

6. The final building plans and construction details for the project shall meet substantial compliance with the drawings dated July 1, 2005, as submitted and reviewed by the Planning Commission.
7. Utility and grading plans must be approved by the City Engineer prior to Building Permit Issuance.
8. A Construction Mitigation Plan must be approved by the Planning Commission.
9. The applicant will record a subdivision plat prior to receiving a Building Permit. The applicant will record a condominium Record of Survey prior to selling individual units.
10. Prior to issuance of any building permits for that unit or building which causes overall water consumption at Empire Pass to exceed 150 gallons per minute (approximately 75 units), the Master Developer shall have provided adequate water source capacity satisfactory to the City Attorney and Public Works Director.
13. Treasure Hill CUP Traffic Study Discussion

Planner Whetstone remarked that discussion this evening regarding the Treasure Hill conditional use permit will focus on the traffic study. The Treasure Hill project is located at the Empire/Lowell switchback and consists of 120 acres.

Planner Whetstone reported that in 1986 the City Council approved a master planned development called the Sweeney Properties master planned development. The Treasure Hill conditional use permit is comprised of two parcels within that master planned development; the Midstation site and the Creole Gulch site. The two sites combined consist of 197 residential unit equivalents and 19 commercial unit equivalents.

Planner Whetstone stated that the Planning Commission has been reviewing this conditional use permit against various criteria in the Land Management Code. The Planning Commission requested that the Staff conduct a peer review of the traffic study that was prepared by the applicant as part of the application. Planner Whetstone noted that the peer review was provided at the first meeting in August.

Planner Whetstone requested that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing this evening and continue the public hearing to October 12. The Staff requested specific direction from the Planning Commission as to any of the recommendations contained in the traffic study. A work session will be scheduled to discuss specific recommendations that may be potential findings or conditions of approval.

Eric DeHaan, City Engineer, introduced John Nepsted and Ryan Hales with Fehr and Peers. Mr. DeHaan stated that the City agonized for a long time over a scope of work on the peer review of the traffic study for the Treasure Hill project. They tried to define the elements that should be included in a peer review recognizing the vast amount of interest this project has generated in Park City and especially Old Town. Mr. DeHaan noted that this project has a previous master plan approval that established density on the site and density creates traffic. Consequently, after numerous conversations internally and with members of the Planning Commission, the scope of work was created for Fehr and Peers to study the traffic information as a peer review. The intent was to look at the operations of the traffic on the streets of Park City, as well as pedestrian operations, maintenance questions, and other issues under the City's control and to the level of mitigation that will be appropriate at the time of approval of this conditional use permit. Mr. DeHaan outlined the specifics of the scope of work noting that they did not request consideration for the widening of Empire and Lowell Avenues. With the emphasis on the maintenance of the existing street network and not trying to force a California style engineering solution on an Old Town neighborhood, they came up with a review of the mitigation and a list of the steps proposed by the developer's engineers.

Ryan Hales stated that the review of the Treasure Hill impact study included a review of the Treasure Hill traffic impact study created by PEC Engineers. It included 282 residential units and 19,000 square feet of retail on 11-1/2 acres. Mr. Hales noted that this was a technical review of the assumptions and conclusions from the study that PEC completed. The study was completed in July 2004 and had an addendum in March of 2005. Mr. Hales remarked that they also looked at the Park City transportation policies and found that the PEC report provided adequate assessment of the traffic characteristics and potential impacts from the Treasure Hill development. Treasure Hill is consistent with the general guidelines and the transportation element of the General Plan and the Land Management Code.

Mr. Hales noted that their evaluation focused on four primary areas; public safety, roadway capacity, intersection capacity and queuing, and pedestrian facilities. Within public safety, they wanted to identify whether the emergency vehicle access and circulation would be adequate during winter conditions. They found that the conditions are adequate. They looked at the turning radius widths and Lowell and Empire Avenue, and the intersections of Manor Way and the geometrics of the site. Mr. Hales stated that the corner radius is adequate for service and delivery vehicles that would be accessing these roads and intersections. This also includes emergency services vehicles. Mr. Hales recognized that there should be parking restrictions on the turnaround at the end of Lowell and Empire to the north of the project. He noted that Treasure Hill is not expected to add additional on-street parking to the area and all the parking will be contained on site within their parking structure. Mr. Hales stated that winter season traffic conditions are not expected to block emergency access on either Lowell or Empire. Treasure Hill will increase traffic on Lowell

and Empire but it should not significantly degrade the traffic conditions based upon the amount of vehicles traveling back and forth to Treasure Hill. To insure smooth circulation, Mr. Hales felt it was imperative to have managed on-street parking restrictions.

