PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
October 27, 2021

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
October 27, 2021

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

EX OFFICIO: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; John Robertson, City Engineer; Alexandra Ananth, Senior City Planner; Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director; Spencer Cawley, City Planner; Lillian Lederer, Planner I; Makena Hawley, Planner II; Heinrich Deters, Trails & Open Space Program Manager; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

---

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Phillips called the meeting to order at approximately 5:50 p.m. He explained that the delayed start time was due to a Commissioner site visit that took place prior to the meeting.

The following written determination was read:

> The Chair issued a written determination that because of the public health emergency, conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may attend in person. This determination is based on the ongoing risks and infection rates statewide and in Summit County. For these reasons, this meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location. Planning Commission members will connect electronically.
>
> Public comments will be accepted virtually. To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom. Written comments submitted before or during the meeting will be entered into the public record but will not be read aloud. For more information on attending virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org.

Chair Phillips further discussed the site visit. He reported that the Planning Commission returned from a site visit at 9300 Marsac Avenue. The visit was for informational purposes and discussions were limited to site-specifics. Chair Phillips explained that the item was included as part of the Regular Session agenda.

2. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Deb Rentfrow stated that after years of inactivity on Development Agreements that were signed over 20 years ago, many developers now wanted to revive those development plans. Park City and Summit County in the 80s and 90s could not have predicted the current situation. She overviewed the ongoing developments at both the City and County level including Snow Park,

Park City Mountain Resort, and Deer Hollow. Ms. Rentfrow felt it was important to raise the following question with the Planning Commission, City Council, County Planning Department, and County Council who in local government was responsible for ensuring that residents would have adequate water and other natural resources 10 years from now. There was a lot of development in the works and it was important to evaluate natural resources with future planning.

There were no further public communications.

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken shared Staff Communications with those present. She reported that the Planning Commission Meetings on November 24, 2021, and December 22, 2021, would not take place. However, Planning Commission Meetings were scheduled for November 10 and 17, 2021, and December 8 and 15, 2021.

Commissioner Van Dine shared a disclosure and stated that she was an employee at Deer Valley Resort for 11 years. She had not been an employee there for the last seven years and no longer had any connection to the resort. Additionally, she noted that she owned a condominium at Lakeside Condominiums in Deer Valley. It would not influence her decision-making.

Commissioner Johnson shared a disclosure and stated that his wife received an annual season pass from Deer Valley Resort and he received one bi-annually through a deal that his father-in-law had worked out with Deer Valley. He was not privy to any of that information and it would not affect his decision-making related to the project. Additionally, he had a disclosure to share about Item 6A. The company he worked for was owned by Western Trust, which also owned Club Lespri. He had no relationship with anyone at Club Lespri or Western Trust.

Commissioner Kenworthy shared a disclosure and stated that he was a landlord for seasonal employees. Deer Valley had a substantial long-term lease with him.

Commissioner Hall shared a disclosure and stated that she was a member of the 1981 Club, which was owned by Deer Valley. It would not impact her decision-making. She also reported that she had used Club Lespri for a rental condominium. Discussions were had about future disclosures. City Attorney, Mark Harrington explained that it was not possible to disclose too often. However, it was up to the Commissioners how often they felt it was necessary. It was most important to disclose at the opening of a public hearing.

4. CONTINUATIONS

A. 3099 Mountain Ridge Court - Plat Amendment - The Applicant Proposes to Amend the Mountain Ridge Subdivision Plat to Modify the Limitations on Maximum Building Square Feet. PL-21-04950.

Chair Phillips reported that there was one continuation on the agenda for a plat amendment.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Thimm moved to CONTINUE 3099 Mountain Ridge Court – Plat Amendment to a date uncertain. Commissioner Van Dine seconded the motion.

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

5. WORK SESSION

A. Deer Hollow Village Parcel 00-0021-01977 – Modification to a Master Planned Development and Conditional Use Permit – The Applicant Proposes Constructing Approximately 350,000 Square Feet with 199,200 Square Feet for 78 Residential Units in Four Buildings, 3,327 Square Feet of Support Commercial, 97,589 Square Feet of Residential Accessory Uses and 45,289 Square Feet for 123 Parking Spaces for a Ski-In Ski-Out Village in Three Phases in the Recreation Commercial Zoning District. PL-21-04917.

Assistant Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, presented the Staff Report and stated that Bill Fiveash with East West Partners and the applicant team was present. The application was submitted as Deer Hollow Village but was now being referred to as Founders Place. She explained that the Work Session discussion had been scheduled to allow for a preliminary review of the project. It would also provide the Planning Commission an opportunity to identify any additional information needed for further project review.

On November 10, 2021, the Planning Commission was scheduled to visit the site at 4:00 p.m. The Commission was also scheduled to determine whether it was a minor or substantive modification to the Master Planned Development ("MPD") that night. The project would be reviewed by the Housing Authority on November 18, 2021 and the project was scheduled for further Commission review on December 8, 2021 and into 2022 as needed.

The proposal was to develop 350,000 square feet with approximately 200,000 square feet for 78 residential units in four buildings. There would be approximately 3,327 square feet of support commercial, 97,589 square-feet of residential accessory uses and 45,289 square feet for 123 parking spaces. Assistant Planning Director Ward explained that the property was located west of Highway 40 and east of The St. Regis. The project was within Park City but was also in Wasatch County. In 1989, there was a Wasatch County Density Determination for the development of the area. That determination acknowledged that it was a great location for recreational amenities in Wasatch County, Summit County, and Park City. However, it was a challenging site and Wasatch County Planning Staff recognized that it would require a high level of focus on areas such as environmental mitigation, vegetation preservation and re-vegetation, site specific design, and aesthetic control.

There were some lawsuits after the density determination and in 1995, there was a settlement agreement with Park City. The property owners outlined parameters for the annexation into Park City, which established 83 multi-unit dwellings at 2,400 square feet per unit, with 60% of dwellings in a Primary Village Structure, four single-family dwellings, 20,000 square foot ski academy, ski chair lift and support commercial with appropriate amenities. Assistant Planning Director Ward reported that there was a 1996 First Amended Density Determination, which was part of the 1995 Settlement Agreement. The amended density determination increased the single-family dwellings to five on site and referred to the multi-unit dwellings as townhouses/cottages, which were not to exceed 2,400 square feet.

The 1990s capped development to the 83 multi-unit dwellings at 2,400 square feet, which totaled 199,200 square feet. Assistant Planning Director Ward reported that the applicant was still proposing the 199,200 square feet, but several of the units were below 2,400 square feet and several were above. Staff recommended that the applicant provide the gross building volume size comparison with the actual building sizes for the 1990s approval and current proposal. The 1995 Settlement Agreement included a Site Plan exhibit and the applicant proposed modifying the building footprints and road configurations. The 1995 Site Plan exhibit was shared. The applicant had created an exhibit to compared the 1995 Site Plan exhibit to the current proposal.

The MPD criteria required the Planning Commission to determine that the project promoted the use of non-vehicular forms of transportation through design and trail connections. It also required the Commission to determine that road, utility lines and structures were designed to work with the existing grade in order to minimize cuts and fills. Staff had requested that the applicant submit a Sensitive Lands Analysis, which was currently in process.

