

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
JANUARY 17, 2018

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair Adam Strachan, Melissa Band, Preston Campbell, John Phillips, Laura Suesser, Doug Thimm

EX OFFICIO: Planning Director, Bruce Erickson; Francisco Astorga, Planner; Assistant City Attorney Polly Samuels McLean; Jody Burnett, Outside Counsel; Anne Laurent, Community Development Director; Matt Dias, Assistant City Manager

=====

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

Chair Strachan called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director Erickson announced that January 26th is the deadline for applications to fill vacancies on the Planning Commission and for current members who wish to re-apply.

Director Erickson noted that the Staff was scheduling a potential meeting on January 24th. That discussion would take place later in the meeting. They needed to make sure there would be a quorum for that meeting and for future special meetings into February if it becomes necessary.

Director Erickson reminded everyone that the parking plan is in effect and he had the blue validation tags for people who parked in China Bridge.

NOTE: The Treasure Hill portion of the Minutes is a verbatim transcript.

Treasure Hill Conditional Use Permit, Creole Gulch and Town Lift Mid-station Sites – Sweeney Properties Master Plan (Application PL-08-00370)

Chair

Strachan: Since this is different than what we've been doing in the past, I don't know who's really going to take the lead here. So I'll just kind of throw it that way and whoever catches it can start talking.

Craig

Call: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Craig Call and I'm here representing the property owner for the alternative Treasure project. And I'd like to start out by simply explaining how committed I believe the City Staff and others who have been working on this have been. As you know, or course, Monday was a Federal Holiday, and yet several times during the day it was obvious from the communications back and forth that your Planning Department leadership and City leadership were busy trying to solve problems with this case. As were our consultants and the professionals that have been retained by both us and the City.

So I just want to appreciate---express my appreciation as the property owner's representative for all the extra work that's gone into this. That doesn't mean that we are smiling with all our arms around even the biggest question. We certainly have our arms around a lot issues so far. We've covered a lot of ground, literally. But the one major thing has been elusive, and a lot of things hang on that. That basically is the road configuration; thus the optimal location of the hotel; thus the amount of excavation; thus the amount, you know, what there is to do with it. But I don't know how anyone could work any harder. And I guess I'm willing to offer that, and then let the City leadership here speak somewhat on where we are.

Matt

Dias: Thank you. Matt Dias, Assistant City Manager. I know you're probably all anxious to see all the good work that Mr. Call said we've been doing. So I will say ditto on his comments in terms of effort and people working together. We obviously appreciate your patience and we know that you're seeking specificity. So we've been doing everything that we can to try to answer the questions that have come up over the past few weeks as we've been working on this.

There was some additional public comment that Staff received over the past two weeks, and so we want to make sure that Francisco presents that for the record prior to going through some points of the development agreement.

Planner

Astorga: Planner Astorga, Senior Planner. We received three additional public comments that were emailed to you this morning. And they're also available on our website. One is from an adjacent property owner, the North Star Homeowners Association, which they simply indicate that they prefer Alternative C. It's the one that also the City and the Commission prefers. They do request that the, that the developer and the City work on finding a secondary access. And that we maintain the ski access available for everyone. It was a short letter. Everything else, over a 100 public comments have been uploaded on our website and are available for review by anyone.

That's all I have to report on that.

Matt

Dias: Okay, so what, what I have here in front of you is I have some sort of, some deal points that have come up in the Development Agreement over the past few weeks. And these are areas where we've had a great discussion. Where you've had great discussion, also, over the past 18 months.

Just to summarize things like the housing obligation, how we're going to handle parking, how we're going to handle excavation, gross square footage for single families. I could kind of go on and on, but there seems to be these kind of six or seven, and I'll call them sticky points, that we've been debating and you've been debating over the past 18 months on how to mitigate and how to handle these issues. And we see the opportunity to try to resolve these in a potential development agreement. So, I'm going to kind of run through them from top to bottom and then offer you, obviously, the opportunity to ask us questions. If that sounds okay.

Okay, so I'll just start right from the top. We've had a lot of discussion about the housing requirements that the development would trigger. And we have agreement with, with the property owner in this revised scenario to use the 99-Resolution, which would be approximately between 8-12,000 net square feet of affordable housing. The reason we don't have the specific number is because it will ultimately be determined by the commercial uses in the hotel and the number of hotel rooms. And so that's the reason I don't have the exact number. That is the general kind of ballpark number that we are using in the Resolution. That is the foundation of that. And it's a little bit---well, it's two-fold so it can be a little

bit confusing. But since the project has been bifurcated into a commercial aspect and into a residential aspect, there are two obligations. And so we've been working on what's the best way to manage that obligation and handle them. Should we handle them together? Do we handle them separately? And so we've had a lot of discussion about that. And what we've been circling around is requiring the owner to fulfill the obligation prior to a CO, certificate of occupancy. Either the residential or commercial. And also allowing them to fulfill the obligation, the entire obligation into one aspect if they wanted to.

So, here's the hypothetical. Although the obligation is bifurcated, we could have a scenario where the hotel was developed first. And under that scenario we would allow, presumably, the entire obligation to be fulfilled at the hotel property. Conversely, if the single-family went first, the owner could fulfill the single-family obligation in that area if the hotel wasn't being built yet. And we kind of think---right now we're circling around that's the most practical, practical solution; and probably the fairest to all parties involved.

We've had a lot of discussion about fee-in-lieu. Moving the housing to other parts of the community where there's more shopping centers and services like the post office and other things. But right now we think this is probably the fairest, most transparent way to present this application.

So, with that, you know, Craig or Anne, if I've, if I've left anything out. And feel free to take questions on this aspect.

Craig
Call:

I'm happy to chime in and just make sure that there's some indication of where we can confirm what you're hearing. The, the ideal way to resolve the questions is, of course, if the hotel is built first. So, because of extended ownership we haven't yet resolved the ideal way to solve the problem if houses go first. But there are several options, one of which Matt has explained. If, for example, part of the [inaudible] complex is going to be modern income housing anyway, and we certainly expect it will be employee housing, then also we've been able to find a way to diffuse the massing of the hotel into different components on the hillside, then it may be that, part of that could be the employee housing component which could free stand. But we just need to get the final information to confirm that. That's certainly a viable option that we're exploring.

Commissioner

Suesser: Matt, could you just explain the---if, if the houses go first, how would the employee housing obligation be filled?

Matt

Dias: It would be fulfilled on site. I should, I should---

Commissioner

Suesser: Before a CO is issued for the home they'd have it on---

Matt

Dias: Correct. Before the first, and correct me if I'm wrong. Before the first single family home received its Certificate of Occupancy, they would have to fulfill the single-family obligation. Not the other obligation, which is for the commercial uses and the hotel. I should say that at any time the developer, or whoever is the ultimate developer or owner, could come in and seek to amend this. There's no reason that they couldn't say we have a good opportunity in another part of town or we have this creative idea. Nothing we would do, I would think, would preclude that unless you asked for it. So that could always be something that happens down the line. But right now knowing that there are two very distinct types of uses up there and the obligations are bifurcated, that there's a way that we can allow these to be tied together and fulfilled together, or allow them to be bifurcated in perpetuity. And just allowing that flexibility. And we're thinking right now it's maybe the way we want to go. And so we're asking for your feedback on that.

Craig

Call: If I may jump in again. Just---one of the problems we have is it's just a 16 or an 18 lots subdivision with a small hotel comparatively to what we've seen before. And so one of the problems we're trying to grapple with and make sure the owners are all in line is, what is the total cumulative overburden with all the different factors put together? I mean, it may be that once---that when all the factors are considered, you know, the removing of material, the building of the road, the preservation of all the ski slopes, the location of the hotel, and the utilities and everything else. Utilities, of course, having to be scaled almost as big as the original plan; and yet a much smaller investment to amortize that over. Maybe it will just be too much. So we certainly expect to get to a conclusion quickly about that, mainly because the biggest factor is the road, and I've already made that speak. And so it may be that we just find that the moderate income

housing requirements at the time that a house is sold makes it really difficult. But we're not there yet, and we hope we never will be. We understand what the City has required. And we also understand your experience and why you want guarantees that this is actually going to be built. And we, we fully understand that and want to make sure that it's completely understood and decided upfront. Thanks.

Commissioner

Phillips: Can, can you tell us of the 8-12,000 square feet, a portion of that is tied to the residential, a portion is tied to the commercial. Do you have any idea on how much? Because if you're talking about building---oh, I'm sorry, it's at the bottom of the page.

Matt

Dias: No, it's a good, yeah, it's a good question. And we won't know definitely, John, until---

Commissioner

Phillips: Yeah, but just ballpark.