Shifting the focus to roadway capacity, Mr. Hales remarked that winter p.m. peak period traffic conditions were the focus of the study due to the fact that people leave the ski resorts at the same time. The capacity on Lowell and Empire Avenue is adequate. Blockage is caused by snow storage and on-street parking and it is assumed that these blockages would occur through intermittent roadway segments. Mr. Hales stated that several things need to happen in order to make the on-street parking and the street itself function adequately. Certain recommendations include limiting parking to one side of the roadway. On-street parking should be limited to half of the roadway length from Manor Way to the turnaround at the end of Empire and Lowell Avenues and should be in alternate 150 foot segments; a 150 feet of storage for cars to park and 150 feet that would be no parking or restricted parking. Mr. Hales noted that alternating the 150 foot sections would allow for someone to pull off to the side and allow another car to pass. He recommended that no parking occur on the turnaround. The Crescent Tram road could be a guide as one recommendation and there would be no parking on Crescent Tram road and on the south side in the area of Lowell and Empire. He also recommended strict enforcement of the parking restrictions during the winter months. Mr. Hales understood that parking can be a problem and he hoped that regulations could help mitigate those problems. Lowell and Empire should be reconstructed to their current width.

Mr. Hales noted that the intersection capacity and queuing was studied during the p.m. peak period during the winter season. The peak resort period departure time can cause ques and short periods of gridlock on Lowell and Empire. There are problems with the existing signalized intersection at Deer Valley Drive and Park Avenue. There are capacity shortfalls and the intersection cannot handle all the traffic reaching the intersection at the same time. Mr. Hales recommended that the east bound approach supply dual left turn lanes and that the south bound approach also have two left turn lanes. These modifications would bring that intersection to an adequate level of service. Mr. Hales noted that there would be a modification of signal timings and left turn phasing. He stated that the intersection at Empire Avenue and Silver King Drive is also overloaded but other than Presidents Day weekend it does not meet the requirements to become signalized. Mr. Hales recommended having human traffic control during those peak periods of outflow.

Mr. Hales stated that they ran an operational analysis and identified favorable intersection operations. However there is a lot of side friction on Lowell and Empire Avenue created by the cars that park intermittently on both sides of the road, vehicles that stop for pick up or drop off, and pedestrians in the roadway. Mr. Hales recommended consolidating pedestrian crossings to specific areas rather than free flow across the road in different areas.

Regarding pedestrian connectivity, Mr. Hales noted that the existing pedestrian facilities provide convenient connections. Ski trail connections are provided to link Treasure Hill to the Park City Mountain Resort base. Non-ski pedestrians should also be considered through sidewalks and paths. Two are being provided with this development as outlined in the PEC study. Mr. Hale commented on a recommendation for on-call shuttle and transit service to be provided. The cabriolet will provide opportunities for people at Treasure Hill to access downtown Park City. Mr. Hales commented on a technical assessment of the traffic study completed by PEC engineers and noted that the traffic volumes have been adequately evaluated. There was a 30% internal reduction on the site which means that people will not be using their vehicles for transportation; i.e., 30% reduction in trips. Mr. Hales reviewed comparison numbers from other locations evaluated by PEC. Those numbers were higher and showed that a 30% reduction for Treasure Hill does not maximize the full opportunity and leaves some vehicles on the roadway network. In terms of trip generation and assignment, Mr. Hales stated that once the trips generated are identified for the specific site he anticipates 162 trips during that p.m. peak period when the resorts are unloading. He noted that they ran a sensitivity analysis on Crescent Tram and found that approximately 90 vehicles currently use Crescent Tram during that peak period. Traffic from this development could add another 16 to 20 trips on Crescent Tram. Mr. Hales recommended discouraging motorists from using Crescent Tram. Treasure Hill should provide guests with route maps that could include an ingress movement on Lowell and egress movement on Empire to split up the traffic. Mr. Hales believed there are adequate traffic operations with the exception of the Deer Valley/Park Avenue intersection.

Mr. Hales stated that Fehr and Peers review agrees with the recommendations from Treasure Hill in terms of impacts and mitigations. They also agree that the mitigated items in the PEC study do mitigate the traffic to the best that can be expected for this development.

