mr. Williams stated that it was possible from his standpoint. Laynee Jones replied that AECOM would be ready to come back in February.

Commissioner Thimm noted that the Staff report requested that the Commissioners provide input as to whether they thought the existing base mountain development should be brought into the conversation concerning traffic and circulation. He personally thought it absolutely should be part of the conversation. Commissioner Thimm suggested that it could even extend to consideration of determining how much staff actually comes into the site adding to the traffic and parking, and if there is some way of setting up a shuttle system.

Commissioner Thimm noted that both the Staff report and public input mentioned fee-in-lieu of work force housing on the site. He thought the fee-in-lieu would be a mistake. In terms of traffic and parking, having a work force that is able to walk to work makes sense. Commissioner Thimm did not think work force housing should be moved away from the development.

Commissioner Thimm was unsure about the number of parking stalls being 1200 or 1800. He needed to further look at the studies to understand it. He agreed with Commissioner Suesser that if there is a fee to park it would be interesting to see whether it would make difference. If the charge was a significant amount, the question is whether people would actually park elsewhere and shuttle in, and what that would mean in terms of the number of stalls actually needed. He thought it would be a shame to build too many stalls and have them stand empty. However, it would be a bigger shame to not build enough and have parking impact the surrounding neighborhoods. Commissioner Thimm stated that the balance needs to be well understood.

Commissioner Thimm noted that open space was briefly touched on this evening. He would like the Staff to do a complete analysis of the open space and provide findings on what is required, what is being provided, and how it compares to the 1998 approval.

With regard to architecture and exceptions to heights and setbacks, Commissioner Thimm noted that for the last several months the Commissioners have asked the

applicant to look at this through the lens of the 1998 approval. That comparison was finally provided in the Staff report and the presentation given this evening, and he appreciated the effort. Commissioner Thimm stated that he now understands much better how the massing is being apportioned about the site and how it compares to the 1998 approval. Commissioner Thimm remarked that what occurs along Empire Avenue at the Building B site is a vast improvement. He believed that acknowledging that the applicant was listening to them was a gross understatement. Major changes have been made along there compared to what was first presented. The first submittal had an exposed parking structure along much of Empire Avenue, and that has since been changed. There is scale, they have circulation and pedestrian access through the site, and they have a view corridor. He thought the plan had come a long way. Commissioner Thimm stated that consistent with his previous comments, he continues to support the idea of moving square footage and height from Building D to Building C. There would be an increase to that site, but in looking at the overall project, there would be an overall decrease in square footage and, therefore, intensity of use. Commissioner Thimm stated that in general, having the heights move in that direction has been good. It appears from the exhibits this evening that there is some continuity between what is being presented and what was presented in 1998. Commissioner Thimm was still concerned about the east end of Building D. It is a stark facade along Empire Avenue, and it should be looked at closer.

In terms of setback justification, Commissioner Thimm felt the criteria was starting to be addressed. Findings need to be made on a situation-by-situation basis, that they are matching up with what the LMC says is required to allow for the reduced setback. Commissioner Thimm saw evidence of adherence to that requirement on many of the parcels, with the exception of Building D.

Commissioner Suesser echoed Commissioner Thimm's comments. She had provided her comments regarding circulation earlier in the meeting. Commissioner Suesser heard the comments about the requirement for these height exceptions requiring the stepping up. She did not believe there was enough stepping in this project and she would be looking at that closely in terms of the building heights, especially Building D and the high point of Building B. Commissioner Suesser agreed that a lot of progress has been made, particularly on Building B, the access way, and the townhomes. She appreciated that the developer listened to their comments and were proposing better and better solutions for this development.

Commissioner Van Dine agreed completely with Commissioners Thimm and Suesser. She did not think they should decrease the parking because they already use the existing parking. She was not opposed to paid parking, but the number of parking stalls should not be reduced. Commissioner Van Dine appreciated the changes to Lot B and

she thought more work could be done. Regarding the stepping and setback exceptions, she believed they would have a hard time justifying the architectural design element with what has been presented so far. Commissioner Van Dine appreciated the changes to the transit and she thought even more improvements could be done. She appreciated the developer's willingness to listen to their comments and provide other options. She was especially pleased to hear their willingness to look at the pedestrian bridge as suggested by Commissioner Kenworthy and how that might be an option with the changes to Parcel B. She also like the dedicated crossing area in Scenario 2B. Commissioner Van Dine looked forward to seeing further revisions at the next meeting.

Chair Phillips remarked that the applicant continues to make adjustments as acknowledged by the public and the Commissioners. He thought the developer had done a good job and he assumed they would take the comments from this evening and move forward with further adjustments on heights, facades, and stepping. Chair Phillips noted that the Planning Commission previously asked for shadow studies. He thought this was a good time for that study because it may help determine where some of those changes need to occur.