Assistant Planning Director Ward reported that the 1996 First Amended Density Determination required gable or hip roofs and restricted the top level to no more than 50% of the building footprint. It also capped the vertical walls to no more than three levels in height. Maximum building height in the Recreation Commercial Zoning District was 35-feet, with a five-foot extension for gable and hip roofs. The applicant submittal stated that the buildings would have the appearance of four stories with average heights of finished grade at 54 to 68 feet from the wall base to the roof peak. Additionally, the applicant had created illustrations of the 1995 Site Plan and superimposed the current proposal in order to compare the two.

The Commission could consider increased height for MPD cases based on a site-specific analysis. Assistant Planning Director Ward explained that the applicant must first request the determination. They would then bear the burden of proof that the necessary findings for an increase in height could be made if the Commission found that the proposal met certain criteria. Staff recommended that the applicant submit more information related to the criteria.

Assistant Planning Director Ward reported that the 1995 Settlement Agreement required a permanent disconnection of Keetley Road (now Deer Hollow Road) to prevent vehicular through-traffic in the Deer Crest area from Highway 40 into Park City. The building footprint of what was called the Primary Village Structure was supposed to be partially located within the historic road. In 2017, the Settlement Agreement was amended to remove the requirement. In the 90s, one of the concerns was that developing the area would bring traffic from Highway 40 into Park City. However, the development was gated and as a result, the requirement was removed in 2017. Chair Phillips recalled that item coming through the Planning Commission. Assistant Planning Director Ward confirmed that the Commission had forwarded a positive recommendation at that time and the City Council approved the amendment to the Settlement Agreement.

The applicant proposed changes to the road configuration. Assistant Planning Director Ward reported that access to the main structure had been shifted to the west. The Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") criteria would require the Commission to consider traffic, emergency vehicle access as well as internal vehicle and pedestrian circulation. The MPD criteria would require the Commission to consider minimizing grading and large retaining structures. It also required utility lines and structures be designed to work with existing grade and to minimize cuts and fills.

Assistant Planning Director Ward noted that the applicant was requesting a reduction in parking. This was unusual for a development in Park City. The 1995 Settlement Agreement established that parking would be determined by Wasatch County Officials when they did the Density Determination Amendment. Wasatch County set the number of parking stalls at 166. Under the Land Management Code ("LMC") for parking, the project would require 149 spaces. The applicant had proposed 123. She explained that the Commission could approve reduced parking if the applicant submitted a parking study that showed the uses would overlap, commercial spaces would serve those residing within the project and any other factors that supported the conclusion that the project would generate less parking than what was required. There was a provision in the 1995 Settlement Agreement that stated the parking was to be provided in underground structures below the building footprints. The applicant had proposed shifting some of that parking to the first level.

In terms of support commercial and residential accessory use, Staff found the proposal aligned with the approvals that stated support commercial must be capped at 5%. The applicant had proposed approximately 300 square feet for restaurant and dining and approximately 100,000 square feet for ski lockers, a gym, yoga studio, business center, lobbies and other accessory uses. Staff had requested a Sensitive Land Overlay Analysis and that was in process. Assistant Planning Director Ward explained that Staff had also recommend that the applicant provide a comparison of the building volume from the 90s to the current proposal, that the applicant submit analysis regarding the criteria for changes to height and that the Commission identify any additional information needed for project review.

The applicant, Mr. Fiveash, introduced himself and stated that Anne Mooney from Sparano + Mooney Architecture, Tom Bennett from Ballard Spahr and several other team members were present. Mr. Fiveash reported that East West Partners had been in Park City since 2002. They were primarily condominium developers. East West Partners was working with the land owner of Deer Crest, Deer Crest Associates. Some of the previous Deer Crest Associates work was shared with the Commission. It was noted that Deer Crest Associates had two remaining parcels that were part of the original MPD agreement for Deer Crest. Those two parcels were the Deer Hollow area, which was currently being discussed. They also had additional entitlements down at the base of the Jordanelle Gondola.

Mr. Fiveash explained that East West Partners, Sparano + Mooney Architecture and Ballard Spahr initially sat down to review the goals and objectives of the Park City community. He believed that the proposal was in line with those goals and objectives. Information about the history of Deer Crest was shared. Mr. Fiveash stated that what was allowed to be done on the site was very clear. In the early 1990s, there was litigation between Park City and the land owners of Deer Crest. There were a lot of concerns from Park City, because Deer Crest had an outsized impact on Park City, but was not within the planning jurisdiction. The 1995 Settlement Agreement clearly outlined what was permitted to be built on site and what that process would look like.

One of the most important documents related to the 1995 Settlement Agreement was the 1996 First Amended Density Determination. It clarified some of the items that were important to both Park City and Wasatch County. The two documents together created the MPD that outlined the rights and obligations of both parties in the development of the Deer Hollow area. As soon as the 1996 First Amended Density Determination was done, the land owner was required to vacate the public right-of-way on Keetley Road. It was originally a public road and the idea was that it needed to be vacated and future access needed to be shut down. In 1997, the Settlement Agreement was amended to clarify a few items and move some single-family home sites around.

Mr. Fiveash reported that in 1998, the Deer Crest Interlocal Agreement occurred. He noted that the area was one of few where Park City resided in Wasatch County. As a result, both the City and County had to agree on the following: who had the public obligations of providing services and who would receive the public tax benefits. When that was arranged and the City and County were able to agree, the land was annexed into Park City in 1998. That included both the hotel site, the Deer Hollow site and approximately 16 home sites at the area, which were now referred to as Snow Top Court. Once the annexation occurred, it was possible to start the development. In 2001, the land owner and a separate developer jointly submitted a CUP application for what became known as the Rosewood CUP application. It proposed a 105-room hotel on the ridgeline. That went through and had been subsequently amended.

As part of one the amendments to the CUP, the Settlement Agreement was amended again in 2001 to move some home sites around. In 2017, the Deer Crest Homeowners Association ("HOA"), Deer Crest Associates and Mr. Bennett submitted an amendment to the Settlement Agreement, which would not require that the site be built in the middle of the road. The original idea was to stop traffic and certain properties would be built on the road. However, it was decided that it was in the best interest to leave the road in the current location in order to maintain safety access and convenient delivery access. The development would rely on the two gates to ensure that it did not turn into a thoroughfare.

After the 2017 Settlement Agreement, East West Partners became involved with the project. They went through and pulled out all of the requirements for the development. For instance, up to 83 residences and support commercial space could be up to 5% of the gross square footage. Mr. Fiveash explained that density for amenities was drafted "as appropriate." There was approximately 20,000 square feet of actual amenities. The 1996 First Amended Density Determination was important for how the buildings would look and how tall they would be. The height in the determination was laid out as 75-feet with a maximum of five levels. The top level could not be more than the 50% of the total building footprint and there could not be vertical walls greater than three levels. On roof forms, it was specifically called out as gable roofs consisting of two incline planes that met at a ridge or sloped to the side wall. Mr. Fiveash also noted that the determination stated the following:

- 60% of the units developed shall be concentrated into a single structure, the Primary Village Structure.

