

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION MINUTES  
JANUARY 8, 2014**

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

ROLL CALL:

Chair Worel opened the work session and noted that all Commissioners were present except Commissioner Strachan who was excused.

Director Thomas Eddington introduced Preston Campbell, Steve Joyce and John Phillips as the new Planning Commissioners.

**WORK SESSION ITEMS**

1315 Lowell Avenue, PCMR – Amendment to Master Planned Development and Conditional Use Permit (Application PL-13092135 and PL-13-02136)

Planner Astorga stated that for the benefit of the three new Commissioners the intent this evening was to revisit the Work Session discussion from November 20, 2013 regarding the amendment to the MPD and CUP for Park City Mountain Resort. He apologized to Chair Worel and Commissioner Gross for having to hear the presentation again; however, since the change to the Planning Commission was substantial the Staff thought it was appropriate to reintroduce the current application.

Planner Astorga reported that the current application filed by PCMR was to amend the MPD that was approved in 1997 and the development agreement that was recorded in 1998. The objective this evening was also to introduce the Woodward facility that PCMR was proposing to build on Parcel C.

Michael Barille with Plan Works Design introduced his team; Tim Brenwald with Powdr Corp, and Jenni Smith and Tom Pettigrew with PCMR. Mr. Barille welcomed the new Commissioners.

Mr. Barille laid out what the team hoped to accomplish throughout the next several months of discussion with the Planning Commission. The first was to process a conditional use permit that would allow a facility called Woodward Park City. Secondly, minor changes would be made to the existing Development Agreement to allow processing of the conditional use permit by allowing some of the resort accessories for multiple parcels within the master plan to be consolidated at the location where they propose to build the

Woodward facility. Mr. Barille stated that they would immediately follow that up by laying out the proposed changes to the Master Plan and bring any of the items that would need to be changed in the Development Agreement to the Planning Commission. The last item would be to process a subdivision plat to parcel out the piece for the facility.

Mr. Barille outlined the goals for the process. He believed the application was unique to resort development in Park City and it would bring a new aspect to high altitude training, snow sports training, action sports training and youth activities that are not currently offered in the community. The target was to complete the permits process through the course of the winter and to have the first few permits ready to begin construction on the Woodward facility in the spring. Mr. Barille assumed it would take 12 to 18 months to construct the facility.

Mr. Barille stated that the goal with the Planning Commission was to take as much time as necessary, but to proceed efficiently. He was working with the Staff to lay out a series of topics for each of the upcoming meetings to address the issues required to process the conditional use permit. He noted that some of the topics would be traffic, operational plans, architectural design, site layout, and articulation of the buildings. Other items would be how this project relates to the employee housing requirements within the Development, and how they intend to meet that requirement, as well as density allocation and phasing, the site plan and how the proposal fits within the overall plan. Mr. Barille stated that the team would address neighborhood concerns that are brought forward during neighborhood meetings and open houses.

Mr. Barille provided a brief background of Woodward. It is year-round action sports and training facility. Some of the activities include snowboarding, skiing, gymnastics and cheer and digital media and film. It is an innovative way of teaching sports.

Mr. Barille presented slides of Woodward facilities that have already been constructed in mountain resorts and how they function.

Tom Pettigrew thought it was worthwhile to consider that the facility, particularly in the summer, was driven by the campus. The bulk of the children from 9 to 15 years old are housed in a facility at a time of year when the public school is not in session. The facility is intact and there is a dormitory and cafeteria on site. Training for low level beginner skill sets to higher level skill sets can be accommodated within the facility. Mr. Pettigrew thought it was an exciting opportunity to bring this type of winter/summer activities to the Woodward site. There would be opportunities during the shoulder season for adult and corporate based types of activities. Mr. Pettigrew commented on the opportunities during the winter to utilize the snow surface outside and the Woodward surface inside, and ways

to incorporate the ski and snowboard school programming into Woodward to accelerate the learning process. There would also be programming specific to certain times of the year, such as Christmas, President's week and spring breaks.

Mr. Pettigrew stated that several areas inside the building would be re-purposed. For example, the summer dormitory would be used as employee housing during the winter season. The cafeteria would be re-purposed as a food and beverage facility for the team members.