Chair Barth opened the public hearing.

Kira Parkhurst, a resident on Empire Avenue, demonstrated what really happens on Empire Avenue in terms of pedestrians and vehicular traffic coming from various developments, residences, and the resort. She commented on the problems and inconvenience the residents will endure if the City applies some of the recommended restrictions in order to make Treasure Hill work.

Puggy Holmgren stated that she kept hearing the phrase "adequate" and "can be done". She felt this sounded marginal at best and it is not acceptable to Park City. Even with all the crosswalks in Park City, people cross wherever they want. Ms. Holmgren remarked that human traffic control smacks of Disneyland and she hated to see that come to Park

City. She felt they need to do a lot more with the traffic situation before giving this project the go ahead. Ms. Holmgren did not think it was reasonable to think a stop and pass plan would really work. She noted that 20 years ago this was a great plan and people looked forward to it, however just because someone in authority says its acceptable does not mean it is. Many things happened 20 years ago that people would like to have changed. The City has the opportunity to correct a decision that could have serious consequence to Park City and she hoped they would not pass it up.

Bryan Vanhecke, a resident on Empire Avenue, felt the pedestrian issue puts the City at liability with regard to potential pedestrian accidents. Currently it is a dangerous situation and this plan will make it worse. Mr Vanhecke asked for more clarification on the two left turn lanes Mr. Hales mentioned. He was also unclear on the 30% vehicle reduction. Mr. Vanhecke noted that Crescent Tram Drive is not used by a lot of tourists but the taxis use it and taxis will be driving people from the Treasure Hill development to town. Mr. Vanhecke recognized the Sweeney's rights to develop this land but he was unsure how they can approve a seven story hotel with nearly 2,000 beds, a convention center, and commercial space on such a sensitive land with inadequate roads and infrastructure to support it. Mr. Vanhecke stated that circumstances are different today than they were in 1986 and he wondered if this is really what they want in the heart of Old Town. He noted that most residents in Park City still have no idea that this development is under consideration and those who do know are unaware of the scope and scale of the project. Mr. Vanhecke believed the City, the Sweeney's, and the media need to do a better job of publicizing this project and educating the community on exactly what is going on. He felt the Park Record buries the story on page 3 and to his knowledge there has never been a rendering or drawing of this development showing its true scale and scope on the front page of the paper. Mr. Vanhecke noted that there has never been a study conducted during peak winters times and all the recommendations are based on assumptions. He believes the reality is that traffic will be greater, roads are narrower, and they need to pay serious attention to pedestrian safety. Mr. Vanhecke was curious as to how similar cities deal with this type of situation. Sun Valley has done a good job of managing growth and he would like to know how they do it. He knows that some cities have placed a 6-12 month moratorium while they try to get their hands around this type of situation and he wondered if Park City would consider doing the same thing.

Brett Fox, a resident at 1226 Lowell Avenue, believed the Fehr and Peers report identified and substantiated a lot of the problems he has heard from local residents about pedestrians and on-street parking. He heard an engineer this evening talk about blockage caused by snow, pedestrians, and on-street parking. Although solutions were offered in the report, Mr. Fox believes they were oversimplified and glossed through and may be solutions that would thrill the developer but not be acceptable to the local residents. He agreed with Ms. Parkhurst that on-street parking needs to be available for the residents unless additional parking is provided nearby. Eliminating the parking does not eliminate

the need. Mr. Fox was happy to see that the report recommended pedestrian connections between the Treasure Hill development and the Park City Mountain Resort. He was disappointed that no consideration was given to widening the streets so parking can remain or that Lowell and Empire might be made one-way year around to accommodate traffic later in the year. Mr. Fox stated that to ask the local residents to reduce the parking by over 75% on Empire and 50% on Lowell to accommodate a large development is more than unfair. He felt the report understates the extensive delays in ques and stacking caused by the pedestrians and the existing traffic conditions. He believes that once everything in Park City is built out their traffic systems will fail if consideration is not given for the future today.

Linda McReynolds, a resident on Norfolk underneath Crescent Tram, stated that if parking is restricted on Lowell and Empire all the people will park on Norfolk and 9th Street and there is no room. Ms. McReynolds remarked that unless you live there you don't know what it's like and that causes the residents great frustration. In some cases during a snow storm a fire truck would not be able to access a burning home. She believed that the traffic recommendations proposed will not work and they are very unsafe.