Mr. Fiveash stated that his understanding of that language was that the community did not want to see 83 townhomes all over the side of the hill. The language was written to ensure that there were some condominiums as well. He added that while the documents were very clear about what needed to be done, there was also some flexibility. As far as configuration, there was language to state that a lot of the development sites were still general in nature. Mr. Fiveash reported that there was language that specified that adjustments on multi-family development parcels could not be increased by more than 5%. Additionally, it stated that the developer could reconfigure the building footprint and shapes from those shown on the concept plan. East West Partners had asked Sparano + Mooney to reexamine the original Site Plan to ensure that the land was being treated as respectfully as possible and the best possible project was created.

Information was shared related to parking. Mr. Fiveash explained that the proposal was to drop the parking down to 1.5 spaces per unit. This could be an effective tool to encourage people to use non-personal vehicles for transportation. One of the proposals was for there to be an HOA shuttle to try to discourage people from using private vehicles when they wanted to come into town to use the various amenities. This would relieve some of the traffic.

Ms. Mooney shared an overview of the major drivers that had grounded the development of the design. The team took information from the entitlement documents, the Deer Crest Design Guidelines and the Park City LMC. Working within that framework, the team approached the project with the following goals in mind:

- Integrate the architecture and landscape design into the mountain site and work with the existing topography;
- Bring sustainability to the foreground of the project;
- Fold in the history, culture and traditions of Park City, Deer Valley and the region.

The 1995 Site Plan had been analyzed in order to better understand the design and determine the viability of development. Ms. Mooney explained that there were a number of improvements that could be made related to the extent of excavation and site disturbance as well as the retaining walls. Massing was also a concern. The team felt that the sprawling nature was overwhelming and could be improved upon, so the design worked to compress the form and consolidate the impact on the site. That would require less pathways devoted to vehicles, less excavations and less retaining walls. Ms. Mooney noted that the 17 cottages were sprawling and in a heavily wooded area of the site. The design explored better ways to develop those while allowing for more open space on that part of the site.

Ms. Mooney explained that the team used the 1995 site plan for reference, but also considered the constraints that existed on the site. From there, the next generation of the Site Plan was developed. They worked closely with a Civil and Landscape Architecture team to reduce excavation, weave indoor and outdoor spaces through the architecture and maximize open space. An estimated 13 acres of the site could be set aside as dedicated open space. Ms. Mooney noted that parking was contained to an enclosed parking garage that would be stacked below the units.

The project would have very little impact on the closest neighbors. Snow Top Court was 750 feet above the area to the north west, Deer Crest Estates was 18 feet to the south and The St. Regis was 2,500 feet away to the south west. Ms. Mooney overviewed the proposed materials, which included wood siding, board form concrete and standing seam metal. She noted that there would be a lot of articulation in the facades with balconies and an expressive roof line. Landscaping was considered to be a primary building material and the team was looking to incorporate native plants into the plan. Additionally, there were vegetated roofs in the proposal. The intention was to take a balanced and thoughtful approach to architecture.

Mr. Fiveash summarized some of the main points of the proposal. He reported that the proposal met the density requirement, had less than 83 units and less than the total allowed square footage. They were permitted to have up to 9,900 square feet of support commercial, but they had 3,400 square feet. He stated that there were appropriate amenities and the proposal met the employee housing requirement with four units. The heights were under the 75-foot requirements and 50% of the upper floor was set back to create some articulation in the building. 60% of the units were in a single building and less than 5% of the site had changed. The only thing that he was uncertain of was the gable roof. He believed they were gabled, but there were questions about language.

Commissioner Suesser asked about the grade on either side of the road. Mr. Fiveash explained that there was a slope in both directions. From east to west, there were slopes that ranged from 15 to 30% and the north to south slope was in the 30 to 40% range. Ms. Mooney noted that there was a complex topography to navigate and consider.

Commissioner Thimm believed the reduced footprint and the reduced amount of disturbance proposed would be beneficial. He wanted to see a comparison between the original approval and current proposal as it related to the footprint and site disturbance. This would make it easier for Commissioners to understand the reduction. Commissioner Thimm agreed with Staff recommendation for gross building volume size comparisons. He did not believe there should be more parking than necessary and suggested that a fully vetted parking analysis be conducted to support the reduction in stalls. He felt there should also be a Transportation Demand Management ("TDM") plan conducted and shared.

Commissioner Van Dine expressed concerns about a large retaining wall near the eastern most building around the base. She felt that might need to be reconsidered. Commissioner Van Dine agreed with Commissioner Thimm and believed a parking analysis and TDM would be beneficial. Commissioner Johnson echoed her concerns and wondered how tall the retaining wall would be for the Phase Three building. He looked forward to seeing the Sensitive Lands Analysis. Commissioner Johnson asked about the potential timeline for the project. Mr. Fiveash explained that the goal was to break ground in the spring and have the Phase One buildings completed by Fall 2024. He hoped that the other buildings would be added in the following years, with Phase Two in 2025 and Phase Three in 2026.

Commissioner Hall requested that Assistant Planning Director Ward share the recorded plat and full Exhibit F with Commissioners. She asked whether the item had been noticed to the public. Assistant Planning Director Ward reported that there was public notice given for the Work Session. Ahead of the next meeting, there would be postcards mailed to nearby property owners. However, due to the location of the development, it would not affect many residents. Commissioner Hall believed it was important for the applicant to hear public feedback earlier on in the process. Assistant Planning Director Ward noted that one email comment had been received and would be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

Commissioner Hall asked about the need for affordable units within the structure. Assistant Planning Director Ward reported that the applicant was currently in discussions with the Housing Department and they were continuing to work out the housing obligations. That had not been included in the Meeting Materials Packet for the current Planning Commission Meeting, but it would be provided to the Planning Commission to review in future.

Commissioner Thimm mentioned the applicant question regarding the gable roof. He believed the amount of roof that was gabled would be at least 51% and therefore, the dominant portion of the roof would likely be considered a gable form. However, he noted that there were shed roofs on the ends, which were the most visible areas. He wondered whether a more traditional gable form would be appropriate in those locations.

Commissioner Kenworthy wondered why the underground parking requirement had been put in place. Mr. Fiveash was not certain, but believed that underground parking versus surface parking was the subject of debate in the 90s and the language ensured that underground parking was chosen for the project. Commissioner Kenworthy agreed with previous Commissioner comments and felt that a TDM and parking analysis should be prioritized.

Commissioner Suesser asked whether access to the development would be from Highway 40. Mr. Fiveash reported that the Settlement Agreement allowed access to the site from the Queen Esther Gate and the Highway 40 side. There was also an allowance that stated the garage could be entered from both sides. Commissioner Suesser noted that the 1995 Site Plan included a ski academy proposal. Mr. Fiveash explained that in the second amendment to the Settlement Agreement, the ski academy was moved down to the Jordanelle area.

Chair Phillips agreed with many of the comments shared by Staff and Commissioners. He felt the presentation introduced the project well and thanked Mr. Fiveash, Ms. Mooney and Mr. Bennett for attending the Planning Commission Meeting.

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

Chair Phillips explained that he would still be present at the meeting, but was dealing with some technical issues. He asked Commissioner Suesser to run the meeting until his video worked. Senior City Planner, Alexandra Ananth introduced Gary Horton and Jeremy Searle from WCG. Mr. Searle explained that his work focused on traffic analysis for the site and Mr. Horton focused more on the transit roadway and some of the design elements.