Jenni Smith, with PCMR, stated that Powdr Corp. purchased the Woodward Camps three years ago. Since then they have incorporated a similar facility in Tahoe. She believed this was a unique opportunity to have a year-round training facility and it raises the bar on year-round recreational opportunities. Ms. Smith stated that part of the planning and programming for the Woodward building would be a downhill and mountain biking program. She remarked that this facility would be key to growing the core business that they operate. She noted that there are 95 million in the Millennium generation. The next largest generation is the baby boomers at 78 million. They see Woodward fitting into that demand as well as fitting into the growth of the industry. These are they young people they want to capture so the ski industry can continue to have a vibrant future.

Ms. Smith pointed out that the summer camps would bring new destination visitors during the summer. The children will be in camp and the parents will be mountain biking, hiking, and spending money on dining, shopping and lodging. It is a real opportunity for all of Park City to capitalize on new visitors in town. She stated that high-profile, elite athletes train in this community and Woodward is another facility that could be used for training.

Mr. Barille presented slides showing the concept architecture for the Woodward building, as well as images to show how they were trying to draw some of that design and the materials. Mr. Barille remarked that they were drawing their inspiration from the mining history by keeping the structures simple, but with a contemporary twist. The proposed materials would include metal siding in varying hues to create architectural interest and sense of movement. A wood material would provide the mountain context. Canopies would help screen the glass and maintain the sustainable aspects of the building. Glass windows down to the pedestrian level would allow interaction by seeing what goes on inside.

Mr. Barille presented a context site plan showing the Resort and the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Barille provided a brief background for the development. In 1998 a large scale master

planned development was approved by the City. In November 2001 amendments were made with respect to parking and traffic and how it would be phased. In total, over 1 million square feet of development was approved in a mix of lodging, commercial and resort support uses. Approximately 805,000 square feet remains. Five separate building parcels were called out in the MPD and the building heights reach up to five or six stories across much of the site. At some point in the future Mr. Barille thought it would be important to walk through the existing plan, how the buildings were laid out and articulated, and where the building heights vary. They would be prepared with a model showing the proposed plans so the Commissioners could get a sense for the changes and how pedestrians will interact with the new building plan. They also intend to discuss some of the improvements reflected by the layout they have chosen.

Mr. Barille stated that the new concept proposes to use less density than what was previously entitled. He presented a location map from a joint session with the City Council and the Planning Commission in December of 2011. The context for that conversation was to look at future development and redevelopment in the base area of the Resort, and how that fits in with the context of the resort neighborhood and the general plan, and within the context of the RDA. Mr. Barille remarked that the heart of the Resort is close to the Old Town area and the Town Lift is a strong connection between the Resort and downtown. Planning is currently ongoing for City property to utilize that land and to create better connections through the Resort neighborhood and downtown.

Mr. Barille noted that the area for base area development was shown in orange. The boundary for the RDA was shown in yellow. He reviewed the full site plan that they propose to bring forward as part of the changes to the Master Planned Development agreement. Some of the key elements included use of the upper parking lot for a combined parking structure and transit facility that would replace the current surface parking at the Resort. It would isolate the impacts and allow them to organize the traffic flow to that site. They would also be able to separate transit traffic from drop-offs and day skiers and create a flow more intuitive to first-time guests.

Mr. Barille outlined some of the goals from the joint session for this neighborhood and redevelopment of the Resort. The goals included interactive open spaces, a diverse and family friendly environment that is inviting, a way to clearly identify the sense of arrival at the resort, and to revitalize the Resort activities. Mr. Barille explained how the team tried to accomplish those goals in their site planning. From a pedestrian standpoint, a key element of the plan is to maintain flat walkable corridors at a number of locations, both through the existing base area and through the redevelopment that would occur on the lower parking lots. Mr. Barille showed how the Woodward facility would fit within the broader context of the site and the layout of the facility.

Mr. Barille stated that the definition from the Development Agreement talks about the fact that resort accessory uses are approved uses within the developer's winter and summer operations that would not require the use of unit equivalents. In conversations with Staff it was determined that they may need some unit equivalents from the overall entitlements. The Woodward facility has a blended nature of the activities planned and they would bring back more specifics on that in the future. Mr. Barille believed that most of the uses and programs in the design are consistent with the definition of Resort Accessory Use. He reviewed a list of activities that were anticipated to be Resort Accessory Uses at the time of the Development Agreement. He believed they were very similar to what was currently being proposed.

