

# Planning Commission Staff Report



Planning

**Author:** Kirsten Whetstone  
**Subject:** Treasure Hill CUP  
**Date:** August 25, 2004  
**Type of Item:** Administrative

## Summary Recommendations:

The planning staff requests the Commission review and discuss the Treasure Hill CUP as it relates to conditional use permit criterion # 11 (physical design and Compatibility with surrounding structures in Mass, scale, style, design, and architectural detailing). Staff requests the Commission provide specific comment, hold a public hearing, and continue the public hearing to the September 22, 2004 meeting.

## Description:

### A. Topic:

**Project Name:** Treasure Hill (Mid-station and Creole Gulch parcels of the Sweeney Properties Master Planned Development)  
**Applicant:** MPE, Inc.  
**Location:** Empire Avenue  
**Proposal:** Request for approval of a CUP and preliminary subdivision plat for 197 UE residential and 19 UE commercial (approximately 282 condominium/townhouse/hotel suites ranging in size from 650 sf to >2,500 sf and approximately 19,000 sf (net) resort related support commercial uses), 473 parking spaces, and up to 10% of the gross floor area for meeting rooms and support uses. Resort related amenities are also proposed, such as pools, spas, etc. The proposal includes approximately 51 acres of dedicated open space for ski runs, trails, and passive use. The proposal includes a revised Town Lift chair lift/cabriolet people mover system.  
**Zoning:** E-MPD (Sweeney Properties Master Planned Development) and ROS (Recreational Open Space)  
**Adjacent Uses:** Ski resort and related uses, single-family residences, condominiums, bed & breakfast inns, and open space.  
**Date of Application:** January 13, 2004  
**Project Planner:** Kirsten Whetstone

### B. Background

On December 18, 1985 the Planning Commission approved a Master Planned Development for the Treasure Hill/Sweeney Properties, consisting of a total of 277 unit equivalents (UE) on the 123.59- acre site. The Master Planned Development was approved with a detailed description of densities, height zones, land uses, utility and public improvement requirements, a phasing plan (20+ years), a trail plan, etc.

A combined total of 197 UE residential and 19 UE commercial were approved for the 11.5 acre remaining development parcels known as 1) Creole Gulch (161.5 residential UE and 15.5 commercial UE on 7.75 acres) and 2) Mid-station (35.5 residential UE and 3.5 commercial UE on 3.75 acres).

According to the approved Sweeney Properties MPD, development on individual parcels shall be reviewed as Conditional Use Permits. The Creole Gulch and Mid-station parcels are the last parcels of the MPD to undergo development review.

Design booklets were distributed with the April 14 and April 28, 2004 packets and are available for public review at the Planning Department.

The applicants also have established a web site where plans and documents can be viewed and down loaded. ([www.treasurehillpc.com](http://www.treasurehillpc.com)). (Park City does not warrant the completeness or accuracy of documents on this website.)

### C. Project Description

The project site is located on Treasure Hill, west of Old Town Park City, generally south of the Empire Avenue and Lowell Avenue switch back with access to the site from Empire and Lowell Avenues. Included in the proposal is a request for a preliminary subdivision plat for the Creole and Mid-station parcels and associated open space lands of the Sweeney Properties Master Plan.

#### Site Area:

TOTAL SITE TREASURE HILL	123.59 ACRES
MIDSTATION DEVELOPMENT PARCEL	3.75 ACRES
CREOLE DEVELOPMENT PARCEL	7.75 ACRES
TOTAL DEDICATED OPEN SPACE	110 ACRES
OPEN SPACE WITH TREASURE HILL CUP	51 ACRES
OPEN SPACE PREVIOUSLY DEDICATED	59 ACRES

#### Units/Density:

##### RESIDENTIAL:

MIDSTATION – **35.5 UE – maximum allowed** (approx. 71,000 SF)

Condominium/townhouses: 2 at <1,000 sf, 9 at <1500 sf, 8 at <2,000 sf, and 14 at greater than 2,000 sf.

**Approx. 33.25 UE proposed** (depends on size of units > 2,000 sf).

Parking: 60 spaces required, 63 spaces proposed in underground structure.

