

To: Park City Planning Commission

May 25, 2016

Subject: **Alice Claim Subdivision**

I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the Planning Commission for all the time they've taken to thoroughly review and evaluate this project in the past, and now again. I am curious: As a member of the public who has made numerous comments on this project, along with many others, in the past; **how are our comments kept as reference materials?** And for that matter, the Commissioners' comments? **Years of important testimony has been given and I was wondering how that information is made available to the current Planning Commission.**

As I reviewed the packet for the three Alice Gully Project items on the agenda, I thought: Why three items on the agenda? If the first is not approved, there's no need for #2 or #3. Guess it must be procedural.

1) **Alice Claim Subdivision and Plat Amendment**

Why should the City approve this project? **Adding density would benefit only the developer.** Is there good cause for this project? Does it benefit the City? The neighborhood? As I understand it, it is one parcel that must meet very specific requirements to be subdivided into more lots; and it's not a land use right to have more lots in this case. **Both the public and Commissioners have made arguments that must be reviewed and resolved to meet the subdivision standards.**

Approving this project would set a precedent, encouraging future developers to increase the density on the remaining parcels and hillsides in Historic Old Town Park City.

Public Safety: Viewing Document (**EXHIBIT J**) prepared by FEHR & PEERS to show Emergency Vehicle Turning Movement, just confirms to me the inherent danger of this intersection by adding access to Alice Claim. The applicant offering land at the corner adds no benefit. **Exhibit J does not reference the severe pitch or grade of this intersection.**

Adding a stop sign at the uphill corner of King Road and Ridge only reconfirms to me that drawing something doesn't mean it works. I'd like to see any passenger vehicle, dump truck, cement truck, or PC Mountain Resort vehicle come to a complete stop on the uphill of King Road, then proceed (whether left or particularly right) in the winter. I would even question the ability of any vehicle, particularly a large vehicle, to stop on a dry day on the uphill, then safely proceed.

Having lived on Sampson Avenue since 1980, I respectfully disagree with the applicant's traffic engineer and our City Engineer when they state that nine homes have negligible traffic impact in this area. (Exhibit N)

Many public safety concerns have been expressed over the course of the Planning Commission meetings. **Future Planning Commissions will have a hard time using public health, safety and welfare standards to appropriately limit lands not suitable for development, if the Planning Commission ignores them here.**

To: Park City Planning Commission
Subject: **Alice Claim Subdivision**

May 25, 2016

2) CUP for Retaining Walls

The three-10'- step back walls, totally 30 feet, is not the desired look for Historic Old Town Park City. Rather than a paragraph describing the walls, we need to see a realistic/accurate drawing of the retaining wall(s) from the vantage point of, say, the center of the intersection: **Like a superimposed wall to scale on a photo of the hillside.**

If approved, this **sets a precedent for future development.** Permitting these walls in Historic Old Town Park City would give the undesirable look of, say, Deer Crest.

3) Property Swap 123 Ridge and Lot 1

No need to address. Swapping these two triangular parcels has no purpose unless project is approved.

Alice Claim Gully Subdivision does not belong in Historic Old Town Park City.

Respectfully,



Carol B Sletta
135 Sampson Avenue