Mr. Barille noted that since the last work session an open house for the general public was held on December 14<sup>th</sup>. Another open house was scheduled for January 9 at the Legacy Lodge. They also met with three different property managers and attended two HOA annual meetings to give a presentation and answer questions.

Mr. Barille noted that two websites were developed for the general public. One was [woodwardparkcity.com](http://woodwardparkcity.com) and the second was [masterplan.pcmr.com](http://masterplan.pcmr.com). The first outlined the Woodward programming and showed videos of the facility. The second reviewed the history of the entitlements and the overall site plan.

Mr. Barille stated that they would like to have the Woodward Park City facility completed in 2015 so it could be used during the 2015-16 season. The next project would be parking and the transit facility over the next five years. The remaining buildings in the master plan would be phased over the next 10-15 years.

Planner Astorga stated that he and Director Eddington had the opportunity to visit the site last year. He is the project planner and he encouraged the Commissioners and the public to contact him if they had questions about the process. Planner Astorga noted that a series of work sessions would be scheduled to help expedite the review and approval process. The Staff has started internal discussions with the City Engineer regarding traffic and parking. Planner Astorga remarked that the proposal would not work unless density could be transferred from one place to another. Before they could move forward on Parcel C, which is the proposed Woodward facility, it was important to know how the Planning Commission felt about transferring density. He requested a head nod on that issue. The Staff recommended that they allow the applicant to amend the existing MPD. Specific points would be addressed at each work session in an effort to draft findings to approve the amendment to the MPD and the conditional use permit for Parcel C.

Chair Worel asked about attendance at the December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. Ms. Smith replied that approximately 20 to 30 people attended. She expected more people at the meeting on January 9<sup>th</sup> because they had mailed postcards to all property owners within 200 feet. It was also advertised on the radio and in the Park Radio. Chair Worel thought more people might attend since the holidays were over. Mr. Barille stated that they intentionally scheduled an open house during the holidays to give the second home owners an opportunity to attend. The websites were also set up as a point of information for the second home owners who live out of town.

Commissioner Joyce commented on the loss of 230 parking spaces with the Woodward facility. He assumed that included extra parking for construction. He wanted to know the total parking before the loss of 230 spaces. Mr. Pettigrew stated that there were approximately 1250 surface spots and another 300 spaces in the underground area under the lodge. Commissioner Joyce clarified that they would be looking at the loss of 230 spaces for several years until the parking structure is built. Ms. Smith replied that this was correct. She noted that they would hire consultants to help with parking recommendations. Currently, during the busy holiday season, employees park at the Munchkin and shuttle to the Resort. They also have an agreement with the School District to utilize their parking spaces on weekends and holidays for the next three years as additional parking. Mr. Pettigrew stated that over 100 customers were shuttled during the holiday period utilizing their own van base. He expected the same during the President's weekend and again in March.

Commissioner Joyce stated he had personally seen people park at the Library on busy days and walk to the Resort. He understood the Resort was trying to do the right things through signage and shuttles; however, it does spill out. His concern was whether it would spill out more with the parking reduction and more frequently. He thought it was an issue that needed to be addressed in the parking plan because it definitely impacts the community and other businesses.

Ms. Smith noted that all the Resort employees who live in Salt Lake get a free bus pass so they are able to utilize the Salt Lake City/Park City Transit bus. They also try to incorporate as much public transportation and other forms of transportation to reduce the number of cars. Ms. Smith welcomed suggestions on how to get season pass holders out of their individual cars.

Commissioner Phillips concurred with the comments expressed by Commissioner Joyce; however his concerns went further. He believed the apex of the parking issue would be while the parking structure is under construction because some of the amenities would displace more parking spaces. He thought the parking plan needed to address parking

along those lines as well.

Mr. Barille stated that as the buildings in the master plan are constructed, they would each have underground parking under the footprint of that building. The parking structure is intended to replace all the surface parking that exists today. The parking would be an equal trade once the structure is constructed.

Chair Worel asked how long it would take to construct the parking structure. Mr. Barille believed it would be a two year horizon. It would be built in a couple of pods for easier transitioning. Chair Worel remarked that to Commissioner Phillip's point, parking would be displaced for that two year period. Tim Brenwald with PCMR, explained that the goal would be to build parking as the structures are built.