CREOLE - **161.5 UE – maximum allowed** (approx. 323,000 SF)

Hotel/Suites: 37 at <650 sf

Condominium units: 84 at < 650 sf, 99 at < 1000 sf, 69 at < 1500 sf, 53 at < 2000 sf, and 14 at > 2500 sf. The applicants have provided a summary by unit types that meets the 161.5 UE. This represents one scenario given the building configuration and volumetrics as diagramed. **Approx. 161.5 UE proposed**

Parking: 333 spaces required, 410 spaces proposed in underground structure.

## **COMMERCIAL:**

Maximum allowed per MPD- 19 UE COMMERCIAL USES (19,000 SF)

Proposed at the MIDSTATION- Support commercial: approximately 3,748 sf (gross), 3,500 sf (net). **Maximum allowed is 3,500 sf (net leasable). Proposed is 3,500 sf (net).**

Proposed at CREOLE- Support commercial: approximately 18,905 sf (gross), 15,500 sf (net). **Maximum allowed is 15,500 sf (net leasable). Proposed in 15,500 sf (net).**

Meeting space and support commercial (10% of the total approved floor area) per Land Management Code (15-6-8.) is allowed per the MPD, in addition to the 19 UE of commercial uses. The applicants intend to utilize the full 10% for meeting and support commercial spaces. Additional square footage is allowed for back of house and other ancillary uses, such as storage, mechanical, common space, etc.

## **RESORT RELATED USES:**

Other proposed uses include, revisions to the Town lift chair lift, revisions to ski runs and trails, pedestrian connections to Main Street, public plaza areas, a small mining exhibit/museum, as well as private amenities such as spas, pools, plazas, and exercise facilities.

## **D. Conditional Use Permit Review**

At the previous meeting on August 11, the applicants presented information for discussion of CUP criteria 7-10 (fencing, screening, building mass, building location and orientation, open space, signs, and lighting) and a public hearing was held.

At the July 14 meeting, the applicants presented plans and information to the Planning Commission regarding CUP criterion #2 (traffic) as well as criteria #'s 12-15 (#12- noise, vibration, odors, etc.; #13- control of delivery and service, loading and unloading, etc.; #14- expected ownership; and #15- impacts on Sensitive Lands, topography, slope retention, etc.). Criteria # 1- 6 were discussed at the May 26, 2004 meeting.

At this August 25 meeting the applicants have prepared a short visual analysis and computer model to present to the Commission to address CUP criterion 11 (physical design and Compatibility with surrounding structures in Mass, scale, style, design, and architectural detailing).

Staff has outlined below a preliminary analysis of the Treasure Hill CUP as it relates to Conditional Use Permit criterion 11 (staff comments are in italics):

### **Criterion # 11 (physical design and Compatibility with surrounding structures in Mass, scale, style, design, and architectural detailing)**

**Staff requests discussion.** *This criterion should be considered in the context of the 1985 Sweeney Properties Master Plan approval, which shed density from the overall MPD property, including the steep slopes of Treasure Hill, primarily to the two parcels that make up the Treasure Hill CUP. These parcels were approved in the 1985 MPD as a resort area base, such as Snow Park, Silver Lake, and the*

*Park City Mountain Resort village area, where typically, development is clustered in mass around landscaped open space, pedestrian plazas, and ski runs/trails, leaving significant open space around the perimeter and beyond.*

*Typical solutions for clustering in this type of resort base area are to reduce overall building footprint and increase building height, and to provide underground parking. This generally provides more open space and limits the amount of disturbed area, while providing the increased tourist-based density (bed base) in close proximity to resorts, ski lifts, ski runs, and other tourist amenities, such as restaurants, bars, shops, galleries, etc.*

*The approved MPD included building height zones as well as a maximum average height for the parcels. The applicants have submitted a height matrix to demonstrate that the proposed site plan and building massing complies with the approved MPD height zones and overall average height requirements.*