Planner Ananth stated that the Deer Valley Snow Park application was to amend the existing MPD. There was also a CUP for Phase One of the Snow Park Village redevelopment, which included the parking structure, the transit and mobility hub and overall site plan. The current Planning Commission Meeting would focus on the parking and transportation analysis and there would be presentations from both the consulting group and applicant. The next meeting on the Deer Valley Snow Park proposal was scheduled to take place on December 8, 2021 and would begin with a site visit at 4:00 p.m. at the Snow Park parking lot. During the Regular Meeting on that date, the parking and transportation discussions would continue.

Since the last meeting, the applicant had submitted a Parking Analysis, Parking Management Plan and a TDM Plan. This was in addition to the Transportation Analysis that was submitted with the application. Planner Ananth reported that the project was governed by the existing MPD, which was known as the Deer Valley Twelfth Amended and Restated Large Scale MPD Permit, the Park City LMC, the General Plan for the Lower Deer Valley Neighborhood and the Park City adopted Transportation Plans. Planner Ananth overviewed the adopted Transportation Plans:

- Complete Streets Resolution, adopted 2018;
- Transportation Demand Management Plan, adopted 2016;
- Traffic and Transportation Master Plan, adopted 2011;
- Vision 2020 Transportation Innovation Pillar.

Planner Ananth explained that a lot of what the adopted Transportation Plans focused on was the modal priority for decision making. This gave higher priority to active transportation (pedestrians and bicyclists) and transit instead of general-purpose parking and traffic. The Lower Deer Valley Neighborhood Plan noted that traffic flows in out Deer Valley were a priority along with alternative modes of transportation being included in development plans. She explained that the City was looking to prioritize transit with dedicated bus lanes wherever possible. Staff would meet with the applicant next week to look at the right-of-way and the potential for bus-only lanes in and out of the Deer Valley Snow Park area.

Other areas of concern for the Planning and Engineering Divisions were:

- Mitigation for the increased traffic on Deer Valley Drive East;
- The number of curb cuts, entrances and exits to the proposed garage, which could interrupt the active transportation infrastructure;
- Provide the right amount of parking and not oversupply parking;
- Improve the TDM to ensure a modal shift to transit was prioritized.

The applicant looked at three intersections when reviewing the area: the Deer Valley Drive Y intersection, Marsac Roundabout and Deer Valley Drive/Bonanza Drive. There was some congestion at the Deer Valley Y intersection, but the other intersections were managing well. The applicant proposed a realignment of the Deer Valley Y intersection as well as a potential signal to improve traffic in that area. The Planning Department wanted to note that although the applicant studied the three intersections, they did not look at the Deer Valley Drive/224 intersection or the Bonanza Drive/248 intersection. She explained that those areas were where the bottlenecks occurred. Staff was concerned that without consideration of those intersections, the analysis may not be completely accurate. They had asked the Deer Valley transportation consultants to go back and focus on those areas in future.

Planner Ananth shared a slide to illustrate how the applicant proposed to change the Deer Valley Y intersection. The goal was to direct vehicles down towards Deer Valley Drive East as opposed to Deer Valley Drive West. The roadway would be expanded and there would be pedestrian improvements. However, Staff wanted to hear more about what that would mean for Deer Valley Drive East and whether additional mitigation efforts would be needed. Staff also wanted to understand how the location of the mobility hub was chosen. It was located off of Doe Pass Road at the backend of the Snow Park parking garage as opposed to the front end. In addition, Staff wanted to learn more about possible dedicated bus lanes.

The entrances and exits into the garage were discussed. Planner Ananth noted that they all impacted the proposed sidewalks around the site. Staff had asked the applicant to look at that further. Each of the garage levels was independent to one another and one suggestion was to combine two of the levels to reduce some of the access points. They were interested in reducing some of the access points off of Doe Pass Road so there was no interference with the transit and mobility hub. Planner Ananth addressed parking and explained that the LMC had a list of requirements for the off-street parking spaces that the applicant had proposed to waive. She noted that the LMC required 2,262 parking stalls for all three phases of the site, but the applicant had proposed 1,800. The commercial uses were complimentary to the ski resort and the timing and use of the event center could be controlled and conditioned. The Planning Department was fairly supportive of the proposed parking reduction.

Planner Ananth explained that the proposal would remove the overflow parking that happened on Deer Valley Drive East on 10% of ski days per season as the applicant would increase the amount of day skier parking from what currently existed. The implementation of paid parking and the TDM plan made the proposed parking reduction reasonable. She noted that the applicant had not proposed to rely on City infrastructure in order to justify the 20% parking reduction. Staff was concerned that the applicant not overpark the site, as more parking would equal more traffic.

Mr. Searle reported that WCG was asked to review various submittals from the Deer Valley team, such as the traffic analysis, parking analysis, transit and mobility hub documents, turning radius documents and the TDM. The review was done with the Park City priorities in mind and there was a focus on active transportation and transit. For each of the documents, a review memo was shared with the Deer Valley project team. It included detailed comments, which were later discussed with the team in more detail. The intention was to share an overview of the potential areas of concern with the Planning Commission for consideration.

The traffic analysis was discussed first. Mr. Searle noted that while three intersections were examined, some other important intersections were not. Additionally, the analysis did not look at the internal circulation, such as drop offs, the mobility hub and hotel traffic. There would be a lot happening in and around the site and it was important to determine that the site functioned well. Mr. Searle explained that there were also comments related to the trip reductions assumed in the traffic analysis. They were not opposed to the trip reductions, but requested detailed information to ensure that the numbers presented were actually achievable. The review memo also included comments related to the trip distribution for analysis. Origin destination data was included, but there were some inconsistencies between that data and how the trips from the project were assigned from the roadway network. They had asked the applicant to double check the information and ensure that it was analyzed correctly.

WCG also requested additional information about the existing transit usage as well as what types of improvements would be implemented. It was important to ensure that the transit first policy was a primary focus. The plans they had seen incorporated transit, but did not seem to have it as a high priority. Mr. Searle also addressed the shift of traffic on Deer Valley Drive. The project team expected to shift traffic from Deer Valley Drive West to Deer Valley Drive East. He explained that the existing AM peak hour traffic on Deer Valley Drive East was 355 vehicles. The existing PM peak hour traffic on Deer Valley Drive East was 642 vehicles. With the proposed shift in traffic, the AM peak hour traffic would increase to 1,000 vehicles and the PM peak house traffic would increase to 1,300 vehicles. There could be roadway and access point issues along Deer Valley Drive East as the result of that shift. Additional clarity was needed to determine whether mitigation efforts would be put in place.

Commissioner Suesser wondered whether an analysis was done on Deer Valley Drive West as well. Mr. Searle noted that all of the traffic currently on the road would be shifted over to Deer Valley Drive East and there would be a reduction in cars on Deer Valley Drive West. Commissioner Van Dine wondered whether there would be an impact on traffic due to the increased number of restaurants and amenities. Mr. Searle confirmed this and stated that the intent was to spread out the traffic. Those restaurants and amenities were part of the rationale for the proposed parking reductions. Commissioner Suesser noted that the applicant wanted to encourage transit first. She asked if there had been an analysis of the remote parking availability in order to support that modal shift. Mr. Searle explained that there had been a request for more information related to that shift in the review memo.