Commissioner Joyce stated that when the original agreement was done, they went through a surprising amount of detail of breaking out the different parcels and square footage. They also took the extra step of saying that the density on each parcel was set. Having not been around in 1997, it appeared that a lot of thought went into that and that Park City Mountain Resort agreed with it. Commissioner Joyce requested whatever information the Planning Department could provide regarding the thought process in 1997. He would not want to unravel what was done if there was good purpose behind it. Commissioner Joyce also requested that the applicant respond to the information the Staff brings forward.

Planner Astorga offered to provide whatever information was available. He pointed out that the minutes at that time were not prepared in as much detail, and it was difficult to understand the reasoning behind the limitation of not being able to transfer density.

Director Eddington stated that when the Staff researched the history, they found that it was an in-depth Master Planned Development. He believed the intent was to create blocks and pods. Director Eddington noted that there was an evolution to what PCMR is doing that was not anticipated in 1997, and it might be time to open it up and look at new pods. From reading the documents, he believed it was more about sense of space and geography, as well as building massing, shadow studies, etc. Director Eddington thought the City would still have those same requests moving forward.

Mr. Barille offered to respond to the comments and concerns expressed by the Planning Commission at a later meeting. He felt it was important to show the Commissioners why more but smaller footprints could feel as good as bigger consolidated footprints. He mentioned other advantages that accrue with the proposed plan.

Commissioner Campbell asked if Parcels C,B, and E would have underground parking as

well. Mr. Barille replied that this was correct. Commissioner Campbell clarified that Woodward would have underground parking. Mr. Barille stated that they were proposing to park Woodward in the parking structure and to operate primarily with drop-offs. However Parcels B and C and the rest of the buildings in the plan would have underground parking. Commissioner Campbell asked for the number of seasonal workers that could be accommodated in the dormitories. Mr. Barille replied that they were looking at approximately 36 units with two employees per unit during the seasonal employee housing period. It would be more of a bunk, dormitory style for campers and counselors during the summer.

Commissioner Gross asked if there was any type of employee accommodations currently. Ms. Smith answered no. Commissioner Gross referred to Parcel A, the current hotel, and asked if it fits the graph on page 4 as far as accessory use, etc. Planner Astorga stated that based on numeric calculations they were close to maxing out their allotted gross square footage. Commissioner Gross asked about the accessory use to the resort of 35,000 square feet. Planner Astorga could not recall. However, he believed that Parcel A was not included because the Resort built what was supposed to be built per the MPD. Commissioner Gross was concerned that the accessory to the Resort was growing by approximately 350%. Whereas, the original square footage of 159,000 square feet showing as residential was not accessory to the Resort, which he understands is important to the operation and critical to what they are trying to do as a community. He was not opposed, but he questioned how it would all function with everything that would occur in the future. Commissioner Gross could see logistical issues that needed to be addressed. He assumed the 230 spaces that would be lost were under Parcel C as shown. He was told that it was under the building footprint of Woodward as shown. Commissioner Gross stated that realistically, the 230 spaces lost would not leave enough additional parking for construction staging and construction personnel. He thought it was important to make sure they have the surety like they had at Empire Pass that construction personnel would not conflict with the tourist and local population.

Mr. Barille stated that the applicant intends to submit construction mitigation and parking plans that would address those items and concerns.

Commissioner Gross asked if the new street coming in off of Empire would occur with the initial phase. Mr. Barille did not believe it would need to occur with the initial phase. It was in the previous approval and they carried it through because it would eventually create nice visual connections to the mountains. The road would become more important as the rest of the buildings are constructed.

Commissioner Gross asked for the percentage of locals that would be actively involved with



the Woodward campus. Mr. Brenwald stated that it would depend on the season. Summer would be a blend of local and destination campers. During the shoulder and off-seasons, there is typically significant participation from the local community. Day passes and season passes are offered. Commissioner Gross asked about affordability for the locals. Mr. Brenwald recalled that the pass for Tahoe was approximately \$250.

Commissioner Gross felt this proposal was a critical component to the future of Park City, and it ties in with the RDA and transit for the area. He thought it was important to move it through the process as quickly as possible to meet the desired time frame.

The Work Session was adjourned.