Matt

Dias: But ball park. We've done the best we could with ball park.

Commissioner

Phillips: I apologize. It's right in front of my face.

Matt

Dias: No, that's okay. And we knew that was important to you, we knew that was important to the public. So to the extent that we could try to add specificity here, we've attempted to do that.

Commissioner

Suesser: Can you just walk through how that was calculated, the 8-12,000?

Anne

Laurent: Sure. Anne Laurent, the Community Development Director. The way the Resolution works is that you look at the different uses. And the Code talks about employee generation. And then you translate that into AUEs, and then you multiply that by 800 square feet per AUE. So each of that, like that 2.7 AUE equals times 800 square feet is 2160.

And the hotel employee generation is based on number of rooms. The single-family is number of units. So if that 18 number changed that AUE number would change, and that final number would change.

Chair

Strachan: I think it's probably best to maybe just roll through them all, and then we can give you feedback on all of them since we better look at them globally.

Matt

Dias: Great. Sounds good. Yeah, we agree. We've had a long discussion, as well as you, in terms of the parking requirements and how to park this hotel. For a variety of reasons parking equates to excavation, soils, neighborhood disruptions. And so we've had a lot of discussion about how to minimize neighborhood impacts and if there was a way that we could play with the parking requirements to attempt to mitigate neighborhood impacts. And we've been circling around a few options. And so I'll throw them out here.

The first one is, we can obviously just be true Code compliant. And it's similar to what we presented over the last few weeks, which is approximately 225 spaces of structured parking. It is dependent on some hotel rooms and other things, but that's an approximate number. But we have been consulting with our transportation team and our transit folks and other individuals who contemplate a parking reduction. A parking reduction would mean less excavation, less soils remediation, soils removal, less blasting; but we would need to make sure that we have stringent controls in terms of firm transportation plans for guests and for visitors. Ongoing monitoring, counting, making sure we're holding the property and its operations accountable. So, that is one idea is we could reduce the parking requirement by 20%.

And then we had another idea that was perhaps an additional reduction or an additional incentive could be provided if we had better connection to Old Town. I think it's in everyone's best interest if this property had better connection to Old Town. If people are going shopping or dining or wanting to go to dinner, that they don't have to be shuttled back and forth. And that would be an ideal scenario. So, we throw out there the potential to provide an additional incentive to under park the property, provided we had a very, very high end, very efficient kind of connection to Main Street that would ensure that those trips didn't need to be taken in a shuttle or a

van; which would reduce the impacts on streets like Empire from those shuttles and those trips.

So those are two, well three, excuse me, concepts that we have. The first is Code Compliance, the second is consider a 20% reduction. And the third is you could go even further some day with a new mid-mountain station and a really slick kind of people-mover. You could even contemplate maybe an additional reduction. So I throw that out there.

Commissioner

Thimm: So just looking at the map, are we talking about, with the additional reduction, a total of 55% reduction or just 15% more than the 20%?

Matt

Dias: I'm sorry, can you say that again?

Commissioner

Thimm: So it says, if I look at the third bullet point it says additional reduction 35%. Is that 35% on top of the 20% reduction, or is that a total of 35%?

Matt

Dias: Total of.

Commissioner

Thimm: Okay.

Matt

Dias: Good question. Excuse me. And so obviously we're trying to be creative. We understand we would need a very robust transportation plan, monitoring plan, to ensure that the operations warranted this type of a reduction. And we're aware of that.

Keep moving or you have anything you want to fire at me? Keep moving?

All right. Mid-station. We've had a lot of discussion about this, particularly at the last Planning Commission meeting, and even the last City Council meeting. Tentatively, we have agreed on no more than 10,000 gross square feet of resort accessory at Mid-station, and 7500 net. There's been a lot of discussion about what this Mid-station might need to be a functioning Mid-station. Whether it would need to be able to sell lift tickets, ski lockers and storage. And then obviously some type of food

and beverage. And we have worked with the owner to try to constrain having a full-service restaurant there. And I think we heard from you and from City Council that that was a concern, having a full-service restaurant there and that becoming a commercial draw and driving traffic and parking and other intensity to this, to this area. And the idea was this is truly supposed to be a skier amenity. And so we've tried to constrain it. We've constrained it with a no table service type food and beverage accessory, and employee parking only. So it's not somewhere that Anne and I can drive when we want to go mountain biking or we want to go skiing for the day and park. It is not that type of a, of a mid-station. Obviously, this is contingent upon some sort of Town Lift upgrade with, with the Resort. And we would also make sure it complied with the other zoning requirements in that zone. Height and everything else. So that's, that's where we've come on that issue. I know there's been a lot of discussion.

Keep moving? Some other items that have turned a lot of heads. You know, obviously the excavation of the reduced scale and scope of this project in and of itself, we feel like, is a major, major get for the community and for that hillside. We are trying to maintain that any uncontaminated soils remain on the site to reduce dump trucks moving in and out of this area and on neighborhood streets. Trying to use fill and other methodologies at the Resort potentially to take some of this material. And then obviously there's a caveat at the stage where the EPA has any type of contaminated soil, that that soil would need to come off. And I think we've heard from you and the City Council that you'd like us to hold the line here and try to make sure that everything can stay on site. We're working to do that.

Single-family. This has been another area that people have commented on in terms of trying to get a better definition of the total size of the homes in this area. And normally this type of a subdivision we would just apply the Code, and, and whoever the developers would come in, and there would be some type of an allotment for net square footage versus gross square footage for a garage and other type of things that typically aren't counted in the net square footage. But again, we know you've sought and the Council has sought certainty and specificity. So we've been working very, very hard with the owner to try to bring you a number and try to bring the community a number; a gross, gross square footage. I don't have for you today. I do hope to have that for you, though, next week. We hope to have a cap on the single-families, to provide you and the community with

certainty of how big those homes are. And we know that's very important [inaudible] as well.

And then finally we had previously been in here and we had said we had a, a disagreement---or I won't even call it a disagreement. The owner was requesting additional meeting space, but the owner is no longer requesting that meeting space. They are just going by the kind of Code compliant 5,000 square feet of meeting space that the Code would provide. And we just applied the percentage to it. So, positive progress there. And we know that had been a concern of yours last week.

Okay, so this is the, the elephant in the room, so to speak. Adam, I don't know if you want to take a break here and just review those items and see if there were any other questions before we dive into the, the difficult with the road and the work we've been doing there.

Chair

Strachan: Questions on those other issues? Thoughts?

Commissioner

Thimm: A couple of questions. Regarding excavation, with respect to clean soil, you said it would remain on site. Is there going to be some sort of a definition of what on-site means.

Director

Erickson: The answer is yes. And we're working on that definition as part, as part of the mitigation strategy now. But it will be at a minimum consistent with the previous MPD. And we're exploring with the owner at adjacent property, particularly the ski run, but we don't have any agreements to commit to at this point.

Commissioner

Thimm: Another quick question. It's on parking impacts, these, these reductions. Is there any kind of analysis being done or has it been done to determine viability of the 35% reduction, for example? I mean, you mentioned if a more robust mid-station were established, then that could work. Is there some sort of an analysis that says that it actually would be viable, or how do we get to that conclusion?

Matt

Dias: Well, we have a few other properties in our community that have been under parked, and they're kind of the basis for our initial run at this. And we have been working with our transportation and transit folks. But the basis of this is there are a few other hotel properties in our community.

Commissioner

Thimm: So local case studies, then?

Matt

Dias: There are some local examples. And I think Bruce can probably sound off a couple of them off the top of his head. And we have reviewed several of them. And there are examples that have worked well, and there are examples that have not worked so well. And I think our intent is to try to take the best examples and apply them here. And that's what we've attempted to do. So Bruce, I don't know if you want to chime in to answer Doug's question.

Director

Erickson: Thank you. Just---I'll put two of them out there. The 20% reduction number comes from the development agreement at Empire Pass and the approval of Montage, which goes with their full shuttle and full employee work. We have a gate on both ends of Deer Crest, which you're aware of. We just received the 2016/2017 update of the parking studies at four of their peak periods and two of their unpeak periods. And we now have that number of parking spaces that's consistent with the previous studies that occurred at Deer Valley under the previous manager up there. So we'll be able to share those numbers in the next report.

The 35% I think is a, is a more experimental number. But I think it has to do with the distance of the project to Old Town and the viability of the lift system that potentially could mitigate trip generation, rather than a shuttle service, or Lyft or Uber or this, that and the other thing. The opportunity to have a gate on this property, which we've discussed with you in the past, also gives us some control mechanisms we wouldn't have say at Montage or at Empire Pass, the other projects near the Silver Strike project, or Silver Lake.

