

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES
APRIL 23, 2014**

PRESENT: Nann Worel, Preston Campbell, Stewart Gross, Steve Joyce, John Phillips, Clay Stuard, Thomas Eddington, Francisco Astorga, Polly Samuels McLean.

Commissioner Strachan was recused.

WORK SESSION ITEMS

1315 Lowell Avenue, PCMR – Amendment to Master Planned Development and Conditional Use Permit (Application PL-13-02135 and PL-14-02136)

Planner Francisco Astorga reported that he had received four public input letters that would become part of the file and shown as public input in the future. Planner Astorga clarified that this was a work session and no action would be taken.

Planner Astorga requested that the Planning Commission review the Conditional Use Permit for the Woodward Facility preliminary plans and provide direction to the applicant and Staff to continue reviewing the MPD Amendment and CUP in accordance with applicable LMC regulations. Related exhibits were included in the Staff report. The applicant verified that these were only working documents as they move forward. The applicant wanted input from the Planning Commission regarding the architectural components and other issues before finalizing the plans.

Michael Barille introduced Hans Cerny, the project architect, Jenni Smith and Tom Pettigrew with PCMR and Tim Brenwald from Powdr Corp.

Mr. Barille stated that he and Planner Astorga meet on a weekly basis to work through the intended process for the permits, the type of information that needs to be presented and the issues to address at upcoming meetings. There is ongoing discussion with Staff and they understand that it is a multi-step process. Mr. Barille anticipated a meeting with the Planning Commission once a month to present a reasonable list of issues for discussion and input.

Chair Worel asked if the presentations would be done in work session. Mr. Barille requested input from the Planning Commission on the best format. He personally believed that public hearings should be scheduled in the near future so the Planning Commission and the applicant would have the benefit of hearing public comments early in the process.

Mr. Barille reported that preliminary meetings have also been held with the Fire District, the Building Department, the Sewer District, the Water Department and the City Engineer to preview the project and identify preliminary issues with the design or other elements of the

project.

Mr. Barille acknowledged that everyone was anxious to get into the details of the development agreement and the overall density and how it fits within the broader Master Plan. In scheduling the topics for various meetings, he and Planner Astorga had scheduled the discussion on how this particular project fits within the broader context of the development agreement for the next meeting. The intent this evening was to familiarize the Planning Commission with the details of Woodward, how it is designed and why it is designed in that way, and the elements they were trying to accomplish in the building. He believed the background was important as they move into the next step in the process.

Planner Astorga suggested for the next meeting that they discuss a schedule that the applicant and the Planning Commission could agree on with specific dates for specific items.

Mr. Barille stated that besides looking at the Woodward project as a Woodward Training Facility, they should also look at it as a project that can advance some of the longstanding needs at the resort, and address and mitigate some of the impacts the Resort has on the community. They tried to design as much quality and purpose to each part of the program as possible. For example, one wing of the building is dedicated to dormitories for the campers who attend the Woodward Camp during the summer. During the winter those same dormitories would be converted into seasonal employee housing. The community has always pushed for affordable housing on-site as much as possible in an effort to mitigate traffic impacts and this would provide that benefit. As an owner/operator, PCMR is committed to looking at this facility as a long-term revenue piece and a way of growing new skiers and riders in a struggling industry.

Hans Cerny, the project architect, presented 3D images and modeling of the building and the floor plans. The building was broken into four major masses. The first is the training floor with all the ramps, skate features a pits. The dorm tower has dormitory housing and a cafeteria and other support functions. There is also a Pub and Skater Lounge Café for both the public and the skaters. Mr. Cerny indicated appendages that were designed to break up the training floor mass.

Mr. Barille explained that the Pub was not integral to the function of the Woodward Training facility, but for a long time the Resort and the community have felt there was a lack of Après skiing opportunities at PCMR versus other places. This site lends itself to that experience because of the views. It was also exciting and innovative to allow the Pub to view into the training facility. Mr. Barille felt the Pub would help with the unload period at the end of the day if some of the skiers could be encouraged to stay longer.