Peter Barnes, representing the owner of the property on the inside of the curve, stated that the original traffic study suggested flattening that curve to increase the sight lines. Since houses are being built on that curve flattening it is not an option. Mr. Barnes noted that the Staff report reported on a report that was a review of an earlier report and he thinks the second traffic report makes the assumption that the first traffic report was basically correct subject to specific criteria. Mr. Barnes asked the Planning Commission to consider what would happen if the Lowell/Empire loop were not City owned streets and were public access easement only under private ownership. His client has no opinion at this time and Mr. Barnes intends to look at this project more holistically rather than in piecemeal format. He suggested that if 25% of the people will enter using the Lowell/Empire Loop and that 75% of the traffic will enter by Lowell the result of the study is true. In deference to the people who live in the area, he felt they should consider what would happen if one or two of the variables change. If that happens, would the project and the traffic study still be valid.

He suggested that it may not be. Mr. Barnes sympathized with the applicant and he felt it was appalling that the applicant has been delayed this long. He applauded Mr. DeHaan's suggestion that the engineers have advanced a long way in their roadway design and that narrow streets are better than wider streets. However, if a fire truck cannot get up the street the situation becomes critical. Mr. Barnes noted that Director Putt made a previous comment regarding the Staff's current disposition towards approving a certain type of roof form. He was horrified to think that the Staff would allowing the Planning Commission to approve things expressly forbidden by the Land Management Code without first consulting with the Legal Department or addressing the architectural design guidelines in their entirety.

Mike Allred, a resident on Empire Avenue, stated that he has previously asked the question of what they can do about Park City Mountain Resort blocking Lowell Avenue. The Resort has basically been given Lowell Avenue in front of the Park City Resort for Park City transit traffic. The development agreement with Mr. Sweeney specifically says that Lowell Avenue is a major access to unload his development. He wondered if anyone could answer his question. No one has discussed the issue or put forth any solutions for Park City Mountain Resort and Park City Transit to give Lowell Avenue back to the citizens. Mr. Allred did not believe this project should be discussed until this question is answered since Lowell Avenue is not available to Mr. Sweeney to load and unload his development. Mr. Allred strongly felt that it is fundamentally wrong to assume 20 years later that Mr. Sweeney has the right to build this development. Park City made a fundamentally wrong decision by not including a sunset clause for this development. He urged the Planning Commission to seriously consider that conditions have changed dramatically since approval was given in 1986. He agreed completely with Ms. Parkhurst's comments and what was demonstrated in her display. The engineers have done a great job with their computers but there is no way to get citizens and cars to respond to the exact requirements of their computer model. Mr. Allred stated that the Planning Commission has the responsibility to consider the neighborhood and not to disrupt it based on an allegiance to a contract that was made twenty years ago.

Craig Weaver, a resident at 1117 Norfolk, noted that the traffic study did not address Norfolk Avenue or Woodside Avenue. The recommendations proposed will impact these two streets and force people to park there. Mr. Weaver stated that Woodside and Norfolk have enough parking problems with their own residents and they cannot accommodate any more. He supported what everyone else has said this evening. Mr. Weaver remarked that when he walks his dog in the morning he purposely avoids Empire Avenue in the winter because of the traffic problem near Empire and Lowell.

Jimmy Tard, a resident on Empire Avenue near Crescent Tram, felt this was a public safety issue. The idea of one car waiting while another car passes may work but what happens if one car gets stuck and the other car is an ambulance. Mr. Tard stated that cars get stuck at Crescent Tram off of Empire on a daily basis regardless of which direction they travel. His neighbor's house has been hit by cars sliding off the road in the winter. Mr. Tard worried about the increased traffic and he does not think the Sweeney's should be able to tell them where to park or how to get home.

Ed Brophy stated that he lives around the corner on Lower Deer Valley Drive. Mr. Brophy noted that a few weeks ago the Planning Commission discussed a condominium project on Lower Deer Valley Drive that was approved several years ago. At the time of the approval the condominium was given a seven foot setback but they did not use their approval and returned with a request for a 20 foot setback. Mr. Brophy asked the

Planning Commission to explain why a twenty year project is set in concrete yet another project that is only two years old can move.