Commissioner Kenworthy noted that the vast majority of people in Park City agreed with a transit first approach, but there needed to be a clear plan. Mr. Searle stated that a comprehensive evaluation and a coordinated effort would be needed. It was important that a solid transit plan was in place. Commissioner Kenworthy referenced a comment in the review memo, which stated that many of the Deer Valley clients were wealthy and there needed to be an incentive for those clients to switch to transit. Mr. Searle commented that additional information was needed related to the paid parking system and how transit would be made more convenient.

Commissioner Suesser noted that Staff was concerned about providing too much parking. She believed that if a parking spot was available, there would be visitors willing to pay for that spot. A further reduction in parking may be appropriate to discourage people from driving. Commissioner Van Dine agreed that convenience would be a key factor for transit use. She wondered whether WCG had any strategies that they were working on related to that. Mr. Searle clarified that they had provided comments and suggestions to the applicant, but there was no final plan in place. He noted that dedicated bus lanes, transit signal priority for buses at key intersections, making sure the mobility hub on site functioned well and seamless transfers would all be considered.

Mr. Searle shared comments related to active transportation. The traffic analysis assumed high vehicle reductions due to the different mode choices, which included active transportation. It was important to make sure that the reductions were reasonable and there were good facilities and amenities in place to ensure that visitors were able to walk or ride their bicycles to the destination. A full active transportation plan had been requested. WCG had also requested that the Deer Valley team identify all of the active transportation crossing and conflict points as well as identify mitigation measures to ensure safety. They also requested that there was a clear plan to determine how the active transportation routes would be safe and useful during the winter months.

Mr. Horton reported that WCG had provided a concept for the applicant to consider for transit prioritization. It included the addition of a single transit only lane from the Deer Valley Y intersection. Additionally, the Deer Valley Y intersection would have transit signal prioritization. Another suggestion was made for access points into the parking lots from Doe Pass Road. Mr. Horton explained that the idea was to remove those access points due to conflicts and potential delays for transit. Some additional possibilities were shared with the Planning Commission. For instance, there could be a one-way loop, with one lane for transit and one lane for personal vehicles. The transit hubs could also be relocated to more ideal locations for transit riders. Additionally, bus stops could be added along the loop.

Mr. Horton shared two potential ideas for consideration as it related to transit: the in-lane idea and the bus pull-out idea. The in-lane idea would involve the bus staying in one lane and allowing riders to get on and off. Vehicles would stay behind the bus and the bus would not lose a spot in line. That would make transit the highest priority and would discourage the use of vehicles as personal vehicles would have to wait behind buses. The bus pull-out idea would use a signal to allow buses to pull back into traffic without having to wait for there to be a gap in traffic in order to do so. The suggestions had been shared with the applicant.

Commissioner Thimm believed the in-lane concept could encourage visitors to take transit and wondered if there were examples elsewhere where that type of concept had been implemented. Mr. Horton noted that WCG would look into that further. Commissioner Thimm asked for a WCG recommendation about how far the curb cuts should be from the mobility hub. Mr. Searle noted that the access was almost adjacent to the mobility hub, which was problematic. The intention was to remove accesses off of Doe Pass Road. However, the parking garage still needed to be accessible. Those details were being worked through with the applicant.

Commissioner Hall asked for additional data related to neighborhood traffic delays on high transit ridership days. City Engineer, John Robertson stated that Staff could look into how increased ridership would impact the neighborhood traffic. Planner Ananth was not sure whether that type of data was collected. She believed there would be data about buses loading and unloading passengers, but not necessarily about the vehicle delays behind the buses.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked about the one-way loop suggestion. Mr. Searle clarified that the applicant proposal did not include a loop. It would have Deer Valley Drive West dead end and a gate would prevent visitors from going too far down the road. They assumed that 80% of the traffic would enter from Deer Valley Drive East. Commissioner Kenworthy asked for further details about the WCG proposed one-way loop. Mr. Horton stated that the one-way loop would make ins and outs to the accesses smoother and easier as there would be less conflicts.

Chair Phillips noted that the one-way loop had been proposed by WCG for brainstorming. He felt it would be best to wait until the Deer Valley team had considered the idea further. It did not make sense to spend too much time focusing on the suggestion at the current time. Chair Phillips asked about potential unintended impacts caused by the bus signal. For instance, backups from lower Deer Valley Drive to the roundabout. Mr. Horton explained that they had not looked into that yet, but felt that with the 5-to-10-minute gaps between buses, that risk would be low. Discussions were had about incentivizing transit. Chair Phillips felt that the closer visitors were dropped off to the lift, the more attractive transit would be. Mr. Searle agreed and stated that those comments had been shared in the review memo. It was important to make transit usage convenient.

Mr. Horton reported that WCG also reviewed the mobility hub and turning radius. There were a few items on the applicant submission that created issues. For instance, the fact that the turning radiuses of the buses conflicted with other turning movements. Those issues had been highlighted for the applicant and the applicant would make corrections as needed. Mr. Searle stated that WCG also reviewed the TDM plan and additional detail was requested on the concept level initiatives that were proposed. They recommended that there be an ongoing monitoring system to ensure that the initiatives ran successfully. There were also additional ideas for applicant consideration, which included the following:

- Work with hotels and overnight stay locations to improve messaging related to vehicle-optional vacations;
- Focus on employee education so employees are able to share transportation information and options with guests;
- Expand the e-bike share system;
- Focus on transit convenience.

Peter Pillman from IBI Group explained that due to time constraints, some of his presentation may be differed to a future meeting. IBI Group was excited to work with WCG and review the concepts that they had proposed. Snow Park Project Manager, Rich Wagner reported that the Deer Valley team had been focused on community outreach for the last six to eight months. They reached out to over 300 community member groups and organizations to gather as much feedback and information as possible. What made sense had been implemented into the Site Plan. Mr. Wagner stated that there was a balancing act between the input, the various goals and the desires of Deer Valley Resort. The Site Plan was not perfect for every scenario, but it was balanced. Once one item was tweaked, it would impact the effectiveness of the overall plan. He noted that all of the Planning Commission Meetings to date had been informational. In future, he asked that there be a more actionable approach taken. For instance, determining the location of the mobility hub. If that needed to be moved, he needed to know sooner rather than later. Chair Phillips understood and appreciated that the Deer Valley team had been working with the Commission.

Steven Issowits from Deer Valley Resort stated that the intention was to move towards a transit focused planning process. However, there were several other factors outside of Deer Valley control to consider. He appreciated the comments made by WCG, but added that there was a balancing act to consider. Mr. Issowits explained that the Deer Valley team had shown how they suggested prioritizing transit and how the transit center would be improved. He addressed the WCG in-lane concept and noted that he did not see that occurring as it would likely cause major traffic backups behind the buses. It would be possible to look at other locations for bus drop-offs.

Chair Phillips noted that the Deer Valley team and WCG had not had an opportunity to have a full discussion related to the review memos and the WCG suggestions made. He trusted that those discussions would take place. Chair Phillips felt that the comments related to balance made sense and there was a lot to consider. Given the time constraints of the current meeting, he did not believe there would be an opportunity for public comments.

Mr. Wagner reported that there had been discussions with the Fire Marshal and there would be emergency access through the village. It would be cleared during the winter. He noted that some paver elements would need to be expanded and approximately 50-feet of the ski beach would be lost, but it was the only way to achieve a loop system in that location. There would still be a decent ski beach. Mr. Pillman felt that some of the issues needed to be discussed further with WCG. The Planning Commission site visit was scheduled to take place on December 8, 2021 and it would be possible to spend time at the Planning Commission Meeting that same evening to answer outstanding some questions.