Commissioner

Suesser: And that reduction, that 20% or 35% reduction in parking, is that parking overall, including employee parking?

Director

Erickson: We're working on that right now. It's much easier for us to control a larger reduction for, for guests than it is for employees. Right now we're working on a requirement to know where employee parking will be on a fee title piece of land that's consistent with the Land Management Code. So we wouldn't just reduce this without having the piece of ground where employees would be parked and a shuttle program for employees.

Commissioner

Band: And if---I think you mentioned it as an incentive, the 35% reduction and the lift. I know that we've heard from the applicant here that the viability of the Mid-station isn't really something that they can do themselves because it's just not a big enough project to pay for it. So who are we anticipating paying for that if it happens?

Director

Erickson: We, we have precluded no options in terms of upgrading the lift systems. So there's nothing in the development agreement that would preclude it. You could have, similar to what we see in Europe or some of the other places, a separate operator to come in and operate and lift, and make some sort of adjacent deal with the property that the Resort could operate it, a Master Owners Association could operate it. We're just not precluding any of the options to see that installed.

Commissioner

Campbell: Can I throw one thing out? This may be more detailed that we want to get into at this early stage, but I---and I think somebody already brought it up, but it's kind of gelled in my mind and I think it would be a miss. I would love to see some kind of people mover so somebody in street shoes could go to dinner in, in town. Get on the people mover get back to this hotel, or vice-versa. But if it turned into such a thing that a visitor that was staying somewhere else on the mountain skied down to the Town Lift, took their skis off to go in and eat, and had to carry the skis back up, that's not a big deal either. But if somebody just wanted to do laps on the Town Lift, and some people do, and you couldn't get on that thing without taking your skis off, it seems like it would be a miss. Does that make sense? You know, because right now it's a typical chair lift and you can ride it in street shoes, or you can ride it without taking your skis off.

And again, I apologize if I'm getting into more detail than we need to. But if I had my way I'd be more supportive of a people mover that lets you get on it without taking your skis off.

Matt

Dias: Okay. Noted tonight. I don't want to speak out of turn, but we all sort of agree on that quality guest experience.

Commissioner

Campbell: It would be great if it would run at night, too, and that you didn't have to have skis on. I don't know what kind of configuration that would take, but it would be nice if that was possible.

Matt

Dias: Right. And I think our attempt is not to preclude anything like that because we would, we would be supportive of that as well.

All right. I'm going to kick it over to Craig Call here.

Craig
Call:

So---we're on the road, right? There we go. So let me kind of help to do just a bit of background first. Again, we've been trying to look at this entire huge Treasure site and come up with ideal configurations. And--- I'm sorry, I should have booted this up beforehand. So this is the, this is the big picture. And one of the big reasons that I can't see it is that I [inaudible]. So you'll notice, one thing about this is, incidentally just in case you were wondering, those colored areas on the ski slopes are placement zones for---fill zones for a much bigger project. So some of those may still be available. And I guess the only point I'd make at this point is, a lot of work has already been done on where some fill might go. And we hope that the major mitigation of dropping the amount of fill dramatically makes this much more reliable. And that's the thing that we are trying to probe. But moving right along.

So, the one thing you remember about the site in particular is how heavily wooded it is, and also how dramatically steep it is. So, the good news is you could do a lot of work as you move across the hill that isn't going to be particularly observable in part because it's, we've got a lot of natural [inaudible]. That doesn't mean there won't be quite a lot done to change what's there, but what isn't changed is going to help mask the kind of cuts and fills that would be necessary. Here's a view of the same area from

the Marsac parking lot. And the potential location of the hotel is this area where there's some pine trees. I guess I'm not showing---if you look at the Silver Top Transit center, then you go up and you can see the ridgeline coming down covered with trees. And behind that another ridgeline covered with aspens where there's no leaves. And then a pocket of pine trees, of evergreen. That's the hotel location if we achieve what we've been trying to achieve. Let me show it for the benefit of those in the audience.

On the picture, on the picture you can see the power line. And that's---the power line crosses the hotel site. But the question is, you know, given the steep terrain, how do you get there. And when you get there can you take advantage of some of the, the existing landscaping and such to help the whole process blend in better. In this photograph, which is from the Aerie, you can again see the Treasure Mountain. The, the line running up through the center of the mountain is the Town Lift. Then moving to the right, that's the Creole ski run. Then moving farther to the right you can see relatively faintly kind of an elbow where something goes up off to the right-hand upper corner and then turns. That's the power line. Next to that is the grove of trees. And I use the term grove a little loosely here because it's steep. I mean, it's not like---if you had picnic area you'd want a very flexible picnic table, because it's, it's a little steep.

So the question is, how do we get there? So this is one plan we came up with showing some, some roads on the larger Treasure site. And we, we brought the road out of Empire and Lowell, which is off to the left. And then crossed where you see two orange balloons there. Going off to the right and then making a fast switchback, and coming back along the face of the mountain, then skirting over to the northwest corner of the property up in the hotel location. The reason for all this road is to maintain the grades. And as this was completed, we, we just found that it probably didn't, it wasn't optimal. And we also, of course, had quite a lot of comments from the City Staff. We appreciate all the involvement of Matt Cassel, as well as the fire authorities, to try to determine how all this is balanced. And the City, of course, has retained Ward Engineering, and they commented on this. And these, and we've retained our own civil engineers to try to comment. So, again, this is an interim plan that simply wasn't, it wasn't settled on and we went to another one. A little closer view of that same plan.

But the concept of creating a loop is in response to the Fire Code, and a real effort to try to get some kind of adequate emergency access that meets the requirement to make sure even for a modest size 18-lot subdivision on a very steep location, that we can, we can provide the kind of emergency, really, that's needed when relief is needed.

So, you remember this from the very first meeting. This is where we started; Options A, B and C. Basically, the hotel remains in about the same location as this C. The return loop that we planned has been dramatically changed and, and expanded and re-thought. So let me show you the latest drawing before today. So this is much more current. And this drawing is not even showing up on the screen. That's interesting. Honest, it's on mind. How do I do that. Francisco, seeing that you got all the talent here, how do I send that to the other---? Okay. I apologize. All right.

So here we have done our best to make sure that we have 10% grades with no more than a 12% grade on short intervals. And, you know, here is one road plan. And the City may have another to show. This has been proposed through our architectural firm GSBS, and with the civil engineering firm that's been of help there. And the City's proposed another. And we're responding to the City's proposal and the City's responding to ours. But generally speaking, these are the kinds of solutions we're coming up with. Number one, the roads are not as long. The loop is not as high. It comes much farther down the mountain. And the loop crosses and touches the purple area on the left, which is the hotel site. And, again, it's very conceptual. It shows a cul-de-sac, but my guess is that that road might, might come right into an entryway or an underground parking structure more than a cul-de-sac, simply because anything we do to better utilize the site for disperse massing, the better the whole structure will function, I hope, and appear from both the community, from the town center, from State Route 224, and from other vistas where it might be seen. And then we have also put circles here to indicate that yes, there are viable locations for homes dispersed around the property so they cannot be in a point where they disturb a lot of that vegetation, and we can preserve much of the hillside and the vegetation.

Let me also comment on the red areas on the upper right-hand. Those are areas adjacent to the future Town Lift connection or weight station, where the Mid-station could be built. But there are, there are huge areas shown there as possible locations. Again, the, the maximum footprint for

that structure would only be at 10,000 feet. So this is much larger than what anything, than what might be included in the Mid-station complex.

So anyway, that's the, those are the factors we've been considering. The terrain, the slope, the vegetation, the location of the hotel, and the ability for the emergency access that meets the Fire Code. This is one of the solutions. The City may have another that it wishes to show, depending on what you all want to do.

Anne
Laurent:

Okay, good evening. Anne Laurent, again. The, the City's alignment is slightly different. Primarily, we just have slightly different, like, goals we're trying to achieve. But at the end of the day we want a road that works. So, we---based on the options I updated you all on last week, we further refined it. And you can see that we were able to get a road that accesses off of Empire and is at the 9-10% that meets the Fire Code all the way up.

Where we run into trouble is how do we get back down? And we are getting close. What we're going to do as a last step is finesse, finesse this piece of it here to try to get it to cut in a little lower and start going down lower. And then look at just doing maybe a separate little spur, one spur up to the hotel, and enter into it and maybe go underneath it, to try to allow us to start lower to get down. And we think that, we believe we're going to be able to get this pretty close if we refine this upper piece. So that's where we are and that's our goal.

The other option we looked at was if we can work with this section here and try to do something. Even though it's a little steeper, that's not where the access is. The main access would be this access. And we could work on smaller sections being a little steeper here, which is allowed in the, in the Fire Code.