Lois Garda stated that she and her husband live on North Star Drive at the top of Lowell Avenue. Mrs. Garda appreciated that the Planning Commission commissioned this additional study and she was happy to see that this study did include the safety issues on Empire and Lowell Avenue. Mrs. Garda remarked that the congestion at intersections is an inconvenience and the congestion on Empire and Lowell is a real danger. She addressed some of the practical ramifications of the consultant's recommendations, particularly regarding Empire. Her first concern is where the residents who live there will park. Her second concern relates to snow removal and she used the diagram provided by Mrs. Parkhurst to explain what happens during a snow storm and noted that the projections of traffic do not take any of this into consideration. Mrs. Garda noted that the heavy equipment during a snow storm will completely block the road and no one will be able to get by. She remarked that during the period of construction when even larger vehicles will be coming up and down the road and there is no tax revenue from a completed project to pay for that snow removal, the City will have to carry the cost burden. Mrs. Garda noted that pedestrian traffic will increase and there is no where for people to walk. The solution suggested are sidewalks and there is no place for sidewalks. Another suggestion is for increased vehicle traffic to carry these pedestrians, however the number of vehicles is not noted in the report. Mrs. Garda noted that the consultants suggest that traffic not be allowed to turn in or out of Crescent Tram indicated by no turn signs. Mrs. Garda stated that Ninety trips was the projection for Crescent Tram and she believes at least half of those turn off of Empire and now they will have to stay on Empire which will increase the traffic further. She noted that there is no projection of vehicle traffic during construction and nothing mentioned about safety during that time. Mrs. Garda stated that the community has been told again and again that there cannot be revisions to this plan without opening everything up. In 1997 Pat Sweeney came to her house and explained his plans for the property to her and her husband. He stated that he submitted to the Planning Commission a plan for 44 single family homes up and down the mountain approximately 2400 square feet each. The Park Record also says in its September 21, 1995 issue that Pat Sweeney submitted to the Park City Planning Commission possible amendments to the Sweeney master plan. She believed that either the Commissioners in 1995 opened this plan for reconsideration or there is a procedure for bringing revisions to the plan.

Chair Barth suggested that Mrs. Garda meet with the Planning Department to discuss this aspect of her comments. Mrs. Garda hoped the Planning Commission would take this into consideration and work with the developer to come up with a plan that has less issues.

Gary Curtsand, a resident at Manor Way and Empire was concerned that the traffic study did not adequately address this intersection. Thirty years ago the Resort signed an

agreement one way traffic. With the proposed plan, everyone will come down Lowell and the Resort will not allow traffic to cut through their parking lot.

Kaitlyn McHugh, a resident at 841 Empire Avenue, felt the suggested modifications are severely inadequate and the proposed pedestrian crossings are from one non-existent sidewalk to another. It discouraged motorists who use Crescent Tram and in the winter 10th Street is closed from Empire to Park Avenue which means there will be no access to Park Avenue or Main Street until you reach Park City Mountain Resort. Ms. McHugh remarked that as described by the engineers parking is supposedly intermittent and she asked if the 150 foot sections take into consideration the driveways. In addition, two left turn lanes are proposed at the Park Avenue/Deer Valley Drive intersection and she wondered where those left turn lanes are going. Ms. McHugh asked for clarification on whether the 30% reduction pertains to Treasure Hill or the Resort. She noted that there were times during the winter when Norfolk, Woodside, Empire, and Lowell were reduced to one lane due to the snow and it lasted for days and sometimes weeks. One lane eliminates parking and inhibits emergency vehicles. Ms. McHugh noted that she visited the Planning Department and they were incredible helpful. She saw diagrams of the Sweeney's plan and she wondered if that information could be made available to the public or printed in the Park Record.

Shannon O'Neal stated that he and his family live on Woodside Avenue. He did not believe this 19 years old plan works with Old Town and the citizens in attendance this evening have done a good job of illustrating what it is like to live there. Mr. O'Neal felt this plan could work great in the summer but when the snow flies it will not work and it will degrade the quality of life for everyone who lives there. He stated that the City has been helpful and responsive to his neighborhood in terms of traffic calming and he understands that the City wants to encourage people to actually live in town rather than just have nightly rentals. The more pedestrian access they lose and the less pedestrian friendly it becomes, the less able they are to live there. He is respectful of the Sweeney's rights to developer their property, but a 19 year old permit does not work in 2005 and it does not make sense to allow it.

