

4. Red Cloud - Preliminary and final plat

MOTION: Commissioner Powers moved to CONTINUE this item to September 22, 2004. Commissioner Volkman seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

5. Treasurer Hill Conditional Use Permit for single multi-family, hotel, and commercial uses

Planner Kirsten Whetstone presented the staff report and requested that the Planning Commission review and discuss the Treasure Hill Conditional Use Permit relative to Criterion #11, physical design and compatibility with surrounding structures in mass, scale, style, design, and architectural detailing. The Staff requested that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and continue the public hearing until September 22, 2004, at which time the Staff will present all 15 criteria reviewed to date and a summary of the discussions and public input. She recalled that the Planning Commission reviewed Criteria 7-10 on August 11, 2004, and Criteria 2, 12, and 15 on July 14, 2004. Planner Whetstone requested specific input on the location of Building 4A in terms of setbacks and stepping and the overall massing of Building 1B. She noted that the staff report contains an analysis of the criteria for discussion.

Pat Sweeney, representing the applicant, provided a presentation and visual analysis to help clarify Criterion 11 and a portion of Criterion 15. He stated that he realized more work needs to be done on Criterion 11, and they will continue to perfect the project. Criterion 15 discusses appropriateness of the location. Mr. Sweeney stated that he believed it would be hard to find a better location for this kind of density and this kind of building on the hillside. Of the 123 acres, the proposed location is in Creole Gulch at the confluence of ski runs, and it allows for the cabriolet connection to the base and convenient connections to 8th and 6th Streets. Historically, Park City had large buildings and medium sized buildings next to small dwellings as shown on this site at the turn of the century. Mr. Sweeney indicated the Marriot Summit project and the same small houses and explained that they propose putting a mirror image of Summit Watch in this location.

David Eldredge, project architect, provided a few examples that he felt demonstrated a variety of size, style, and characteristics of the architecture of the period they would envision in this project. The intent is to use modern expressions architecture using elements which make the buildings historical. A common element is richness and articulation resulting from light and shadow variety and a variety of textures, materials, and color. He referred to the conceptual design and explained they pallet of elements that was varied and applied to bring uniqueness to each building in the project. Due to the residential nature of the project, the buildings will be further articulated using balconies.

The fenestration proposed will be double hung or casement in combination with picture windows, transoms, and a variety of divided lights. Mr. Eldredge explained that those five elements were applied in concept to these groups of buildings to extend the urban fabric up the hillside and through the project.

Mr. Sweeney reviewed the visual analysis from the various viewpoints identified by the Staff as being important vantage points. Mr. Eldredge reviewed the building types proposed in specific areas of the project.

Commissioner Volkman asked Planner Whetstone to point out specific areas of concern. Planner Whetstone identified the buildings and noted that one concern is the setbacks on building 4A and the massing of building 1B.

Vice-Chair O'Hara reopened the public hearing.

Annie Lewis Garda stated that she understood Mr. Sweeney had planned to do a photo looking back from her deck showing the seven story building 100 feet away and noted that she did not see it in the analysis this evening. Mr. Sweeney replied that the photo was not taken and offered to provide computer graphics to show the building. Ms. Garda referred to the comment that there are smaller buildings on the other side of the project that build up to the density on the hill. There are residences on her side of the project, but there is not a similar build up, and she asked that this be taken in to consideration. She recalled that Mr. Sweeney previously stated that changes could be made to mitigate the density on her side if he were given some flexibility and this could be done without increasing the square footage of the project or impinging on the promised open space. Mr. Garda requested that be done.

Alan Larson stated that he is closer to the buildings than the Gardas. He had requested a photo showing the view from his deck, but that was not taken. He recalled that he expressed traffic concerns at the last public hearing and while he realized that is not on the agenda this evening, he intends to bring it up at the appropriate time. He stated that he is very concerned about the safety issues associated with limited access.