So those are the two that we're trying to refine to get one that works that the Fire Code, well the Fire Marshall, the Fire District, sorry, I can't find the right words. But you can see that we still have some trouble areas we're still trying to refine. And then in addition to that, what I haven't---until we refine it I want to be able to give definitive answers on the amount of excavation and where the retaining walls area. Right now on this the retaining walls are largely down in the lower area up to about here. There, there certainly will likely be some in other areas, but I don't have that level

of detail yet on this. And once we get it working with the grades we look forward to giving you that specificity.

Commissioner

Thimm: So, Anne, in addition to where the roads are and the excavation, I think the---and where the retaining walls are, I think the heights of the retaining walls will be really important too for consideration.

Anne

Laurent: Yes. Yes. And, and we're feeling pretty good that we're not having much issues up high on these options. So that's good. The main difference between what Mr. Call showed and what the City showed is we were trying to keep at least one of the roads on the, I guess to the north of the run, ski run, and trying not to cut into the hillside again with a second road. I think we'd also like to keep the road a little lower if we can and make it work, because we're just trying to think of minimizing the amount of cuts across the same hillside.

Commissioner

Suesser: Could you run, could you run through the three, I think three proposed--- Mr. Call's proposed road and then the City's two proposals. I just want to look at them again.

Anne

Laurent: So these are the City's two. I don't have---I'd have to hand the---and then this one. And I'm going to hand it over to Craig to show his.

Commissioner

Thimm: Has the City looked at this, and are there misgivings with respect to this? Or is there a preferred option that the City and the City Engineer, in particular, have in terms of these three options.

Anne

Laurent: I think, I think right now we're just trying to get the civil engineers to agree with the main issues and what the points are so that we're not dealing with different perceptions of the information of what's doable and not.

Commissioner

Thimm: So still all preliminary. Still all feasibility study, then.

Anne

Laurent: I would say the City's, the City's options are much further along in their engineering. GSBS has just started to have Parametrix look at theirs. So there's been more work done engineering wise on the City's side of this point. And they're trying to catch up.

Commissioner

Thimm: Okay. Thank you.

Chair

Strachan: Craig, anything further to add?

Craig

Call: I think that shows the main issues that we're trying to address. Let me just verify. Our, our architect is here in case he wanted to comment. I think that's a pretty good overview, but again, we set the stage for public questions and your questions that we're happy to respond to.

Chair

Strachan: Great.

Director

Erickson: So I, I think the highest possible level for the Planning Commission determination is whether the road should try and come down north of Creole Gulch and only cross once, or should the road cross the main mass of mountain to the south of Creole Gulch, which is the applicant's suggested proposal right now. We're working on that and I don't have an answer for you. But that's, that's the main distinction. The applicant is further up the hill than the City's proposals. The hotel is closer to the north and west property lines in the applicant's proposal.

I think the other factor in the applicant's proposal that you're not seeing in the City's conceptualization of this, is the applicant is showing some potential locations for homes which are distributed across the site. We haven't made a determination whether the impacts are greater or less from that. And none of the engineers have confirmed the location of the retaining walls and the ability to access the building sites off of the road.

So all of those issues are moving forward in a, in a calculus of how does this work, where do they all go, is this the real deal, what's the deal killer,

you know, and, and magnify this discussion by the steepness of the site and visibility of the site.

Commissioner

Band: So the problem is that we've got these three drawings and we're not really looking at apples to apples here. I mean, we've got the applicant's drawings, which is lovely, but it doesn't show us where the grades are; and the City's do. So, I think you said it's a 10% overall mostly, and with a little stretch of 12%. Is that correct?

Craig

Call: Let me invite the architect to just address that briefly.

Commissioner

Band: Thank you.

David

Brems: What we're trying to achieve is a 10% road that directly goes up to the hotel and does not have to go through the home sites. And what we've been asked to do is look at a 10% road with some stretches of 12% road; not to exceed 250 feet in length, which helped in some of these locations. And as Anne indicated, we, we have another traffic civil engineer looking at this road right now. We'll, we'll get this road to the same level of engineering as the one that you're seeing by the City probably within a week, maybe sooner. We're also---there's similarities to these two proposals, and there's difference. We would like to get together after we get that engineering done and look at the amount of cut and fill, and see if we can't arrive at a, you know, one proposal that we'll bring, bring back to you.

I think we ought to talk about the differences in, in the grading and the way that this works at that later date.

Assistant City

Attorney

McLean: Can you state your name for the record, please?

David

Brems: My name is David Brems, B-r-e-m-s, GSBS Architects.

Commissioner

Suesser: And Matt, can you bring up your drawings again and show us the best you can the difference in the hotel sites from your proposal to the applicant's proposal. Or Mr. Call's proposal.

Director

Erickson: While they're getting that up, the simplest, the simplest way to look at these two where the hotel site is, is the proximity to the corner in the upper left, and also the location of the angle station in the power line. You can see the bend in the power line in this drawing. The other proposal, the proposal we looked at earlier in the week was sitting on the order of elevation 7400. This proposal is sitting on the order of elevation 7300, plus or minus. So, the applicant has moved down the hill. We're attempting to hold firm at this location. It's much more consistent with the location of Exhibit C or Plan Option Concept Idea C, Charlie, which is at the bend of the power line.

Commissioner

Suesser: Oka, so I misunderstood. So the applicant is bringing the hotel down the hill a little bit.

Director

Erickson: The applicant is further up the hill than the City's current proposal, but they have brought it down from their previous proposal.

Commissioner

Suesser: The City's proposal, though, is a little higher, isn't it?

Director

Erickson: No. No. The applicant's proposal is always higher than the City's proposal.

Anne

Laurent: Anne Laurent. I can chime in. There's an area in here where my cursor is moving, where it flattens out a little bit. The goal of both the landowner and the City is to utilize that to the best of the design's advantage. It's just a matter of the other design---GSBS is running the road up and above and using both sides and spreading out a little more. I think the City's goal would be to start a little lower. And yes, it may have to spread out just a bit and to try to work with the terrain. We don't know exactly, yet. But I

think at the end of the day we want to merge and we want to come with something that we can say, yeah, this works and it will work for the hotel.

Commissioner

Band: So just so I understand, help, help me. What more important here? Is it keeping to a certain defined area, or getting a road that works?

Anne

Laurent: Largely it's getting a road that works. And the, the purpose of the hotel being on a site that isn't as sloped allows us to minimize the massing and the impacts as it falls, as the grade falls away.

Commissioner

Band: No, no, I get that. And it sounds like you guys are---both, both the applicant and the City are in agreement about where the hotel should be. So, it sounds like we've got a couple of different---obviously we've got a couple of different iterations on the road here. And I know, Bruce, you said you wanted to hear from us, but I'm not an engineer. So what I would love to see is the traffic engineers agreeing where the best---and the Fire Department saying, okay, this is where the road should go. And the least amount of cut and the least amount of, you know, over 10% grade.

Director

Erickson: So the Fire Official is working daily on these roads. But I'm going to---the traffic, the, the civil engineers are the ones that are going to rule on the, on the adequacy of the road; not the traffic folks. The traffic folks will decide which way the road, the cars want to go and how many. I, I don't think you need to be an engineer to conceptualize the difference between two roads crossing the south face of the mountain, or one road crossing the face, and a steeper road on the north face. So you can do that from a resident perspective, and that's the concept. So if you look at it top down, everybody seemed to accept sort of Concept C, which is the hotel higher on the site and away from the neighbors. Right now we're trying to attempt to resolve a Concept C with a road that meets the fire standards and the civil engineering standards with the least amount of cut and fill, least amount of retaining walls. And then we'll deal with the home site locations.

Commissioner

Band: Okay.

Commissioner

Suesser: So the City's alternative roads would result in a lot less cut and fill.

Director

Erickson: I don't know the answer to that yet, because the City's alternative comes down the north side, and the landowner's alternative cuts across the south side. So it would be on the, underneath this blue section, again. So they may, they may come in fairly close, but we don't know yet.

Commissioner

Suesser: Keeping the road in the gulch like the City's proposed and having it switchback like that is going to require more bridges. Correct?

Director

Erickson: In the drawing you're looking at right now, it looks like there's only one bridge across the ski run. In the applicant's proposal I think I saw two. But I didn't review it today.

Commissioner

Suesser: Okay.

Director

Erickson: There may be a third down at the bottom where Empire and Lowell cross in order to maintain ski in/ski out to those properties on both solutions; whether it's the landowner's solution or, or one of the City's solutions. And that's still to be determined while they work on these road grades, cuts and fill.

Chair

Strachan: All right. What next?