Mr. Barille noted that it has been widely reported on the radio that this was an 80,000

square foot project. He clarified that the footprint of all the functions together was approximately 40,000. The 80,000 square feet considered all floors of volume for all the uses.

Mr. Cerny stated that in terms of character, massing and forms, they tried to use the existing materials and themes in the resort, such as the mining theme. Materials included corrugated metal and bracing and wood that were used in the Marriott Mountainside and Legacy Lodge, but to use them in a new and unique way. Mr. Cerny explained how the different materials would be used on different portions of the project to provide uniqueness. Mr. Cerny reviewed the layout of the facility. A unique part of the Woodward program is the production and media facilities. Kids film the athletes and create the music. A portion of the facility will be used for music studios, computer labs and projection equipment.

Chair Worel asked how many seasonal employees could be housed in the dormitory. Mr. Cerny replied that there would be 30 rooms and each room is designed to handle two employees per room for a total of 60 employees. He believed the affordable housing requirement was to house 80 employees. Mr. Cerny stated that during the summer all of the Woodward campuses are designed for bunk housing with five to seven kids and one counselor in each room. During the winter there would only be two people to a room to make it more livable for the employees. The conversion would involve moving furniture to a storage area.

Commissioner Stuard commented on the architectural theming and noted that clear theming was established in the development agreement, which the Marriott executed in their building. He asked if there were any concerns about having the Marriott architectural theming, the theming around the new portions of the resort itself of the day lodge, the older theming of the Park City Lodge, this theming and the uncertain theming on the rest of the project. Mr. Barille remarked that it was a balance that everyone should be conscious of. The goal is to incorporate of elements of those good starts towards the design guidelines and the aesthetics in the development agreement to make sure the Woodward building is a consistent offshoot of the Marriott Mountainside and the Legacy Lodge. Mr. Barille expected to have a future discussion with the Planning Commission regarding the overall architecture theme for the rest of the buildings in the master plan and how it fits into the scope. They anticipate a set of design guidelines to help tie that more tightly together than what is in the current development agreement. They also thought about having a design review committee that would include Resort representatives and a representative from the Planning Commission to help review the projects as they come forward to maintain consistency. Mr. Barille stated that in terms of the older development, he believed they would want some departure from the northeast brick and steeple theme that the Resort started with. Maintaining continuity and consistency is an absolutely concern and they need to remain conscious of it.

Mr. Barille stated that something they often see in master plan development projects and ski resorts in particular is that they get built all at once and the result in a Disneyland look where all the architecture is the same and it blends together as one mass and one color form. He believed it was good to have an organic nature for how buildings develop over time because it helps to promote a slightly different design in each one.

Mr. Barille reviewed the massing views. He stated that it was initially prepared to show the proximity and the amount of space between the existing buildings and the proposed footprint to demonstrate how the façade was angled, as opposed to building it right against the property line. Angling allows for pedestrian corridors and landscape opportunities. He pointed out the functionality elements that were maintained.

Mr. Barille stated that the exhibit was presented in meetings with the neighboring property owners and they rightly expressed that it did not do a good job of communicating what they wanted the end-built environment to be. Mr. Barille presented other exhibits showing the design progression and how those concerns were addressed. A meeting with the Lodge property owners was scheduled on May 8th to review the new exhibits and to hear their input.

Mr. Barille presented additional 3-D modeling exhibits showing the relief and variation in the facades, as well as the architectural elements and relative mass in terms of the building versus the buildings behind it, and the views to the mountains behind it. Some of the same views were taken with a massing that was representative of what is approved in the current MPD to help the Planning Commission compare and contrast.

Planner Astorga asked the Planning Commission for any additional information they thought would be beneficial, or whether the materials provided were adequate for their review.

Commissioner Stuard wanted to see how the new proposed building overlays on the currently approved site plan. He asked if the massing that was shown was directly off the volumetrics diagram. Mr. Cerny answered yes. Commissioner did not think it looked the way he remembered seeing it on the volumetrics. He recalled that building stepping had occurred. The new plan showed a straight up and down face. Mr. Barille offered to check the volumetrics and make sure it was the same. Planner Astorga suggested a massing overlay or a side by side comparison from different views. Commissioner Stuard referred to the proposed site plan and noted that per the development agreement a 75' setback is required between the Park City Lodge and the Building on Parcel C. He understood that the new building was angled rather than parallel to the Lodge, but it appeared to wrap around the end and be much closer to the Park City Lodge than the building proposed on Parcel C. Commissioner Stuard was also interested in seeing that comparison on the site plan overlay.

Commissioner Stuard stated that in terms of the architecture there was a major difference between the new proposal and what was originally approved. He is familiar with Woodward Facilities and two of his children attended Woodward. He did not believe the buildings were of the same character, quality and style that was currently approved in the development agreement. Commissioner Stuard remarked that any additional information regarding the materials and other architectural components is important because it is a big change from one concept to another.

Mr. Barille offered to provide representative material, cut sheets and other things to help the Planning Commission understand the depth and quality of materials. If Commissioner Stuard was saying that the existing Woodward facilities in other parts of the Country were not consistent with the kind of articulation and quality of design expected under the development agreement, he would agree. Those are all Butler buildings and they had consciously made a departure from that with this proposal.

Planner Astorga requested that the Commissioners focus their comments this evening on the technical aspects of the MPD amendment rather than the architectural details.

Commissioner Joyce reiterated his previous concern regarding parking and the migration of parking during the construction process. He understood that most or all of the other new buildings would have underground parking. Mr. Barille replied that he was correct. Commissioner Joyce liked the lower profile design to protect the views; however, the sacrifice is lack of parking. He thought parking would be a big issue for both the transition through the construction process, and also once the project is completed, because there is no parking underground. Mr. Barille replied that they have significantly discussed the parking issue. They intend to show an analysis of the parking demand and how to handle the demand until the new parking and transit facility is built. He noted that Preston with Fehr & Peers would give a short presentation this evening. Mr. Barille stated that the construction mitigation element was not ready, partly because they cannot understand the nature of the problem until they know the final design and when construction would begin. Commissioner Joyce clarified that he was not asking for details. His concern was the fact that this would be the first building and the only building without any associated parking. Mr. Barille pointed out that unlike a lodging building, the operation of the Woodward facility was very different. They typically capture visitors who are already visiting the resort and give them an alternate program. The exceptions are the summer camps, but those do not occur during peak parking or traffic demands.

Chair Worel asked if the assumption was that the majority of the employee housed there during the winter season would not have vehicles. She wanted to know where those who do have vehicles would park. Jenni Smith, with PCMR noted that the employees from around the Country and out of the Country do not bring a vehicle. If they do bring a vehicle

it would have to be stored offsite because the Resort does not allow overnight parking in the parking lots. Ms. Smith stated that being on the bus route is a major benefit for the employees who do not have a vehicle.

Commissioner Stuard pointed out that the building that was programmed for Parcel C was also one of the entrances to the major underground parking that was supposed to occur under this building and the other parcels; and that future option would be lost. Mr. Barille stated that when they discuss the broader context of their revisions to the MPD versus the current MPD, the Commissioners will see that one of the major departures in terms of philosophy of the plan is that no one has been able to figure out how to finance and build one single underground parking structure. To have several different lodging properties and different kinds of user operations buildings accessing the same underground parking is a big challenge and in reality may not function all that well for load and unload. They were asked to look at the design more as component parts that could be developed over time and where the parking is under one building at a time rather than one massive excavation.

Preston with Fehr and Peers stated that they have been studying the parking for several months using historical data from the last five years. He reviewed the temporary conditions that would occur until they start building additional parking garages in the future. The facility is an additional service onsite as opposed to a single destination. His presentation this evening focused on the winter months. There would be a total number of 1799 parking stalls, which is peak capacity. He reviewed three different scenarios typical for the winter season; the average work day, the peak ski day, and the peak parking day.