Peter Barnes stated that his client owns the property on the apex of the corner of Lowell and Empire. He was struggling to deal with all the information that has been provided and thanked Mr. Sweeney and his associates for providing this much information. He stated that he has reviewed much of the information published on the website and is looking at a distribution of services. Mr. Barnes stated that he was required to do design studies of homes he is trying to create on land adjacent to this project, and he was asked why he used a particular type of window. He held up a streetscape and asked why anyone cared. He hoped the City would maintain the same level of detail and concern in this project as they did to the windows of his client's house. Mr. Barnes noted that there was a distinct

lack of views taken from the residential areas on Lowell, Empire, Norfolk, 8th Street, and 6th Street. The Staff report says the mass of the building can be mitigated by putting it against a hill, but nowhere on his client=s side can the hill be seen, and only the building can be seen. Mr. Barnes believed there are no details in construction, but it is all relevant, and they should be getting into the details very fast much like they did with his windows. He stated that his client would like to reserve the right to bring other objections in the future; however, currently they have no opinion. He had no reason to believe that the Sweeney=s are anything other than honest, ethical, and dedicated to doing a great project.

Vice-Chair O=Hara continued the public hearing.

Commissioner Erickson expressed concern that the buildings appear to be coming out of what appears to be the Salt Lake Avenues District rather than a Park City concept. He agreed with Mr. Barnes that they should be looking at the details, even though this will go to a CUP later in the process. He believed the 30-foot-high walls would need work, and the two doorways into the garage need work to avoid looking into black holes. He was unsure how to answer the setback question on the north building.

Commissioner Thomas asked if the photographs were shot with a wide angle lens and, if so, what millimeter. Mr. Sweeney was unsure and offered to share the information they have on the various steps of how this was done with anyone who is interested. Planner Whetstone explained that the Staff requested that the applicant use a camera angle and lens based on what the eye would see. The photo from the deck is the only one that did not show the whole view. The Staff wanted the visual analysis to represent what could be seen in the 55 to 65 millimeter range. Commissioner Thomas stated that he did not understand why they used Chicago, San Francisco, and Salt Lake City as comparative architectural styles to Park City. Those are large metropolitan areas, and he did not believe they match the character and scale of Park City. Mr. Sweeney explained that there was no example of the larger buildings in Park City other than the schools. The only way they could make the comparison was to consider what would have happened if Park City had grown like those other cities. Another consideration was that it did not make good architectural sense to make large buildings look like little buildings. A third consideration was given to Ron Ivie and snow shed issues. Mr. Sweeney stated that in the day when this project was approved, it was based on bigger buildings in the Gulch being flat.

Commissioner Erickson recalled that the Planning Commission worked hard on the Caledonia building, and he likes that building and how it meets the Code. He asked if he would be inconsistent to ask for the same direction on these buildings in terms of flatter roofs and architectural details. Commissioner Thomas commented that the architectural elements are important, although they appear to be more applied elements. He was struggling with Criterion 11 in terms of scale in relationship with the adjacent neighborhood fabric, because Park City is not an urban fabric. Park City is a townscape with a different

scale and quality, and he was unsure how to handle the relationship to the adjacent fabric of the neighborhood with buildings as tall as the ones proposed. He requested that cross sections be factored in with the other images showing how slope is handled on the tallest building and the adjacent slopes with regard to the existing power lines.