Matt

Dias: I guess---well, thank you. I think that we, we, you know, appreciate the opportunity and your patience, and, and sticking with us as we presented the information tonight. And a lot of what we presented tonight was based on your feedback and the feedback from the public, quite frankly. We've been taking sort of meticulous notes of the questions from the public. And so, maybe before we discuss---if you don't have any other questions, before we discuss kind of next steps or where we go from here, maybe

take public comment and hear from the public. And that's been very important to us.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah. Have we aired out all of our kind of substantive questions and comments about what we've seen tonight, or are there more?

Director

Erickson: Let me do one more thing, Mr. Chairman. Where is Francisco? Both of these presentations are going to be up on the website by when?

Planner

Astorga: [Inaudible] as soon possible. I just need to get Mr. Call's presentation. It will be up tonight.

Director

Erickson: Okay, so I'll repeat what Francisco said too far away from the mic. And that is that he will upload the City's presentation this evening and Mr. Call's presentation in the morning. And then we're happy to take comments on what the drawings do as we work through this. All right. So they'll be up, the public will be able to see the drawings. Be able to zoom in and out, make some determinations. Thank you. Sorry, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted to make sure that that got out.

Chair

Strachan: Any more questions, comments?

Commissioner

Thimm: I have just a couple of quick things. I presume---Matt, you mentioned that when we're talking about next steps, I mean, this is, and probably rightfully so, come to a very fine focus on how, how we're actually going to get there. We've---and last week we talked a lot about square footages and what's going to be there in terms of area. I presume that in the next steps that, that we're going to be talking about massing and height and scale and that sort of thing, especially for the boutique hotel. Is that true?

Anne

Laurent: Our certainly goal is to, once we get the road figured out and we can hit the massing hard. I know GSBS has already looked at it. We've taken a little run at the mass and scale. But yes, until we get the road nailed down we, we'd like to just---

Commissioner

Thimm: That's where the focus is now?

Anne

Laurent: Yes.

Commissioner

Thimm: Okay. Then, then one other quick thing. Seeing David Brems here, I do need to disclose that over the years I have worked collaboratively with GSBS, as well as in friendly and professional competition with GSBS. But those associations will have no bearing at all on any decisions I'm a part of.

Chair

Strachan: Understood. All right. Anything further? Okay. Let's talk about some next steps so that we give the public everything before we open public comments. Do you have something to on that front?

Matt

Dias: I guess what I would have to add on that front is, is our hope is to return on the 23rd with a bundle package of a development agreement for your consideration, so you can evaluate to what Commissioner Thimm said earlier, everything in its totality and not sort of these kind of one-off kind of issue spotting in a vacuum. And I think it's hard to do that when you're considering the totality of the situation, the ultimate buy-down of half the project, the separation and bifurcation from this kind of mixed-use commercial into half residential and half commercial, more neighborhood compatibility, reduction of the impacts. I think you have to look at the whole thing. And so our objective is very early next week. And I believe the owner agrees to try to give you the package for your consideration.

And at that point if you had additional questions we would obviously do whatever we could to answer those. But you could also direct, for example, you could direct the attorneys to begin, you know, begin drafting up the legal terms. If you could kind of give us the head nod that substantially we have met your concerns and your questions, and you want the attorneys to begin that process. So, so that's a hypothetical, but I think our expectation is we'd be back here next week to answer these final questions and try to give you everything in one big package so you can evaluate it that way. And also make it available for the public ahead

of time so they can provide you with their input and have something to review prior to the meeting.

Chair

Strachan: Well, let's mull that over a bit and open the public comment with that possible schedule in mind. Although I'm not so certain that's the schedule we'll be adhering to. But anything further before we open the public comment? Okay.

Commissioners, anything further public comment? Okay. Let's open the public comment on the Treasure Hill item on the agenda.

Public Comments

Kyra

Parkhurst: Good evening, all. I am Kyra Parkhurst. I live on Empire. Just one thing. The one thing absolutely---the one thing I loved about the Sweeney's project was their original idea of something to help the Main Street merchants. And I don't want that to get lost in this. And I feel the one thing that does kind of perk the Main Street merchants, especially those immediately at the bottom of the Town Lift, is developing a coffee house and ski shops. I mean, how far do we have to go to go get to another coffee house. It's just a little bit down the hill. So I'm not sure---I mean that's another big part that could be eliminated and some excavation to help mitigate the project. After all, right down is the Bridge Café, Atticus, four ski shops; and then they're going to have them at the hotel, and there at the base. So I'm not sure if we really need, if there's a need for it. And there's many resorts that just have a really just smooth drop-off, and there's just a little stand for the lift operator. And they get off or get on and away they go. So, I still, I think that would help the merchants an awful lot.

And then on the 5,000 square feet of meeting space, I think that's---it would be nice if that could be explained or defined on whether it's going to be one large, like the Egyptian at 6,000, and they can hold 266 people. So is it the idea to have one large so that they can have that type of auditorium facility also? Or is it 5,000 divided into smaller spaces that small meetings can be held? And I think there's a big difference there. You know, because 286---one big, will hold events that will draw people into the resort.

But that's it. Thanks.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you.

John

Stafsholt: Hi, John Stafsholt, 633 Woodside. I'm just going to respond to some of the stuff I've seen tonight so far. This---the reason I got up now is this is out on the screen. Looking at it, right here in this support commercial, support commercial, we're supposed to be half the amount, which is 9500. A 50% reduction. But we're adding in 5% of the hotel. This has been contentious all along. I don't think it should be there. We're also double-counting I over here; 5% again in accessory and meeting space. And the meeting space shouldn't be in there, or it shouldn't be counted twice.

We also shouldn't be adding a brand new thing of 10,000 square feet at the mid-station, which is not support commercial at all because it's not attached to the hotel. If there is a mid-station, which is new, and now we have 10,000 square feet of commercial there, that means that everyone, every single skier who goes up the mountain or comes down the mountain whether they're skiing or riding hopefully a gondola and not a people mover, has access to that. So that's absolutely not support commercial at the mid-station if a ski lift goes through there. And to my mind that shouldn't be allowed.

What else in here. A few things beyond this. I just wanted to comment on that because it's there. We're also adding 68,000 square feet of back of house to a 100,000 square foot hotel; plus 5,000 meeting, plus 9500, plus 5,000. We're also adding 20,000 back of house to single-family houses. I don't know. Never heard that at my house, anyway.

Beyond all those things, it's still striking me kind of strange that we are taking like new information that Bruce talked about of actual parking studies in 2017, when this is supposedly still the MPD from 2004 that was done under the 2004 LMC. Now I'm seeing up here that this is based on the 2017 LMC. I may be dim, but I'm probably not the only one who doesn't understand why this isn't a new MPD but it's under a new Land Management Code. So I'd like to understand that. I think we all would. It seems to be it's clearly a new Master Planned Development if it's half the size, all new roads, all new hotels. It's all, if the whole hotel is outside the

limits of disturbance, how could this not be a new Master Planned Development.

It's nice---believe me, I met privately or with the City and they are doing a great job, absolutely, so I don't want to seem like they haven't. It's nice to see the City present here, but I'm a little bit surprised that the City's presenting Park City II's plan. It's kind of surprising to me. If this is the private road system we've been told all along, it's kind of interesting that we're designing it as the City, if we're not to maintain it or plow it or anything else.

Just some thoughts that came to my mind. Hopefully it wasn't too rambling. Thank you.

Neals

Vernagaard: Hi, Neals Vernagaard, Lowell Avenue. Agree with, with John that this whole mid-station thing needs some better clarity for the public. It's starting to sound a little bit like incrementalizing ourselves to Treasure, which doesn't feel right. So we need a whole lot of clarity. [Inaudible], all those kinds of things. Because if it's just a place to change to ski lifts, you don't need a coffee shop. You don't need anything. You just need to show up and put your skis on and go. So that's that point.

Are we going to get some clarity on time frame? I thought after, after reading the paper and going to a bunch of these meetings that tonight was the night that was going to be signed, sealed, and delivered. That the Sweeney's would get their check. Clearly that's not going to happen. Are we going---that's kind of a question that maybe somebody can answer for me.

Chair

Strachan: We've got that same question. We're going to talk about that.

Neals

Vernagaard: And then least, your two road proposals. Best I can see it cuts right through somebody's house. Down at the bottom as it connects with Empire, there's, there's a house there, so it would cut across that person's driveway. That's it. Thank you.

Anne Louis

Garda: I live next door to the property. Thank you, thank you, thank you. Obviously a tremendous amount of work has gone into this and I'm very appreciative of that. I'm particularly appreciative of the time we spent, we spent on excavation and heights and retaining walls and things like that. And that the developer is not pushing to have more meeting space than [inaudible].