Preston stated that when Woodward comes into place 220 spaces would be lost. There is some demand for people to park for Woodward specifically. Since it is a unique use, there were no detailed parking numbers. However, he had examples from Woodward facilities around the Country. In a worst case scenario, 50 spaces are needed for Woodward during the winter based on a comparable site.

Commissioner Joyce recalled from the last meeting that when he asked if there was space for construction materials and other issues, the answer was no. He noted that additional space is required for construction. If they were not prepared to address that this evening, he would like to see that number at some point, along with the loss of space during the construction period. Mr. Barille replied that the answer was the same and the numbers were for the normal operation. He stated that the strategy is to do the construction during the summer season to minimize the parking impacts.

Preston presented a graph showing that losing 220 parking spaces and adding another 50 for Woodward results in a net loss of 270 parking spaces. Using the same graph with Woodward in place, the number of days exceeding the capacity would be 20 days instead of two days under the current winter conditions.

Regarding the offsite parking, the Resort currently utilizes the Park City High School parking lot and the maximum number parked in the lot this year was 215. Therefore, 140 to 160 parking stalls were not utilized, even on the busiest days. There were also additional spaces near McPolin and Treasure Mountain that could potentially be used. Approximately 110 spaces are utilized on average for overflow issues.

Commissioner Stuard asked how many days per winter were included in the 110 average. Preston stated that the shuttles run 25 days per year. Tom Pettigrew with PCMR stated that the 1799 parking stalls mentioned was the maximum under perfect conditions where everyone followed parking directions and there was no snow on the parking lot. Some visitors are aware that shuttles run on Saturday and other peak periods, and they choose to make that their entry point to the resort to avoid parking inconveniences.

Mr. Barille remarked that the issue is whether to build the parking capacity for one or two days a year or for what is comfortable on a daily basis. They were looking for input from the Planning Commission to help find the right balance. Mr. Barille stated that offsite parking and use of shuttles was consistent with trying to minimize the congestion at the Cole's and Jan's Intersection, and the strategies for load/unload as they get into the broader master plans and other master plan development projects in the future.

Commissioner Stuard asked if the Resort compensates the High School for use of the parking lot. Jenni Smith stated that the Resort has a three year agreement with the School and they were currently doing a ski pass exchange.

Planner Astorga asked if the Planning Commission thought they should compare the parking requirements from the approved MPD and compare it to the proposed concept. The Commissioners concurred that they should do the comparison.

Preston presented the conditions. On peak parking days, if they were to utilize the remaining spaces at Park City High School, they would not exceed the capacity when Woodward was operational. If they do exceed the parking capacity at Park High School, there would still be additional spaces at Treasure Mountain and McPolin. If all or some of the management strategies are implemented it would help further reduce the vehicle trips to the resort by 4 to 11 percent, which correlates into a reduction in miles traveled and contributes to less pollution and sustainability.

Commissioner Gross commented on the three year agreement with the High School. He wanted to make sure they had the use of that parking until the parking garage is built. Commissioner Gross believed that ensuring adequate parking for five to seven years was a more realistic time frame. Commissioner Gross supported offsite parking to mitigate impacts at the resort, but he did not think the burden of paying for the shuttles should fall

on the community. Ms. Smith clarified that PMCR has paid for the shuttles for the past several years.

Commissioner Joyce asked if they could assume that the parking lots at the High School would still be available when Deer Valley builds out their parking lots and would need a similar arrangement. Commissioner Joyce was certain that the Resort would do the right things to increase the capacity, but he was concerned with the impacts on the surrounding community. On busy days employees and skiers fan out into parking lots throughout the City. Commissioner Joyce clarified that his primary concern was the neighborhood overflow. He did not believe the numbers presented this evening told the whole story, and at some point they needed to address that issue.

Commissioner Phillips agreed. The Resort may not hit its peak, but there is neighborhood spill-out on busier days and he anticipated hearing those comments during the public hearing. Commissioner Phillips was unsure how it could be enforced but he thought it should be addressed.

Commissioner Campbell thought the parking issue was self-regulating. If people have a difficult time parking they will stop coming. It is in the Resort's best interest to make sure they have a great experience. Commissioner Campbell agreed that parking was a problem, but he did think it was fair to resolve the City's parking issues on the back of one business for one or two days a year. Commissioner Joyce disagreed that it was only a problem one or two days a year, because the sprawl occurs on a normal weekend.

Commissioner Campbell stated that PCMR would not want to discourage people from coming to the Resort, and for that reason they have a bigger interest for resolving the parking problem than anyone else. Commissioner Joyce acknowledged that there is a parking problem throughout Park City, but when one place already has issues and those issues could increase, the Planning Commission does not have the obligation to make the Resort more profitable or to bring more tourists into Park City. Their job is to apply the LMC and make sure the impacts from the resulting facility is properly addressed. Commissioners Stuard and Worel concurred.

Chair Worel stated that she owned a second home directly across the street from PCMR. She personally knows the frustration of not being able to get out of her garage because a skier chose to park in her driveway and walk across the street. Chair Worel stated that as a group they need to find a solution that protects the neighbors and also allows development of the Resort.

Commissioner Stuard stated that he had not attended the previous work sessions, but he had read the minutes and recalled a discussion on the topic of whether or not this use consumes some of the development approvals that were granted to this parcel. The

minutes reflected the debate but there was not a firm conclusion. In his opinion this was a completely separate autonomous general commercial use that consumes the entitlements that were planned for Parcel C. He noted that the development agreement clearly says that if general commercial uses are introduced it would have that affect. Commissioner Stuard remarked that the volumetrics and square footage used for this modified facility would come off the balance for the remaining parcels. He did not believe there was room to transfer density, unless some portion of the originally applied density lies outside of the newly proposed site plan.

Chair Worel asked if density was a scheduled topic. Planner Astorga replied that density would be one of the first items addressed because they could not move forward until that issue was resolved. Mr. Barille stated that he was in a different place of understanding in terms of what the development agreement says about a starting point. They would work with Staff to come up with a reasonable proposal, and he anticipated significant debate and negotiations with the Planning Commission. As the Commissioners prepare for that debate, Mr. Barille suggested that they research the explicit definitions for resort and support commercial. He believed the uses proposed were very consistent with the definition. In addition, they have an agreement that allows an entitlement on all of the land greater than what they were proposing. Mr. Barille asked the Planning Commission to take into consideration the fact that they were already voluntarily reducing what they could build on the other parcels.

Chair Worel called for public input.

Planner Astorga had received written comment from Jim Doilney, which would be included as public input in the next Staff report.

Jim Doilney, representing Marsac Mill and Silver Millhouse Condominium HOA, many of his items had already been addressed. He wanted to emphasize two or three points that were different from the previous focus. Mr. Doilney indicated a pedestrian bridge that goes from the existing parking lot in a direction out of the parking structure. When the HOA met with the Resort they suggested that the pedestrian flow should not be changed as a result of the new proposal. They would not want to lose the existing traffic as a result of the bridge location. Mr. Doilney stated that the HOA would attend public hearings to make sure their request is heard. Mr. Doilney stated that the HOA members also asked about making sure that the flow through occurs on Lowell Avenue. As a third point, when the original plan was approved he attended the public hearing and supported it on behalf of the condominium association. When they went from schematic design to final there were relatively minor adjustments. Architectural imperatives were implemented and buildings were shifted forward and higher by a few feet. Mr. Doilney point out there was litigation from some HOA members as a result of those changes. He asked the Planning Commission to honor the schematics they approve and hold them in compliance. Speaking as an individual, Mr.

Doilney stated that he is a retail owner at PCMR and has an excellent relationship. However, at the time of the original approval it was stated that there was not a future transit center but there would be transit drop-offs. He was unsure whether or not that was implemented. Mr. Doilney was concerned with comments about a future transit center because they already have a transit center for public buses. Mr. Doilney noted that the original approval was 1998. The duration of the interim, as being discussed for temporary conditions, might best be understood in the context of how nothing has occurred since 1998. He asked for the interim and whether or not it would be another 15 year period. He was concerned that constructing the Woodward facility first would delay the important matters such as preservation of parking. Mr. Doilney clarified that he was not trying to be negative, but these were issues that his constituents would like the Planning Commission to consider.