David Nicholas from IBI Group explained that they had been regularly updating and reprising the active transportation plan. They wanted to make sure complete street applications were implemented. In addition, they had looked at the existing curb cuts, the connections of trail systems and the addition of bicycle parking. He stressed the importance of signage and wayfinding in the area. Jon Nepstad from Fehr & Peers added that Fehr & Peers also had a fair amount of work in progress, including the traffic simulations that the Commission would see in future. There would be a meeting the following week with Staff and City consultants to discuss those traffic simulations in person. Chair Phillips appreciated the work that was being done.

It was noted that there had been some questions related to the location of the mobility hub. There was a long period of time between the current Planning Commission Meeting and the December 8, 2021 meeting. It may be beneficial to discuss the mobility hub location prior to that date. Planner Ananth stated that she could share updates with the Commission about the discussions between Staff and the applicant. She pointed out that there were only two meetings in November, because of the Thanksgiving holiday. Mr. Wagner stressed the importance of a focused meeting where the placement of the mobility hub could be confirmed.

Engineer Robertson explained that the placement of the mobility hub would be the first discussion item during the scheduled meeting with the Deer Valley team and Fehr & Peers. He believed that WCG had asked for further clarification, information and data about the proposed mobility hub location. He noted that transit needed to be the main priority.

Commissioner Suesser liked the proposed one-way loop underneath the ski beach. However, she did not think that the mobility hub needed to move. She shared possible traffic flow options. Commissioner Van Dine preferred the initial Deer Valley plan to some of the WCG suggestions. For instance, she did not like the idea of buses stopping in the middle of the street. She also felt that the mobility hub should stay in the proposed location. Commissioner Johnson believed the mobility hub was in a good location, but he appreciated the questions that WCG was asking Deer Valley. He looked forward to hearing more after their discussions took place.

6. REGULAR SESSION

A. 1765 Sidewinder Drive - Plat Amendment - The Applicant Proposes to Re-plat the Second Floor of a Mixed-Use Building from Six Residential Units to One Residential Unit. PL-21-04981.

Planner I, Lillian Lederer, shared the Staff Report and stated that the item was for a plat amendment for Club Lespri Condominium. The applicant, Dave Johnson, was present to answer Commissioner questions. Planner Lederer reported that the property was located at 1765 Sidewinder Drive in the General Commercial (GC) Zone. The applicant proposed to amend the Club Lespri plat and replat the second floor of the mixed-use building from six residential units to one residential unit. The proposal complied with the LMC Chapter 15-2.18. There were no exterior alterations proposed and the existing building complied with lot size, height and width requirements as well as front, side and rear setbacks.

The applicant needed to show that the combination of units would not:

- Impair the structural integrity or mechanical systems of the building or units;
- Reduce the support of any portion of the common areas and facilities or another unit;
- Constitute a violation of Utah Code Section 10-9a-608;
- Violate any section of the International Building Code.

Planner Lederer reported that the applicant had provided a Structural Engineer Report to show that the combination of uses would not affect the integrity of the building. That was Exhibit G in the Staff Report. The proposal complied with LMC 15-3-6, Parking Ratio Requirements For Specific Land Use Categories. Since it was a unit combination, the required parking was reduced from six space to two spaces. The Development Review Committee had reviewed the application on October 5, 2021 and there were no issues raised. No public comments were received for the item, but one clarification about the plat amendment had been requested.

Staff found that the proposal complied with the General Commercial (GC) Zone requirements, the general subdivision requirements and the parking ratio requirements, as outlined and conditioned in the Staff Report. As a result, Staff recommended that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing and consider forwarding a positive recommendation for City Council consideration on November 11, 2021.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to APPROVE the Plat Amendment for Club Lespri Condominiums at 1765 Sidewinder Drive, based on the following:

<u>**Findings of Fact**</u>

1. The proposed condominium is located in the General Commercial (GC) Zone.

2. The structure was originally approved as a hotel, which is an approved use in the General Commercial (GC) Zone and received a Building Permit on September 28, 2000.

3. The Planning Commission granted a Conditional Use Permit for a timeshare for the building on July 11, 2001.

4. The Planning Commission forwarded a positive recommendation to the City Council for the Condominium Conversion on June 26, 2002.

5. The structure is a 9,031 square foot building constructed on a 4,550 square foot lot with 10 units.

6. Parking for the structure is provided by the Prospector Square Subdivision common parking lots.

7. The maximum height for the General Commercial (GC) Zone is 35-feet above grade.

8. Building setbacks for the Prospector Square Subdivision are zero (0).

9. The proposed plat changes the type of ownership of this property to condominium ownership.

10. The Park City Land Management Code and General Plan allow condominium conversions to commercial buildings in the General Commercial (GC) Zone when all minimum code requirements are met.

11. The applicant abandons the July 11, 2002 Planning Commission CUP approval for a timeshare use.

12. The applicant stipulates to all Conditions of Approval.

Conclusions of Law

1. This approval as conditioned is consistent with the requirements of Section 15.7 of the Land Management Code as well as the General Plan.

2. This approval as conditioned does not adversely affect the health, safety, or welfare of the citizens of Park City.

3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by this plat amendment.

4. There is good cause for this condominium plat.

5. The plat is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State Laws regarding condominium plats.

Conditions of Approval

1. All standard conditions of project approval shall apply to this project.

2. This approval shall render the July 11, 2001 CUP approval for a timeshare null and void.

3. No changes to the building (as approved by the Community Development Department on September 28, 2000) are approved as part of this application.

4. The condominium record of survey play shall not be recorded until all issues pertaining to water, sewer and other utilities are fully resolved with the City Engineer and Chief Building Official.

5. This approval shall expire one year from the date of City Council approval, unless this condominium plat is recorded prior to that date.

6. The City Attorney and City Engineer's review and approval of the condominium plat and CC&R's for compliance with the Land Management Code, State Law and conditions of approval, is a condition precedent to recording the plat.

Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion.

VOTE: Commissioner Johnson-Aye; Commissioner Van Dine- Aye; Commissioner Hall-Aye; Commissioner Suesser-Aye, Kenworthy-Aye, Commissioner Thimm-Aye. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

B. 9300 Marsac Ave (Sommet Blanc/B2East Parcel) - Applicant is Requesting a Conditional Use Permit and Amendments to the Approved Master Planned Development and Flagstaff Development Agreement for Proposed Development of 43 Residential Units Above Underground Parking, 4 Townhome Villas within 2 Duplexes on the North-Eastern Portion of the Site, a 3,600-Square-Foot Public Restaurant and a Detached Ancillary Ski Locker Building. PL-21-04771 & PL-20-04702.