Damon Rametz, a resident at 844 Empire Avenue, at the corner of Crescent Tram and Empire Avenue, represented his two roommates who are renters. He supported all the previous comments. He has enjoyed living in Old Town for a few years and it will become more difficult to live there when large construction trucks are continually going past your house. Mr. Rametz felt it would be nice if at some point the City could take a stand and not give in to the developers. He hoped that an alternative plan can be presented that is better and more useful.

Kira Parkhurst remarked that a number of her neighbors spent days researching an incredible number of lawsuits against cities, developers, and traffic study planners when a

pedestrian is killed or injured. This is a lawsuit society and she believed that the first time someone is injured or killed it will come back on the City.

Chair Barth continued the public hearing.

Chair Barth noted that the public will have additional opportunities to make comments at a later date. He stated that Utah is probably the most liberal state in the country in terms of vesting laws. Once a project is approved or applied for with a full application, those entitlements and the density are vested and the City has no choice but to address the project. Also in Utah, those entitlements can last a tremendously long period of time which is why the Planning Commission is dealing with this project twenty years later.

Commissioner O'Hara felt that Fehr and Peers did a good job on their review of the traffic study. It answered a few questions that he had, specifically on whether trucks can make the turn at Manor Way. Being a consultant himself, he understands using weasel words which is a nice way of stating the obvious. Commissioner O'Hara stated that if he were to put this into one sentence he would say that there are no traffic problems as long as the City solves the traffic problems. He summarized that the previous study was correct, however this review identified some problems and there are ways to mitigate the problems. His understanding from reading the report is that the City shall be responsible for mitigating those problems by keeping the roads clear of snow and making sure that pedestrian access is provided and parking is strictly enforced and restricted. He agreed with the report that if the City can do this there should not be any significant impacts from Treasure Hill. Commissioner O'Hara stated that he lived on upper Lowell and the upper portion of Empire and he knows what it is like during the winter. He called the City on several occasions to let them know that people were parking on both sides of the street and traffic could not get through. He was told by the Police Department that nothing could be done because the City did not want to upset the tourists. Commissioner O'Hara remarked that this is a good study and good mitigations have been proposed, however it does not fit the reality. He stated that if the Planning Commission accepts the study and accepts that these mitigation efforts will be adequate to mitigate the problem discussed, he wondered what would do to the City in terms of liability. If they approve this based on these mitigations and the City does not adequately follow through on the mitigation package is the City liable for deaths or injuries on those streets. Commissioner O'Hara referred to language in the study stating that, "The occasional winter season roadway width restrictions are an existing condition and are not expected to be impacted by the proposed Treasure Hill project." He remarked that the existing conditions are not going to be impacted by the proposed project and the issue is how the project is going to create impacts based on those existing conditions. Commissioner O'Hara believed they could address some of the mitigations but he wanted to know the City's liability before moving forward.

Commissioner Sletten was concerned about any kind of mitigation plan that would punitively impact existing residents in the area. He remarked that personal experience could tell everyone that there are issues that need to be dealt with. Having read the study in detail, Commissioner Sletten was having difficulty understanding how parking mitigation could be handled without penalizing the existing residents.

Commissioner Thomas agreed with Commissioners O'Hara and Sletten. He appreciated the work accomplished with the traffic study. Commissioner Thomas understood that analytically you can funnel traffic through this community if everything works right. However, what they heard this evening is the human factor from the people who live there and have experienced the things that do not work. He believed the Planning Commission needs to weigh heavily what the community has to say and understand that they have a full time site analysis going on every day in their process. Commissioner Thomas wanted to know what length of vehicle was anticipated. He pointed out that Commissioner Wintzer had sent two pages of comments and considerations and he passed them on to Chair Barth. Commissioner Thomas stated that the pedestrian component is a huge issue for him and he does not understand how that is being resolved. He felt it was hard to analyze every component and stated that the best visual aid he has seen of this project is the one provided by Ms. Parkhurst. Commissioner Thomas remarked that vehicle and pedestrian traffic should be separated to the greatest extent possible and he does not see that happening in this situation.

Chair Barth felt the traffic study was an excellent report technically. He spent a lot of time on Empire and Lowell last winter and the idea of having some of the pedestrians being cornered off in certain segments will not work. Chair Barth stated that his primary focus is on health, safety, and welfare with specific reference on public and pedestrian safety and the degradation of the quality of life that would result from the increased traffic. He felt this may not be an issue during the summer but based on his experience last winter it fails now and the proposed plan will not work.

Director Putt stated that the Staff will consider all the comments and move forward with continued review of the project.

The Park City Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission _____