

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION NOTES
OCTOBER 13, 2004**

Present: Bruce Erickson, Michael O'Hara, Bob Powers, Jack Thomas, Diane Zimney,
Patrick Putt, Jonathan Weidenhamer

It was noted that Chair Barth would be late, and in his absence, Vice-Chair O'Hara assumed the chair.

WORK SESSION ITEMS

Treasure Hill conditional Use Permit for single, multi-family, hotel, and commercial uses

Planning Director Patrick Putt reported that the Planning Commission had just visited the Treasure Hill site. The applicant had prepared a presentation, and Director Putt requested that the Planning Commission discuss the presentation to determine whether they wished to make a recommendation.

Pat Sweeney, the applicant, presented revisions to the project which included a shift in massing. He noted that a wall was lowered 6-1/2 feet to step the building near the Garda and Larson homes. Mr. Sweeney stated that City Engineer Eric DeHaan had indicated that the road could be dropped by 3 feet, which will also help with the slope coming around the curve. Mr. Sweeney requested input on the concept of a traditional Park City rock wall. He indicated the public entrance to a stair/elevator system going to the funicular. He commented on the amount of terracing, landscaping, and trees. He presented a drawing showing the areas deleted from the initial proposal in terms of height along the northwest edge of the project and noted that the resulting height was residential in scale. He indicated the height measured from existing grade at each break in the stepping. Mr. Sweeney commented on the concept of adding a hill at the property line near the Gardas' deck at a strategic location that could be vegetated to block the tallest part of the building from view. He reviewed additional slides showing the project area in general.

Commissioner Erickson felt the point had been reached where most of the information had been provided and that it was time to evaluate the proposal for the site and compliance with the Conditional Use Permit and development.

Vice-Chair O'Hara felt that a great deal of progress had been made in the massing and asked about the wall. Mr. Sweeney replied that there is a garage behind the wall, and 25 feet of landscapable space would be bermed against most of the wall. The concept for the portion of garage that shows would be rock similar to the transit center. The undulating terraces in front would be more informal stacked rock with large boulders. Relative to existing grade, the plaza is set 6 to 10 feet out of grade. This plan would put the dirt and landscaping back in front of the garage.

Commissioner Thomas commented that the modification of the massing seems to work better than the previous plan. He echoed the concern about the wall and asked if the 25-foot step is one vertical step or whether it cascades. Mr. Sweeney replied that it cascades down. Commissioner Thomas verified with Mr. Sweeney that there will be landscaping between the cascading steps with the parking structure behind. Mr. Sweeney referred to the small rock walls between the Marsac Building and Swede Alley and explained that the garage will form the more formal wall and with an informal wall in front. Commissioner Thomas agreed that it is time to move forward with the evaluation of this project.

Commissioner Erickson questioned whether the height restrictions put in place by the development agreement might cause some difficulty since the tallest buildings are not against the hillside. In this case, the highest, tallest building is away from the mountain and more visible than it should be. He was not interested in changing the development agreement but wondered how they could address the fact that their predecessors were incorrect in their thinking. He wanted to be able to discuss that without risking anything for the applicant or for the City. He expressed concern with the height of Building 4B. Vice-Chair O'Hara that he would welcome a discussion about the height restrictions and was sensitive about timing. He was also hesitant to open the development agreement.

Director Putt explained that the issue could be broken into a number of steps. First would be to address in what area the project square footage could be relocated on the site that would be different from volumetrics allowed in the MPD, which could be done in work session discussions. He believed that was generally being done now in terms of shifting the massing and crafting basic larger building blocks to be more sensitive to adjacent off-site residential structures and the view corridors from the town core. Nothing would have to be amended to accomplish that. Once it can be determined whether positive changes can be achieved that will work for the applicant and the City, the next step will be to craft the language and what the volumetrics should be. If that is acceptable to the Planning Commission and the applicant, the last step will be to formally amend the MPD exhibit related to specific areas of the plan. When the application to amend specific MPD elements reaches the point of final action, amendments would be made only to those specific components of the MPD. If a decision is made to not approve the amendment, the Planning Commission would go back to the building heights in the 1985 MPD.

Vice-Chair O'Hara suggested that the evaluation discussion be held with a subcommittee to move the process along faster. Director Putt recalled that the Planning Commission previously appointed a working subcommittee to work with the Staff and applicant. No decisions were made and no clear direction was given, but they examined specific issues and provided a report to the entire Planning Commission. Commissioner Erickson did not object to a subcommittee but felt that they owed the public a debate so that, when the plan is approved, they will know that all the options were considered.

Mr. Sweeney expressed concern about opening up the master plan and that the process might spin out of control. He was concerned that there would be different opinions and that citizens might challenge the plan. He requested an opinion from the City Attorney as to the legalities involved. He was concerned about the Sensitive Lands Ordinance and that a master plan amendment might have to be considered under the SLO. He was not opposed to making the current plan better if there is a way to address specifics without opening up the entire master plan.

Commissioner Erickson clarified that his intention is to be sure the Planning Commission can explain to the public what they did and why they did it. The basis of Mr. Sweeney's first presentation was on the value of this project to the resort community, and Commissioner Erickson felt they should be sure that the end product supports that. He believed a subcommittee would be appropriate and agreed that they should move forward as quickly as possible.

Vice-Chair O'Hara and Commissioner Thomas volunteered to sit on the subcommittee. Commissioner Erickson noted that this item appears on the agenda every couple of weeks, and the public knows about it. He did not believe this item should disappear from the agenda while the subcommittee meets, because it is important to keep the public informed of their progress. Vice-Chair O'Hara suggested that the subcommittee provide a progress report to the Planning Commission at each meeting. Director Putt expected this to be an agenda item at the next regular meeting on November 10.

Quinn's Junction Annexation - National Ability Center & Recreation Complex

Director Putt reported that the Planning Commission will hold a public hearing this evening and possibly forward a recommendation to the City Council regarding the Quinn's Junction National Ability Center Recreation Complex annexation. This is a 136-acre annexation. 110 acres of the area is owned by the City in two separate parcels, and the other 26 acres is owned by the National Ability Center. One of the City-owned parcels is a 70-acre parcel acquired by Florence Gilmorr a number of years ago with the intent of establishing recreation uses. A deed restriction speaks to specific uses. Part of the annexation will involve a review of the MPD, and submitting an MPD is a requirement of an annexation petition to give the community, Planning Commission, and City Council an understanding of the nature of the proposed uses of the annexation. Director Putt explained that he had asked City representatives Jonathan Weidenhamer and Colin Hilton and the design team to provide a brief overview of the recreation complex development. He clarified that, when the design review goes through a CUP, that is the point when design and location of some of the infrastructure, fields, and parking will be discussed substantively. He explained that the purpose this evening is to provide an understanding of the proposed use and the history to this point. He noted that the use relates to zoning, because the zoning designation is established when property is annexed.