Chair Phillips stated that he always felt that the employee/affordable housing should be onsite. He noted that moving some of the affordable housing offsite will reduce the mass of the buildings and reduce parking, but it will also increase traffic. The balance is finding the right place to move it. He would continue to listen to the arguments on both sides, and he was also interested in getting an opinion from the Housing Authority. Chair Phillips had the same conflict with parking. There are a lot of people looking at the best place for parking and he anticipated a more robust parking discussion at the next meeting. Chair Phillips understood the philosophy of reducing parking because it helps the City-wide goals of reducing traffic coming into town. However, not having enough parking could be devastating. Chair Phillips remarked that insufficient parking is a problem that is difficult to fix later. He believed that evidence from the professionals would help point them in the right direction to make that decision.

Chair Phillips favored the 2b solution. He thought Scenario 3a was more problematic. Commissioner Suesser thought there was confusion about Scenario 3A. She thought that it was underground. Chair Phillips recalled that most of it was based underground and there was some discussion on above ground. At this point, he did not believe anyone was thinking that above ground was a good solution. Chair Phillips felt there were other issues with Scenario 3a as well.

Commissioner Van Dine reported that she had received comments from Commissioner Hall that she was asked to read into the record this evening. She had also forwarded the emailed with Commissioner Hall's comments to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Van Dine read the emailed comments from Commissioner Hall as follows:

Commissioner Hall stated that she was unable to participate but she was sending her input on transportation. 1) Per page 7 question in the Staff Report, yes. I would like the applicant and Staff to approach Vail to expand offsite parking strategies. For example, on a random Tuesday at 8:30, especially last Tuesday, the PCMR parking lots were about two-thirds full because of Staff parking and early bird skiers. This was neither a powder day nor a holiday. Every time I drive by the Ecker Park and Ride it is essentially empty, including pre-Covid times. People, particularly employees, need to use the various park and rides. She would like to require this on some level. Additionally, she would like to find a true incentive for skiers as well. i.e., \$1 food credit for bus ride, free meal after five rides, free Epic hat after ten rides. Raffles for first tracks. Free ski valet, etc. If only 12% of people continue to arrive via bus/shuttle, we are failing. She knows UDOT is outside of their jurisdiction, but she wanted to know if there was any way to bring back the plan to make the middle lane a bus lane going with traffic to expedite bus travel time. Arriving faster at PCMR is definitely an incentive. Please add winter and summer bike parking. 2) Per page 8, yes, please add employee trips to this analysis. This is vital information to ensure that parking and traffic impacts are mitigated and is required for approval. 3) Per Scenario starting on page 11, she was interested in learning more about the logistics of 3a. Commissioner Hall looked forward to the expected reports and notes on Exhibit A that will be beneficial to this discussion.

Mr. Schmidt appreciated the comments and the conversation this evening. As he listened to the discussion regarding the request for a setback variance, he noted that the language reads "necessary to provide architectural variation". However, he did not see where architectural variation is specifically defined within the Code. Mr. Schmidt believed the Code gives the discretion to the Planning Commission to make the determination of necessary. He stated that they are at a master plan level, and the question is whether they want to see more variation in the facade as it is depicted, or if they prefer staying within the 25' with the implications. They would comply with the Code, even though the Code is not as robust in providing the variation the developer would like to provide with the exception. Mr. Schmidt reiterated his belief that the latitude is given to the Planning Commission to make the determination. Regarding the building height, Mr. Schmidt noted that it was discussed in November where they talked about the justifications and how the developer felt they were meeting those justifications. He referred back to the November discussion, and assumed it would be discussed further.

Mr. Schmidt stated that their traffic engineer, Ryan Hales, was prepared to talk about the realignment of Lowell and why it does or does not make sense. He asked if the

Planning Commission was interested in hearing from Mr. Hales or if they preferred to let the consultants have that discussion.

Commissioner Suesser was interested in hearing from Mr. Hale, but it did not need to be tonight. There are problems with Lowell now and that will only continue. The little job in Lowell creates a lot of problems. Mr. Schmidt stated that if Commissioner Suesser was talking about the jog on Lowell at Shadow Ridge, they were proposing to straighten that out to make a smoother transition. They were talking about the realignment of Lowell described in the 1998 plan. Mr. Schmidt suggested allowing Mr. Hales to give a brief explanation of why that realignment does not make sense from a traffic standpoint, and they will work with the consultants to get more details.

Ryan Hales stated that the little jog will be difficult to bring everybody together. A lot of traffic occurs at that intersection and the more they condense it all together they harder it will be. If there is a right turn, they can get many of those vehicles to round the corner fairly quickly, it works well. If they bring some back the opposite direction it becomes more difficult. Mr. Hales stated that in the 1998 study that was completed by Sear Brown, approximately 760 cars were entering during the peak hour. Currently, they anticipated 1200 to 1500, which increases the volume of back up traffic by 25%. Mr. Hales stated that they are working on this as a group. They will meet with the City and talk through this to find the best solution. They next time they come back they will be able to show sidewalks, crosswalks, and other issues.

Mr. Hales stated that they were also trying to prioritize transit. He believed they had found good solutions, but it still needed to be tweaked. He looked forward to working with the City to continue refining those as best as possible.

Mr. Schmidt appreciated everyone's time this evening and he looked forward to continued discussions at the next meeting.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: _____