I, I just want to talk a minute about the possibility of a mid-station. Please don't put anything there that is going to have people parking on Lowell and Empire to get on to the ski lift. Like others, I see no reason to have any kind of mid-station facility at all. We're all perfectly capable of skiing down to the bottom of the Town Lift and going up. And so I, I hope nothing will be put there that attracts more traffic to get on the ski slopes. Thank you.

Chair

Strachan: All right.

Ed

Parisien: I just had a couple of quick questions on, on the road. Has any thought been put into connecting this road, or one of the roads anyway, to the Crown, King's Crown?

Chair

Strachan: Yes.

Ed

Parisien: And that didn't work out? All right. Okay. So, we're going to have two roads, and they're going to be private roads. Right? Are they going to be lit up all night? Has there been any thought given to how they track the lights going on. Those are my two thoughts. Thanks. And thank you for all your work on this. But the lights wouldn't be good.

Rich

Wyman: Hi, my name is Rich Wyman. I'd also like to thank everyone here at the City for doing such excellent work. Just a couple of things. Maybe you already know, maybe you don't. When you, when you Google boutique hotel the first thing that comes up is the Washington School Inn, and it has 12 rooms; not 100. Another comment. At least as far as I understand, and I could be wrong, no meeting space was permitted in the

original MPD. It was absolutely not allowed. And this will exacerbate an already bad situation with the roads. Another thing I just looked up. There's a website called Banquet Tables Pro. And when you type in the amount of meeting space you have---I typed in 5,000 square feet. If you're doing cocktail parties, standing guests, the number of people you can accommodate is 833. That's a lot of people. Both standing and seated is 625. And they go on to break it down into banquet style. Roundable seating, 416 people. Rectangle tables seated 500 people. Theatre or auditorium style; you can get 833 people in there again. So I seriously think you ought to consider the meeting space whether it is in the original MPD or not; which I understand it is not. And second of all is how it's configured, how many people you're going to be able to fit in there, and how much traffic that's going to generate. Thank you.

Chair

Strachan: Thank you. All right, anyone else from the public?

Clint

Massey: Hi, my name's Clint Massey. I've lived at 1213 Empire for 15 years. It's not a rental house, it's mine. I've never been to a meeting, I've never spoken up or anything because I've been a member of THINC and they've done such a good job of speaking up for me. But as we get to the end of this process, I just wanted to just give you a feeling for having lived there for 15 years what I've experienced as the traffic has increased, as we go through destroying---we'd really be sacrificing a lifestyle, our, our neighborhood to this project or any project up there. We all know that. But last Friday night we had traffic backed up all the way from PCMR all the way up Empire Avenue at a standstill for over an hour. And I don't know if anything special was going on, but that just has become the way Empire Avenue is, is being treated now. I ask---you guys have done a great job and, and I love what you've done. Just keep in mind that this is a neighborhood that we live here as you proceed with all these negotiations and the details that's involved in this. This is our home and we are going to sacrifice our, our style, our style of living, no matter what. If anything can be done along the way that alleviates the traffic or that helps, helps everybody understand that we've been here for a long time living, and we deserve to be treated with a little bit of respect as it goes along.

That's all I'm going to say. Thank you.

Chair

Strachan: Anyone else from the public wishing to speak on this item? All right, we'll close the public hearing.

End of Public Comment

Chair

Strachan: Let's talk about next steps. And Anne, you were about to add something? No? Okay. It seems at least to me a little odd that we would have a package before us to consider and sign off on as early as next week, when there's still a lot of questions that I think myself and the other Commissioners still have. And so I don't want to rush that, but I'm open to hearing what the other Commissioners' thoughts are on that.

Commissioner

Suesser: I fully agree with you, Adam. I don't think we have nearly the, the details for what's being proposed here to consider voting on the package as early as next Wednesday.

Commissioner

Band: It would have to be a very impressive package.

Chair

Strachan: And we'd need more time to digest some of the larger---

Commissioner

Thimm: Yeah, and, and that's the point. I mean, it sounds like everything is sort of just in time. So we come to a meeting and it sounds like the ink is still maybe drying on some of these drawings as we look at them. And it seems like we ought to have a full chance to review that in advance of a meeting, not only for the Commissioner but also for the public.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, I agree. I agree.

Matt

Dias: I mean, obviously the time line was negotiated between the Planning Commission and City Council when the, the two Mayors at that time came and negotiated before you; and obviously there was an agreement with the property owner. So, I don't want to speak on behalf of the Mayor,

particularly when he's right behind me, or the property owner. So I might let them speak for themselves if that's okay.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, go ahead, Andy, enlighten us a little bit on what the timing is.

Mayor

Beerman: I was hoping that Matt would speak on my behalf. About a month ago, Chairman, we sat down and you spoke on behalf of the Planning Commission and I spoke on behalf of the Council, and we agreed that we needed to do this in a fairly tight timeline due to your time constraints due to the applicant's time constraints, and the public's concerns. I think we've made a ton of progress but we haven't hit all of our benchmarks. There are certain things that we promised we would have to you in a timely manner so you could make decisions. So I think that coming from the City Council's standpoint we would be okay with a, with a delay long enough to get you that information, which could hopefully could get there pretty quickly. But I can't speak on behalf of the property owner, so I, I will pass that over to Craig.

Craig
Call:

Thank you, Mayor. Again, we appreciate all the extraordinary work that people have done and it's hard to imagine that it could have been, that we could have gotten where we are any quicker. And so we were, we will admit, too optimistic about gathering enough information soon enough. But the kind of commitment we're making---we're, for example, trying to schedule a meeting tomorrow when all the engineers can be in the same place at the same time, and on a couple of key issues, so that the rest of the things can fall into place.

I don't want to slam the door on the idea that we may have enough to you for this very impressive package that Ms. Band referred to. If that's true, then again the, the most---I mean it would be great to get a sense of the Planning Commission. But once we let the lawyers loose and start drafting, obviously, that's where the devil is with the attorney's and the details. So, I mean, there simply can't be a final decision next Tuesday. What could be is a clear direction if we are worthy of that answer because we provided what you need to have to give it.

And by the way, I know the biggest thing that I regret of not having is the massing analysis. I mean, we've got some road work and you can see

kind of how it works. And it really---there's a lot of commonality. But this, this will be a major challenge to try to give, to give you something that would indicate the options for massing that much density, that much, that size. I don't mean to use the word density. The gross size of the project in the location we've chosen and give an impression of what that means. So that's a very high challenge, but we don't want to let ourselves off the hook to try to do that as soon as we can do it in a reasonable, measured, and adequate manner. Understood.

Chair

Strachan: Well, you know, I guess underlying this all is this sort of subtext that the City is demanding information, answers from the applicant. And in some areas we've got them and some areas we haven't, and is holding the applicant's feet to the fire. And that's been one of the reasons for the delay. So I can't say that I am appalled at the delay because I think the reasons are right for it. I mean, we can't just roll over and say, all right it looks good. It's so much less density than 17.2 so we'll just take anything. I think the City has been very good at saying we're not just going to take anything. It's got to be right. You know, it's got to work. So the delay and the time that it takes to flesh those demands of the City out, I'm fine with, with having. It would be another situation altogether if you guys were coming before us and telling me and the rest of the Commissioners that you really just kind of skied most of Martin Luther King weekend, and everything you know, just got put on hold because somebody's daughter graduated from driving school.

And so I just, you know, I'm willing to, to, willing to give you guys more time. I don't know if that's possible in the deal that Park City II, LLC has with the Sweeney's, but that's for you guys to figure out. But there's got to be, to Neals' point, we need to be able to give not only the Commissioners but the public a finite deadline at some point. And maybe it's not next Tuesday we get that future deadline, but at some point we've got to be, you know, all cards face up so we can look at, you know, who's got the best hand and count the cards. So I just hope that you guys, and I think you do understand that, but, you know, it's, it's not going to be okay if this comes to us and we get a week and we're told you gotta decide it. You know, February 7th is, February whatever is the decision date and this is all the information you're ever going get. And we just don't have enough time to go over it all. I mean, I think you guys understand that, but I mean, Doug Thimm is going to look at this with a fine tooth comb because he has all the expertise to do it. So you can't cram it down us.

So I guess in sum, my recommendation is just give us enough notice to read over all the information that you give us in that finite packet and, and we'll do our best. We'll do our best. But, boy, we'll keep at it.

Anything more to add on that front? Are you guys getting the direction you need from us? I mean, you guys are driving the ship yourselves and, and doing a good job at it.