Planner II, Makena Hawley, presented the Staff Report and stated that the item was for an amendment to the 2007 Pod B2, Empire Pass MPD, an amendment to the 2007 Flagstaff Development Agreement and a CUP for the Empire Pass Pod B2 East, Sommet Blanc Residences. Planner Hawley reported that the property was located at 9300 Marsac Avenue and it was adjacent to the Deer Valley Empire Day Lodge and the Montage Deer Valley. It was located in the Residential Development (RD) Zone and was governed by the 2007 Flagstaff Development Agreement. The lot was signified as a developable lot in the agreement and there had been several temporary sales structures placed on it over the years. It was once the location of the Mazepah Mine Shaft, but that had been closed and covered. Subsequent mine remediation had taken place on the lot. During the agreement in the MPD planning, B2East had been granted certain exceptions and limitations on the lot, which included, but were not limited to:

- Design guidelines;
- Previously approved volumetrics in heights, including the Hill-Glazier Plan;
- The maximum amount of Planned Unit Development ("PUD") units.

The applicant proposed Sommet Blanc residences, which included three condominium buildings, with 43 residential units above underground parking. It would include a 3,600 square foot public restaurant, four townhome villas within two duplex buildings and a detached ancillary ski locker building. Planner Hawley explained that the proposal was being reviewed because in the Residential Development (RD) Zone, a multi-unit dwelling was a Conditional Use. Additionally, the 2007 Flagstaff Development Agreement required an amendment to the design guidelines and the number of PUD units. The MPD required Condition of Approval #1 and #2 to be modified.

Planner Hawley stated that the 2007 Flagstaff Development Agreement would look at a change to the maximum density. The design guidelines would be specific to the B2East property and would not change the design guidelines for Empire Pass. For Condition of Approval #2, the height exception granted in 2007 was a maximum of 82-feet. However, for building C, the applicant had requested a maximum of 92-feet. Staff found there was compliance with the CUP criteria. Additionally, the amendment requests and modifications to the MPD and Development Agreement could be mitigated appropriately.

The previously approved volumetrics were evaluated under the Hill-Glazier Plan, which set the unit equivalents and residential square footage. It also set a number of required affordable units and the amount of resort support commercial square footage. Sommet Blanc requested the same amount of square footage and equivalent units, additional affordable units, four additional PUD units and an additional drive. While the footprint was similar, the layouts were different, with the Hill-Glazier Plan being connected and leaning towards the southern corner of the lot. Alternatively, the Sommet Blanc proposal was more separated, with PUD units and a drive leading to those units. It also leaned towards the north on the hill instead. The proposal complied with the unit equivalents, but the height and PUD units would require amendments to the 2007 Pod B2, Empire Pass MPD and 2007 Flagstaff Development Agreement.

The Site Plan was similar to the volumetrics. The current proposal was more broken up and there was an additional drive. Planner Hawley reported that it still met the Residential Development (RD) Zone setbacks and the volumetrics and Site Plan would require amendments. The building height was discussed. She explained that in the 2007 Pod B2, Empire Pass MPD, a Condition of Approval allowed an 82-foot maximum over benchmark grade. However, the Sommet Blanc proposal asked for a 10-foot exemption on Building C in order to step the buildings down towards Empire Day Lodge. An increase to building height could be made with a site-specific analysis and an amendment to that Condition of Approval.

Staff recommended that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing and consider an amendment to the 2007 Pod B2, Empire Pass MPD, an amendment to the 2007 Flagstaff Development Agreement and a CUP for the Empire Pass Pod B2 East, Sommet Blanc Residences, according to the Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval as outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter.

The applicant representatives, Douglas Ogilvy and Hannah Tyler, were present at the meeting. Mr. Ogilvy noted that there had been some comments made during the site visit before the Planning Commission Meeting related to Twisted Branch Road. However, the applicant for Sommet Blanc had no ownership or control over that road and there was no basis for a Condition of Approval on the Sommet Blanc site related to Twisted Branch Road access.

Mr. Ogilvy also pointed out that there had been discussions related to the Mid Mountain Trailhead parking lot. They would improve the parking lot if desired by the Planning Commission, but he requested that there be a Condition of Approval that parking lot improvements be subject to further review and study. Mr. Ogilvy shared a slide presentation with the Commission. It included a project rendering, an aerial view of the site, the Site Plan and several images for context. He noted that coming down the ski side, there was a tree island on Deer Valley property that was adjacent to Building C. There may be an opportunity to maintain that tree island, but it would need to be reviewed with Deer Valley. The property line was discussed. Mr. Ogilvy reported that a 20-foot easement had been granted to Deer Valley to widen the ski trail and an additional 20-foot buffer easement was granted as a safety zone. Under the terms of those easements, they were unable to put any hardscape or landscape improvements that Deer Valley deemed could be dangerous to skiers. Mr. Ogilvy added that there were opportunities for tree preservation.

There was a previous request to look into the affordable housing offering. Mr. Ogilvy stated that Building A and Building B had some units that would be owned by the HOA and Building C would have four studio units. Building heights were discussed. Building A and Building B were six stories with no roof above and Building C was seven stories with no roof above. The majority of Empire Pass had seven story buildings from grade with a roof element above. Mr. Ogilvy shared height comparisons with other buildings. He felt the proposed height changes were reasonable.

Mr. Ogilvy discussed the Mid Mountain Trail area. He reported that Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") had approved the pedestrian crossing at the Twisted Branch Road access point. He felt the traffic counts at Mid Mountain Trail were high enough that UDOT was likely to approve the addition of a striped crosswalk. Regardless of what happened with the parking lot, the proposal was to reroute the trail in that area and add in a kiosk and restroom. The parking lot plan was shared with the Commission. Park City Municipal Corporation managed the parking lot and the applicant had offered to make certain improvements. Mr. Ogilvy noted that they were happy to maintain the commitment to finance and complete the improvements to the parking lot, pending resolution on the desired direction.

Chair Phillips did not believe the item would be voted on during the current Planning Commission Meeting. At the last meeting, he had requested information regarding cross sections for the PUD. He wanted to understand the reason for the additional height request. Commissioner Thimm stated that this was the first noticed public hearing on the item and it was important to give as much time as possible to the public. He wondered what the proposed height was for Building C, as documents referenced both 92-feet and 94-feet. Mr. Ogilvy clarified that it was 94-feet.

Commissioner Johnson commented that it appeared that excavation had already started on the furthest corner on Building C. He wondered whether that was based off of the administrative approval for the sewer line switch. Commissioner Kenworthy asked how Sommet Blanc would prevent guests and visitors from using the parking at the Mid Mountain Trailhead. Mr. Ogilvy reported that the villa units each had a double garage with apron parking for two cars directly in front. There was also some apron parking next to the amenity building. If someone had guests visiting the villas, there would be visitor parking available within the upper driveway area.

Commissioner Suesser stated that based on the presentation and viewing the site, she recommended the proposed parking improvements not be made. It would be more limiting to some of the winter parking and would not provide significant additional safety. She was also concerned about the excavation and 10-foot retaining wall that would be needed and felt it detracted from the environment. With regard to the site, she approved of the architecture, layout and requested building heights. However, she objected to the addition of the upper roadway and the clearing that would be necessary for the villas and the extended driveway to the amenity building. That was a departure from the previously approved plan and she felt it would cause too much destruction to the natural environment.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing.

Angela Moschetta explained that she attended the site visit earlier in the evening. She was not against growth, but believed in smart growth. She noted that the Brighton Estates residents had concerns about the uses in the area. Ms. Moschetta stated that a question was asked at the site visit about the purpose of the changes to the parking lot. It seemed that the intention was to increase usage. She also had a question about the retaining walls. She wondered whether there were height limitations that would determine whether it required an administrative permit.