Trent Davis stated that he has been involved at the Resort Center for 30 years. His father put the original master plan on the entire development area in the 1980s, and he built Snow Flower Condominiums. Mr. Davis noted that he was the owner of the majority of the Lodge at the Mountain Village in terms of square footage due to the commercial. He also has the majority of the commercial under the Village Loft building. All total it was approximately 40,000 square feet of commercial space at the Resort Center. Mr. Davis stated that he also represents the Lodge at the Mountain Village Loft and other projects in Park City as their HOA manager. Mr. Davis remarked that the Lodge at the Mountain Village has developed an owners committee to be actively involved in any outside activities around the Lodge at the Mountain Village that may affect the lodge. He clarified that his comments were on a personal level and he was not talking on their behalf this evening. Mr. Davis intended to express his thoughts on topics of discussion that he would like the Planning Commission to consider as they move forward with the process. He did not believe anyone at the Lodge, including the committee, have made any decisions as to whether or not this is a good project or whether they would fight it moving forward. Mr. Davis expected good cooperation between PCMR and the Planning Commission in addressing the concerns of the committee when presented.

Mr. Davis commented on parking and the employee parking that is currently non-existent at the Resort Center. He was not specifically talking about Resort employees. His concern expanded to Jans, Cole Sports and other retailers who create parking impacts. Mr. Davis believed that issue needed to be addressed. He understood that PCMR was looking at adding commercial space on the corners of the parking structure to be built on Lot D. That is a major concern because it would create more competition in that area of the base, particularly from ski shops. Some of the current tenants can barely survive because of the competition. Mr. Davis stated that more commercial brings more employees as the master plan develops out, that fact must be included in the parking plans.

Mr. Davis stated that his personal concerns included pedestrian access, which Mr. Doilney

already addressed. He also supported the re-design of the transit center. Thought needed to be given to handicap access out of that area and from the Woodward side coming up to the base area. Mr. Davis believed the pedestrian needed more thought. Something that was not mentioned this evening was the bridge that sits between the southern side of the Woodward building and north side of the Lodge of the Mountain Village. He believed that the bridge would be part of the impact of the Lodge of the Mountain Village. Mr. Davis was unsure what purpose the skier bridge would have other than to funnel people out of the new proposed parking garage down to a lower base area. He outlined the reasons for his concern and the people it would impact the most. Mr. Davis commented on the importance of signage. He participated as the master plans were revised over the years and he reiterated his same comments. Mr. Davis stated that the City could not look at this project as just the Woodard Camp parcel. It has to be envisioned in terms of how it would impact the overall master plan. He was pleased to hear comments this evening about comparing the Woodward plan to the overall master plan development that could take ten or twelve years to develop. Mr. Davis commented on the service road and outlined reasons why it is imperative to widen the service road. He noted that the Lodge has a loading dock on the western edge of the building. Under the proposed plan access to the loading dock would be completely eliminated. He emphasized that the loading dock could not be eliminated and the Planning Commission would hear that from the owners during public hearings. Mr. Davis commented how the deliveries to the Woodward facility would disturb the occupants at the Lodge. He pointed out issues related to snow removal. He suggested that the Planning Commission talk to PCMR about a snow melt system on the entire roadway going in because that road would never get sun. He was also unsure where they would push snow or how it could be removed. Mr. Davis requested consideration for landscaping both sides of the roadway and adding sidewalks. He would also like to see lighting upgrades and ADA access.

Chair Worel closed public input.

Director Eddington stated that a discussion on density would be scheduled for either the second meeting in May or the first meeting in June.

Mr. Barille noted that the team has met with Trent Davis several times, as well as the Lodge HOA, and they tried to address some of the issues raised. Mr. Barille stated that Mr. Davis has been the most reasonable and practical neighbor he has ever dealt with. They were progressing on a landscape plan based on input from Mr. Trent, and they were scheduled to have another meeting with the Lodge HOA subcommittee on May 8th.

The Work Session was adjourned.