Mayor

Beerman: Just a question for you guys or a request. I think certainly the timelines have been important to keep things moving along and honor our obligations, but it is equally or more important that we get this correct. And in order to keep us moving along rapidly, I think it's important that we have a firm list of requests from the Planning Commission and what they would like to see at the next meetings. I think most of that Matt's been taking notes, but if you want to summarize what the key items are, we, we know what we need to accomplish what we need to accomplish before you can get to a point where you're willing to make a decision.

Chair

Strachan: Well, clearly the road has got to be nailed down because that's, that's the foundation upon which all the other questions are based. It's holding up the massing analysis, it's holding up the excavation analysis, it's holding up the soils analysis. So that's got to be decided and it's got to be decided soon. That's an engineering and fire question. It's not necessarily a Planning Commission question. But once that gets nailed down the things, I think, we're all going to be looking for---and this is just a partial list, because these guys are going to chime in with several others, I'm sure. You know we're going to be looking at the massing and the bulk and scale. And we're going to be looking at the retaining walls that are going to be necessary for that road. We're going to be looking at the use of that meeting space, because the use ought to be defined. It shouldn't just be blanket meeting space that can be used for hundreds and hundreds of person gatherings. It's got to be nailed down. The mid-station has to be hammered out. That may be policy decision that the City Council has to make, but it is troublesome that that may compete at some level with Main Street, which has always been one of the third rails of the Sweeney MPD. That is that none of the commercial in that project could compete with Main Street. So, if we're going to throw that idea out, there better be a damn good reason why. And we better be very convinced it's

viable. And then if the project---the applicant itself thinks it's worthwhile because the last we heard was that it just may not make financial sense to do it based on the size of the project. If the project was bigger it might make sense, but this project may not support it.

I think those are the biggest issues. The other Commissioners are going to have many more. Why don't we do it the old fashioned way and we'll move left to right and let's just give them some issues.

Commissioner

Thimm: I think, Adam, that you've hit most, most of what's on my mind. I think we, based upon what we've been through, we should probably have an area of disturbance line that's actually defined on this that we understand. A true description and understanding of where, what and what depth the soil is going to be or the rubble or whatever it is when we're done. Another thing is understanding what this means in terms of traffic impacts. I don't think that when we went through the first, when we went through the consideration of 17.2 and maybe it's predecessors, we never even got to a point to where we were completely comfortable that everything was properly mitigated both from a traffic standpoint and emergency vehicle access standpoint in the worst of conditions. And I think that we should understand that if we're going to be looked at as ratifying an agreement.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, and I think a way to do that is to just have---I've been thinking about that a little bit. And I don't want to open a full-blown traffic study into this because I don't think it's necessary. I think what you can do is you can have Alfred Knotts compare the numbers of this new alternative to the numbers that were plugged into the traffic analysis for 17.2. And you can figure out the percentage reductions between those two numbers. And I'm sure he can do that pretty quickly. And the mitigators to that are up to the applicant to provide us, but because you've got the benchmark of 17.2 and its traffic studies, I don't think you have to start from scratch.

Commissioner

Thimm: I, I don't agree. Or excuse me, I do agree. I don't think we need a full-blown study. I do want to hear from both Matt and Alfred.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, yeah. I think that's right. Laura?

Commissioner

Suesser: Well, I, I agree with everything that Doug Thimm just said. With regard to the mid-station, I think that it could, I think a people-mover or some connection from this project to Main Street is vital. And I think that this mid-station, which isn't really mid at all, it's quite close to town, could, could serve that purpose. I don't agree that there should be any commercial uses in the building. I don't believe there should be any parking in that building, including employee parking. I think employee parking can be done off-site. Someone compared it to something like the building at the base of the Funicular, but the access to the base of the Funicular up at Deer Valley and the St. Regis is not what we have here at this development. And I think that part of the mitigation measure could be eliminating any additional parking in that building, and any commercial uses. I think lockers and a people-mover type thing could be uses in that mid-station, but a café and parking, I think, goes too far in terms of the uses of that building.

We've seen three proposed roads. We haven't really heard the pros and cons of any of the proposed proposals. We don't know which of them would, would result in the least excavation or the lowest retaining walls. We haven't really been presented with much tonight with regard to those roads. We need all those details. And yes, the road has to be decided on and the engineers are the ones that will make that decision, but in terms of our weighing in with regard to the roads, you haven't presented enough for us to really evaluate which would be the---whether or not we agree that a road shouldn't cut, two roads shouldn't cut across the hillside versus switch-backing up the north side of Creole ski run. So I don't know how to evaluate it without more information, and I think that needs to be provided so we can do that analysis.

We haven't heard about the gross square footage of the residential homes. We, we haven't heard about whether or not certain configurations of the roads would lead to less disturbance of toxic materials up there. Perhaps that's being considered, but I'd like to hear if one road would prevent more disturbance than another. That could, we could---if we had that information we could help evaluate what's been presented tonight.

And we also certainly need to discuss the massing and the height of the hotel that's being proposed.

One of the public comments was street lights. We haven't heard---and I, I assume that these roads are 20' wide, but we didn't hear that tonight. So, I'm assuming from last week's presentation that they are still 20' wide, but I'd like confirmation of that.

The, the meeting space is a concern. Again, one of the restrictions in the original MPD was not to draw people to the site. And as we mentioned at the first meeting when we considered this alternative, it, it's my feeling that we should stick to that. We shouldn't be drawing people to this site, and that includes event space that could be used for large events that would draw people from off-site.

So, those are my comments.

Commissioner

Band: Thank you. Great comments, so that gives me fewer things to say. I definitely want to understand the 20-35% parking, or under parking if we're going to have the people mover. That sounds pretty iffy right now. It's a great idea. I think we all agree on that as far as a traffic mitigator. As for under parking and meeting space, I think we should---whatever we decide with the meeting space, understand how it's going to work; if it's going to be split up. I think some people have said that already. But if we are allowing them to have larger events, I think we should think about a condition of approval for some kind of shuttles if any of those events actually occur, as opposed to having---especially if we've under parked it, that we have a way to get people to and from there.

Residential home lot size. I'm not sure that we've talked about that at all. I would definitely like to understand what those lots look like. The employee housing being on site. And I think there was a comment made as well about how there might be multiple buildings. Obviously, that goes to mass and scale, but if we're looking at multiple buildings, including a freestanding employee housing building, it would pretty interesting to see what that looks like and how it lays out on the lot. That's it.

Chair

Strachan: Great.

Commissioner

Campbell: So Anne, could you put your second road page back up there? I just want to ask you a quick question about that. So the, the red section there it

feels a little misleading. And that's not the right word because I know it wasn't intentional, but I don't want to pile on and ask for things that are impossible to get in the next week or two. But I think for us to be able to say yes we like it or no we're worried that it's---because really what, I think get a little bit lost in the details here. Really what we're voting on is---my understanding is whether or not we agree with the concept that this reduction is worth the City paying money for as opposed to what we had at 17.2 or, or going back to Woodruff. So I think it would help me, and I think maybe help everybody else, if we could potentially get a 3-D model of that. My question is, is that something you think you can have by next week?

Anne

Laurent: Yes. We've actually done two 3D models of the two previous ones already. We just don't want to show them until we think it works because we don't want to scare anybody.

Commissioner

Campbell: At the risk of over-simplifying, I think we've moved from a thing before and whether it's 17.2 or Woodruff, where the buildings were the most offensive, if that's the right word, but certainly the most noticeable. With this new version, the road is going to be the most noticeable thing with the hotel tucked back in there. There will be a lot of places in Old Town where you won't even be able to see the hotel, especially if it's under four or five stories, which I think we all agree it should be. So to me, you're doing exactly the right thing, which is to concentrate on the road, because that's, that's the make or break portion. But if you're going to have the 3-D model for us next week, I think that's, that's the only thing I would ask for. Thank you.

Commissioner

Phillips: Okay. Well, one of the nice things about going last is that a lot of the things have been said, so I hope I don't disappoint in my lack of things to add to this. You know, I look forward to seeing the, you know, I mean the thing is, is we spent a lot of time looking at three different versions of roads that you guys are all still trying to figure out yourself. So, and we don't know much about it. So I look forward to having you guys flush things out and really presenting, because this more of an update to use and where you're at. Obviously, we don't know what we're looking at as far as that goes.