*The overall site and building design includes elements of building massing, orientation and separation from surrounding buildings, and includes landscaping and screening to provide buffering and additional separation. These elements have been used to provide a design that is sensitive to the existing predominately historic residential district/neighborhood abutting this MPD. This existing neighborhood is a mix of new and historic single-family homes. There are also scattered duplexes, four-plexes, bed and breakfast inns, and other larger homes and buildings in the area. At the August 11, 2004 Commission meeting, the applicant presented sections through the project demonstrating the heights of surrounding buildings in comparison to the heights of the proposed buildings and also showing the horizontal and vertical separation. **(Please refer to the attachments handed out with the August 11, 2004 staff report.)***

*In terms of evaluating the Compatibility of the overall design, staff also requested the applicant considered how the development fits into the community as a whole, as viewed from various vantage points (not specific SLO vantage points, but from areas of town where the project is visible, such as the Town Lift, Heber Avenue, City Park at Deer Valley Drive, Lowell Avenue, and from the Aerie).*

*The applicants have prepared an extensive computerized model and visual analysis to demonstrate that the project is sensitive to the immediate neighborhood and fits into the community fabric as a whole when reviewed in the context of the Sweeney Properties MPD approval. Staff believes that the visual analysis demonstrates how the buildings fit into the site and that there is an adequate hillside backdrop behind the buildings that reduces some of the perceived mass and height.*

*The applicant's design objective has been to provide Compatibility and sensitivity by 1) creating adequate transition to this project from adjacent and neighboring uses, 2) providing adequate separation and screening between the buildings within the project as well as between the project and adjacent houses/buildings, 3) providing architectural stepping both horizontally and vertically to assist in the transition between structures of different sizes, 4) breaking up the massing into*

several individual masses of a variety of sizes, 5) orienting the buildings to fit into the existing topography, and 6) providing necessary architectural detailing to minimize perceived massing and "fit" into the neighborhood and overall community fabric.

Staff believes that the proposed design meets many of these objectives, but staff has concerns with the location of building 4A, in terms of setbacks and stepping, as stated in the August 11, 2004 staff report. Staff also has concerns with the overall massing of Building 1B and requests the Commission provide input regarding both of these buildings.

Staff believes that the preliminary architectural design concept is sensitive and compatible with the historic district, yet is not a replication or duplication of historic Park City architecture.

### **SUMMARY**

After a preliminary analysis of the proposed site plan, proposed setbacks, and building massing, staff believes the overall plan complies with the setbacks, volumetrics, and height limitations as stated in the approved MPD. Staff also believes that the general concepts for the cliff scape and landscaping within the project and in the buffer areas will help to mitigate some of the impacts on adjacent properties created by this project. Staff has concerns with the overall massing of Building 1B and with the location (setbacks) and stepping of building 4A and believes additional attention to these buildings is needed to address the Compatibility issues.

Staff requests the Commission provide input on building locations, massing, articulation, separation, and building setbacks. Staff is also interested in the Commission's comments regarding the architectural design concepts. Staff will continue to work with the applicants on any specific areas of concern and return at the September 22 meeting with any additional revisions.

### **E. Departmental Review**

The Treasure Hill CUP and preliminary subdivision plat were discussed at staff review meetings on May 7 and October 14, 2003, and February 3, June 10, and July 6, 2004. Additional staff review meetings will be held in response to revised plans.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

The applicants have prepared a presentation to address criterion #11 (LMC Section 15-1-10 (E) (11)). The Staff recommends the Commission review and discuss the applicant's presentation materials as they relate to the approved MPD and the Land Management Code requirements for Conditional Use Permits, specifically criteria #11. Staff recommends the Commission conduct a public hearing. The Staff requests specific direction on buildings 1B and 4A. Staff also requests comments and direction on the proposed architectural design concepts. Staff will return at the September 22 meeting with a summary of all 15 CUP criteria.

**Exhibit A- Visual analysis (attached under separate cover)**

**Exhibit B- Height Zone matrix (attached under separate cover)**

**Please also refer to the Treasure Hill Design booklet handed out at the April 14, 2004 meeting. All plans and documents are also available at the Planning Department and on the applicant's website at [www.treasurehillpc.com](http://www.treasurehillpc.com) . Please also bring the handouts and sections from the August 11, 2004 staff report.**