Paul Astorga expressed concerns related to the parking lot. Some people at the site visit did not want to see a berm or guard rail put in as it would limit larger vehicles or trailers being able to maneuver in and out of the lot. Additionally, it would be difficult for larger vehicles to turn around or for snow plowing to be done in the winter. The parking lot being set back further than it currently was would likely add to safety, but it was important that it remained accessible.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Suesser shared a suggestion related to Twisted Branch Road. Since the builder had a relationship with the owner of Twisted Branch Road, it may be possible to provide access to the villas off of that road rather than building another roadway in the area.

Trails & Open Space Program Manager, Heinrich Deters, discussed the intention of the parking lot. He noted that Mid Mountain Trailhead was a public trailhead that accessed the Mid Mountain Trail. The purpose of the parking lot improvements was to provide that public access. Mr. Deters reminded the Planning Commission that in an early meeting associated with the project, Commissioners identified the need for safety improvements in that area. He had worked with the developer to consult with several engineers and UDOT. The different entities felt that safety would be improved by moving vehicles further back from the road, so vehicles were not backing into the actual driving lanes. The addition of restrooms and a kiosk would be a positive community benefit. Mr. Deters noted that some concerns had been expressed about the berm. He could consult with engineers about other possibilities. He felt it was a good project and there was an opportunity for the developer to provide a public amenity that would benefit the community.

Commissioner Thimm asked how many stalls were currently in the parking lot. Mr. Deters reported that there were currently 25 parking stalls and the new layout would have 29 parking stalls. It would be a modest improvement. Commissioner Thimm felt that creating safe traffic conditions had to do with reducing conflicts. The conflicts would be reduced with the new layout. While he understood that there were some concerns about being able to park trailers, in general, it seemed that the proposed solution was superior to the existing condition.

Chair Phillips felt there needed to be more discussions about the parking lot in order to weigh the pros and cons. He understood the argument for public safety and noted that there would be improvements in that area. However, it was important to further discuss potential negative impacts, such as trailer access and vegetation loss.

Commissioner Thimm wondered whether it might be better to separate the parking lot from the rest of the proposal in order to move forward. Commissioner Suesser noted that the Commission wanted to make the parking lot a Condition of Approval on the development. Chair Phillips believed there was still time to reach consensus on the issue before the item was voted on. Commissioner Van Dine noted that the applicant had stated they were willing to have a Condition of Approval related to the parking lot. She did not necessarily believe that it made sense to hold up the application for further parking lot discussions. Commissioner Van Dine supported the proposed changes to the parking lot and felt it would be a significant improvement.

Commissioner Suesser felt it was important to think about snow plows in the area. A berm, hard curb or fence would restrict or limit plowing to some extent. That was a limitation the Commission may not want to impose in the area. Commissioner Johnson felt that the parking lot worked for summer usage, but the winter usage was a concern. He asked for additional information about the Brighton Estates usage of the parking lot. Mr. Deters explained that information related to Brighton Estates should come from the Brighton Estates HOA. In terms of the parking lot, making the area safter with better amenities for users would be positive for the community.

Commissioner Johnson wondered whether snowmobiling was permitted on the City-owned property in Bonanza Flats. Mr. Deters denied this. Commissioner Suesser believed it was permitted in order for residents to access their cabins and for transportation purposes. Mr. Deters explained that during the winter season, it was difficult to plow certain sections of Guardsman Pass. There was an agreement in place that residents could use a snowmobile to ride across the property for access. There was a 25-to-30-foot-wide path with a rope line for designated use in one specific area of the property.

Commissioner Suesser wondered whether the Mid Mountain Trail would still be rerouted if the villas were not being put in. Mr. Deters explained that the alignment worked, but what was proposed was an improvement. He would not actively change the alignment if someone else was not going to pay for it as it was not a current priority. Commissioner Kenworthy asked Mr. Deters to look into how the parking lot could work for visitors with trailers. Mr. Deters stated that Staff could ask engineers to look into the turning radiuses. Commissioner Suesser added that additional information was needed about the winter conditions.

Commissioner Hall mentioned a comment made during the public comment period about retaining walls. Ms. Milliken explained that any retaining wall over 6-feet would be an administrative CUP. Chair Phillips noted that the retaining walls that were currently being put in place had been done through an administrative CUP. He wondered whether the sewer line was being installed up the center of the main drive. Ms. Milliken reported that there was a sewer going in below the retaining walls. Chair Phillips gathered from the site visit that the sewer was being put in under the main drive and that the retaining walls needed to be there to accommodate the project. He pointed out that the developer had spent a lot of money at their risk for something that may not be approved. It put everyone in a difficult position. Ms. Milliken clarified that the sewer line would also service the restaurant further up the hill. The sewer line could still go in whether or not the item was approved. Chair Phillips noted that it appeared the back corner of Building C had been somewhat excavated, which was not necessary for the sewer. It was frustrating to see so much work being done on the site before the project had been approved.

Commissioner Thimm reiterated that it was important for all of the documents to be consistent and that they state 94-feet instead of 92-feet. He wondered whether it would be possible to see a cross section that outlined the areas of disturbance or an analysis about how to disturb as little as possible. Chair Phillips asked for more information about the building height. He wanted to see basic dimensions of the heights (floor to floor and floor to ceiling) in order to better understand the need for additional height. Mr. Ogilvy shared a slide related to that request and overviewed some of the information. While some of the proposed buildings were taller than those in Empire Pass, the roofline was below Twisted Branch Road. There would not be much of an impact on neighbors. The additional height would enable the development to have three story buildings, which would reduce the footprint. He explained that when the proposal went from five units to three units, it became a wider and shallower unit, which also reduced the disturbance.

Chair Phillips asked that additional information about heights be shared at the next Planning Commission Meeting on the item. His concern was that from below, the buildings would tower above the roundabout as a visitor approached that section. Commissioner Suesser asked about the dimensions of the ski locker building. It was noted that the information would be available at a future meeting. Commissioner Thimm stated that the height of the buildings did not concern him as much as the area disturbance. He asked that information related to area disturbance be prepared ahead of the next meeting on the item. Planner Hawley noted that the item could be tabled until the December 8, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting.

Mr. Ogilvy discussed the Hill-Glazier Plan. He also explained that they had not started excavation on Building C. Some soil tests were conducted within the building footprint of proposed Building C and within the footprint of the proposed villas in the Hill-Glazier Plan. Mr. Ogilvy acknowledged the comments made by Commissioners about additional information and stated that he would bring that information to the meeting on the item. He stated that they were willing to improve the parking lot if there was a consensus about what improvements should be made. He suggested that perhaps parallel parking in the winter could be eliminated and 90-degree parking could be done on the back side of the lot to potentially alleviate concerns about backing up a trailer. There were several options to consider as the project moved forward.

MOTION: Commissioner Thimm moved to CONTINUE the Sommet Blanc/B2East Parcel Conditional Use Permit and Amendments to the December 8, 2021, Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Suesser seconded the motion.

VOTE: Commissioner Johnson-Aye; Commissioner Hall-Aye; Commissioner Suesser-Aye, Kenworthy-Aye, Commissioner Van Dine-Aye; Commissioner Thimm-Aye. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

7. ADJOURN

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to adjourn.

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