Commissioner Volkman echoed the comments made by Commissioners Erickson and Thomas. He did not believe there was compatibility with surrounding structures. He did not believe the material given to the Planning Commission provides enough information to be able to provide input on Criterion 11 and architectural detail, design, style, and scale. Planner Whetstone explained that the purpose of the visual analysis was to show the overall project within the context of the town, not from individual properties. She stated that the entire criteria need to be reviewed in the context of the approved MPD that identified height zones and average heights, which they meet. They are looking at compatibility as it relates to an approved master plan. She commented that this has been discussed at Staff level, and it was determined that this area was not identified as an area for single-family residential. The master plan identified it as resort base, and they need to find something that fits in. Compatible in this case does not necessarily mean the same. Commissioner Volkman did not believe there is transition from a neighborhood to this kind of scale. In his opinion, having a seven-story building within 80 feet of a residence means they need to push this project to better fit into the neighborhood. He understood that densities are assigned and that they have height allowances, but there are ways to make this project fit into the neighborhood. He stated that he was stunned by the slides showing the scale and mass of the project and what it does to the hillside. He believed there must be a way to step from single-family neighborhoods to seven-story buildings.

Planner Whetstone felt it might be helpful to bring back the cross sections reviewed at previous meetings and to present more of the information the applicant has submitted to the Staff. Director Putt felt they should begin to look at the overall location of the building bulks and whether they are appropriate. He suggested that the Staff and applicant provide additional study to the perimeter buildings and how they relate to the residential structures an the adjacent neighborhood. Once they get a better sense of where the building masses are located and the scale, they can begin to further refine the building blocks and bulks and talk about the finer architectural details.

Vice-Chair O'Hara agreed with the other Commissioners regarding the massing of the two buildings. He had a problem with going straight up seven stories with a flat wall next door to a residence. He acknowledged the constraints of the site and the areas to which the applicant is restricted in placing the mass and bulk. He asked if geo-technical work had been done on the site. He understood that part of the mass and bulk would be several stories deep and questioned what kind of work might need to be done to excavate holes and whether they plan to blast. Mr. Sweeney stated that they have soils tests and an

opinion from a reputable engineer. Some blasting will be involved, but he was unsure to what extent.

Commissioner Erickson felt it would be important to see the effect of the shadow off of Building 4 onto the buildings directly to the north. He understood the building would be seven stories above grade and was interested in knowing how high the building would be above the Gardas= floor elevation. He felt it would be necessary to see the other photograph from the Gardas= deck and the other landowner=s deck when the building is put into the visual simulation. He favored the design approach but was unsure if the building renderings are completely satisfactory. He asked if the Planning Commission will go through a small scale MPD on each building before it is constructed. Planner Whetstone explained that this is the CUP process for the buildings. The Planning Commission has the discretion to add a condition to the CUP approval to see the architectural design of individual buildings. Commissioner Erickson felt it would help them work through the massing question. Mr. Sweeney stated that he would welcome that review, and he did not expect this to be a one-step process.

6. 2409 Gilt Edge Circle, Arrowood - Plat amendment

Planner Jonathan Weidenhamer reviewed the application for an amendment to a record of survey at Arrowood #2 at 2409 Gilt Edge Circle. The Planning Commission reviewed this item on August 11, 2004, at which time the Staff requested direction on whether there was good cause to move forward. The request is to allow a 400-square-foot addition to a 3,700-square-foot unit. The request meets all the requirements of the State statute and Land Management Code, and all noticing requirements. The proposed open space will be 90%, which exceeds the 60% requirement. There are four on-site parking spaces, and this addition will not trigger additional parking. At the last meeting, the Planning Commission discussed a private settlement agreement between the unit owners at Queen Esther and the developer of this project. It was determined that the City is not a party to that agreement and will not regulate or enforce it. On August 11, the Planning Commission directed the Staff to come back with a recommendation based on good cause that this addition is not visible from the street, is under an existing deck, and does not impact surrounding neighbors other than the two owners who signed a ballot supporting this application. A public hearing was held at the last meeting and a number of people opposed the request. Planner Weidenhamer reported that, since that time, he has spoken with three people who oppose the request because they are concerned about increased traffic, noise, and circulation impacts. He referred to a previous discussion about the number of bedrooms and clarified that the existing unit has a total of three bedrooms, and this amendment will add 400 square feet. A portion of that space will be put into a common living area, and the rest will become an additional bedroom, for a total of four bedrooms. The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for this amended record