So, I'm just trying to think. One of the things---I, I guess the one thing that I will kind of, you know, give my input is on the mid-station. And during the meeting tonight I just, you know, it, it's kind of, it's the one thing to me that seems kind of vague. And I started to try to think about what, what's the purpose? What was the purpose in, in 17.2, and its location and its proximity to where the hotel is? And so I just started thinking about it tonight taking in some the comments. And it seems to me as I'm looking at this map the mid-station---I'm having a hard time getting the complete complex. So I guess what I, what I'd like to see is the concept of the mid-station and how it functions. Because if it's going to be down lower where it was, it's not really serving the, the hotel. So I don't see how it's---unless there's a separate people mover that goes from the mid-station to the hotel. And to me, you know, so---and maybe I'll just leave it at that. But I'm trying to understand how it functions in this new design and the concept. So, to me, with what I have in my head now, it seems to be another pit stop on the way down and it doesn't seem to be serving the same purpose. So, that's all I got.

I might have one more comment. Let me just [inaudible] my notes. If you want to---

Chair

Strachan: One thing that occurs to me is traditionally we haven't even had a meeting during the week of Sundance, which would be next week. It doesn't seem like it would be beneficial to stop the applicant's headway and make them come meet with us when their time may be better spent to try to figure out the mid-station or the road or, or whatever. Plus, trying to jam people into the, what, 12 parking spots that are free during Sundance and making them all drive up here has been something we've not historically done. But---so I guess the short question is do we even want to have a meeting next week?

???: Yes.

Chair

Strachan: Okay.

Commissioner

Suesser: If they have a presentation to give us, I'm willing to meet next week.

Commissioner

Phillips: I agree with that. If they, if they feel like, if they feel like they have something to present, I would be more than willing. I think it gives us--- instead of waiting two weeks to get any more information, even if it's only a little bit more information, the sooner we can get it the better. My opinion. But I'm not saying I'd be ready to vote on the project.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah. No, I don't, don't think that would come up. I think what we've got to figure out is how we're going to agendize things if we have a meeting or not. I think I turn to the applicant and maybe Andy to try to figure that out.

Mayor

Beerman: I'd just like to throw an alternative out there. I think there are some concerns about the public getting here during the middle of the Sundance festival and having full attendance. So in the spirit of allowing us the time to continue working on this but keep you and the public update on progress, would it make sense to post a written update packet for you to have time to review, but not have a formal meeting next week.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, I think that makes sense. It sounds like, Mr. Call, you guys are getting close to being able to provide us with some level of packet of materials that would delve into some of these specifics, or is that not right?

Craig

Call: I believe we are very close. I think one more session with the engineers may crack the nut and give us a, if not a consensus agreement---I mean we really have come very close. The hotel is in the same location and the upper road reaches the same elevation in all the plans. So, we're very close to having it. And that means the engineers can come up with the--- it's been very impressive to me how soon Ward Engineering, for example, working diligently has come back with excavation numbers and retaining wall numbers. And it's phenomenal the kind of commitment that everyone's making. So, yes, it could happen relatively quickly, and I expect it will. But I can't, of course, promise, and your points are well-taken.

Chair

Strachan: what do you guys think about that? A package of materials but not a meeting.

Commissioner

Thimm: I, I think, actually, having a package and having a week to review is, is a very wise thing.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, I would agree with that.

Commissioner

Campbell: Can I just say, without us here to get feedback on what they present next, the, the following week would really be wasted. They're not going to be able to keep going forward if they don't have the direction from us of where to, where to move.

Chair

Strachan: Well.

Commissioner

Campbell: Which maybe that's okay. I don't know. Andy, can you speak to that? I mean, I like the idea of doing it somehow without having to have a meeting, but I wonder if there's some way to get some feedback to the applicant so the second week is not wasted.

Director

Erickson: Let us, let us work on this and decide whether we want to have a two on two or some other kind of meeting, and make sure the public has an opportunity to review it as well. If we do not have a meeting on the 24th, we kind of need an idea whether we have a potential quorum on 31 or, on 31 January whether or not we have a quorum. And I believe we've floated Valentine's Day and that got rejected. So, so it would be the, if we were going to stay on the Wednesdays it would be the 7th---the 31st of January, the 7th of February and not the 14th of February. And, or we'll do a special meeting on one of the other nights because the Historic Preservation Board has a meeting coming up on one of those nights as well. So we need, we should probably, we'll send out another email tomorrow from Laura and Liz to check in on your availability for the 31 and the 7th date.

Assistant
City Attorney

McLean: I'm just going to jump in here. Let's find out availability on the 31st. I don't recommend that we continue this tonight without a date certain.

Chair

Strachan: All right. Well, I think we can all figure out availability on the 31st right here and now, right? We've all got calendars. Is everybody going to be here? I can't be here.

Commissioner

Band: I can't either.

Commissioner

Suesser: I can be here.

Chair

Strachan: We got four?

Commissioner

Campbell: I'm here.

Commissioner

Phillips: I'm here.

Director

Erickson: No Adam, no Band.

Chair

Strachan: We can still have a quorum. We've got a quorum.

Assistant

City Attorney

McLean: Do we have a new vice, Vice-Chair.

Commissioner

Band: Preston.

Director

Erickson: Preston.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah, let's nominate one Pro Tem right now. I nominate Preston Campbell.

Commissioner

Band: I second.

Chair

Strachan: All in favor.

All: Aye.

Chair

Strachan: Motion carries. Okay.

Commissioner

Suesser: Adam, are you here next week on the 24th? You're available on the 24th?

Chair

Strachan: I am not.

Commissioner

Band: I can, I can be here on the 24th. Just not the 31st.

Chair

Strachan: I'm a little leery, I'm not, I'm not sure it's necessarily the Commissioner's availability. It's more the public and, you know, dragging everybody in the middle of Sundance up to, up to the Marsac Building.

Assistant

City Attorney

McLean: Would, would more Commissioners be available on the 30th? The Tuesday night?

Chair

Strachan: No.

Assistant

City Attorney

McLean: No? Okay.

Commissioner

Band: Hold on, let me check. I could do the 30th.

???: Is there another location we could do it on the 24th.

Chair

Strachan: Well, you know, what would you---let's first ask the applicant. Is it your preference to have a meeting, or is it your preference to submit materials and keep driving, and then, you know, have a meeting in a few more week?

Craig

Call: I think the sooner is better. I don't have authority to commit anybody after the end of January. You know, again, the timelines were set in the original negotiation.

Chair

Strachan: Yeah. Right.

Craig

Call: Because nobody's asked that question.

Chair

Strachan: Well, it sounds like we better keep the meeting on the 24th and probably on either the 30th or the 31st.

Craig

Call: That would be consistent with the original plan. Thank you.

Chair

Strachan: Okay. All right. I think that handles scheduling. That doesn't present you guys with any insurmountable snafu's does it? So, going forward with the meeting on the 24th and a meeting on the 31st.

Director

Erickson: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner

Thimm: Melissa, you were available on the 30th but not the 31st?

Commissioner

Band: Yes.

Chair

Strachan: Do we have enough time agendize that? I don't think we do. WE need two weeks, right?

Assistant

City Attorney

McLean: No, you can---because it's a continuation you're okay for the 30th.

Chair

Strachan: Great. Okay. Show of hands, availability on the 30th. Perfect. All right. So a meeting on the 24th. Following meeting on the 30th.

Director

Erickson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That's a motion to continue to January 24th when you have a moment, when you're ready.

Chair

Strachan: As soon as we make sure there's nothing else we need to cover. Anything?

Anne

Laurent: Mr. Chair, Commission. Last week at the City Council, the joint City Council/Planning Commission there was some questions about Lowell Avenue, and Matt Cassel, our City Engineer promised to come back. He can provide that information if you'd like it. He can also hold off if you'd prefer. And then I just didn't know, there was some questions asked in public comment tonight, and I know last week we tried to answer those and keep a rolling conversation, making sure people's questions were answered. Just wanted to check in with you to see if you wanted any of those questions asked during public comment to be answered.

Chair

Strachan: You know, in light of when we're going to have, we're going to handle, you know, the other questions, I think are going to get hammered out as we go through this. You know, I, I suppose the questions about whether we're--- what MPD we're under, I don't think that matters because we're going to be amending it substantively at the end of the day. So, that's the only way

this Development Agreement is going to be memorialized. You're getting an MPD amendment and I don't think there's any other answer to that.

The other questions I think are probably best handled by submitting them to the Staff in writing. The Staff can answer them in writing to the best of their ability and present that to us at the next two meetings. And along with the applicant as well because a lot of those questions Staff isn't going to have the answer to. Only you will.

Craig
Call: Yes.

Chair
Strachan: Okay. All right. Anything else, Commissioners? Are we missing anything? Okay. Nothing further. Great. Then let's have a motion to continue.

MOTION: Commissioner Thimm moved to CONTINUE the Treasure Hill CUP to January 24, 2018. Commissioner Band seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Chair
Strachan: All right. Anybody going out? I'm obviously sick, I won't be going. Going out? No? We're adjourned.

The Park City Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: _____