Treasure Hill

Executive Summary of
Position Statement and Presentation to the Park City Planning Commission

Square Footage Calculations and Volume of Treasure Hill
(Addresses Standards for Review Nos. 3 & 4 and CUP Criteria Nos. 1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11, & 15)

August 10, 2016

I. **Park City Knew It Was Approving a Large Scale Development.** In granting the 1986 MPD Approval, Park City knew Treasure Hill would involve buildings, some of significant scale, typical of a project of this nature. Since service and parking areas were required to be located under the buildings and ski runs, 1,000,000 gross (not net) square feet is not unexpected. (**VISUAL**: BP.01, **VISUAL:** V.01)

A. The Revised Staff Report, dated December 18, 1985 (revised to reflect the October 16, 1986 City Council Approval of the MPD), utilizes such terms as: "high-rise concept," "cluster the bulk," and "massiveness." Kristen Rogers, a member of the City Council, in casting a dissenting vote, referred to the Project as: "large sky scraper type buildings." The clustering concept was the City's brainchild and the City approved it after considering all the ramifications and analyzing a total of eight mountainside alternatives. The City also knew the Project was next to Old Town.

II. **Progression of Treasure Hill.** The evolution of the Treasure Hill design from 1986 to 2004 and from 2004 to 2009 was driven by ordinance and by direction from Staff and the Planning Commission. These influences resulted in:

- Decreased floor-to-floor height of the residential component (largely due to the anticipated usage of post-tensioned slab construction, which minimizes the thickness of the floor structure);

- Increased meeting and support commercial space using percentages confirmed by Staff;

- The addition of employee housing; and

- Parking, service, and circulation revisions.

These revisions resulted in modest volume changes above ground and, more significantly, increased volume underground. The Project was also dropped a few feet further into the hillside in order to further reduce scale along the Lowell/Empire frontage.

III. **Square Footage Calculations and Exhibit W**.

A. The 1986 MPD Approval granted approximately 413,000 "net" square feet depending on unit configuration. Keep in mind that a 15,000 square foot condominium in 1986 only counted as 1.5 UEs (2 UEs under the 2003 code), so volume was not fixed in 1986.

B. As shown in the last hearing, the Woodruff Drawings contemplated approximately 876,000 "gross" square feet and, had the Woodruff concept been further developed similar to the current CUP application, it would have increased in size, as estimated in our previous meeting, to approximately 997,804 square feet.

C. Based upon calculations permitted under the 2003 LMC, the 2004 CUP Submittal contemplated upwards of 849,007 "gross" square feet.

1. 2,000/1,000 square footage calculations were agreed upon by MPE Inc. and Staff. Otherwise square footage and volume would be even greater.

2. 2,000/1,000 square footage calculations were used for Montage and appear to have been used for St. Regis.

D. Based upon the progression of Treasure Hill through the CUP process, the 2009 refined CUP Submittal, including design of meeting space and support commercial, contemplated 1,016,877 gross square feet. This amount has been subsequently reduced to 1,008,808 by eliminating the mine exhibition from the Project.

E. The "Additional" square footage is permitted by the 2003 LMC and is "reasonable".

1. Reasonable in the context of what is required to make Treasure Hill a functionally developed and profitable operating project.

2. Reasonable in the context of what Park City has permitted for other similar developments.

a) Exhibit W Analysis (**VISUAL**: Comparison of Treasure Hill and Montage, **VISUAL:** Exhibit W Information)

3. The 2003 LMC limits meeting space to 5% of the total floor area and support commercial to 5% of the gross floor area ***without qualification***, and the 2009 CUP Application complies with the 5% requirement for both, even if ***all floor area*** related to vested commercial, meeting space, and support commercial is not included in making the calculation.

IV. Volume. Volume is a function of square footage (a building's horizontal and vertical dimensions) and floor to floor heights. An increase in volume means an increase in construction costs, so developers are disincentivized to maximize volume. Notably, there is no

mention of volume restrictions with respect to the Estate (E) Zone in the 1985 Code, the 2003 Code, or the MPD Approval.

A. The volume of Treasure Hill is primarily a function of UEs, vehicular access, topography, and the different types of spatial usages reasonably required for the Project.

1. **Function Drives Height.** Floor to floor heights required for a functional development include:

a) Parking clearances. 16' floor to floor for service and fire trucks and 14' floor to floor for ambulances and handicapped vans. These floor to floor dimensions allow for drop downs and transfer beams, sprinkling systems, lighting, and ventilation systems and are conservative at this level of design.

b) Lobby heights.

c) Commercial Space heights.

d) Meeting Space heights.

e) Residential Space floor height, minimum 10.5' floor to floor

f) For Treasure Hill, all of the above are typical and reasonable, and logically, were inherent in the MPD approval, given the City's awareness of the size of the Project.

g) David Eldredge, the Project architect, has performed an analysis of Treasure Hill's volume. (**VISUAL:** Volume Analysis)

h) Based on the plats of record, the Montage has floor to floor heights of 11' for residential areas and 19-21' for public spaces and the St. Regis 10.6-11' for residential areas and 23' for public spaces.

2. **Bulk of Higher Areas Are Below Reestablished Grade.** Most of the higher spaces in Treasure Hill are located below re-established grade. (**VISUAL**: Summary of volume analysis)

V. Volume Location. The location of volume on the Treasure Hill site was driven by function and the desire to mitigate height, and was a key consideration early in the design and approval process. Its location, along with the location ski improvements and fire and safety elements, became the foundation of agreements with the City and Park City Resort, including the agreed upon Fire Protection Plan.

A. Placing the Project further "in a gulch," a term coined by Tom Shellenberger, who cast an assenting Council member vote, on October 16, 1986, respects this key MPD mass and scale mitigator. A topnotch skiing experience into Old Town is very important. Fire and safety is critical. The excavation and the cliffscape concept necessary to accomplish the forgoing logically followed. All of these elements were in play when the Fire Protection Plan was agreed to early in 2004 with the City being represented by its Chief Building Official and Fire Marshall, Ron Ivie. This all occurred before the formal CUP application in 2004, which incorporated all the same elements. The 2004 CUP application, as refined with input from Staff, Planning Commission, and public, was then the basis for a 2006 agreement with Park City Resort regarding lift and run improvements and allocation of responsibilities over mountain usage between the owners of Treasure Hill and the operator of the resort. Excavation and cliffscape construction mitigates height. Contrary to that which was suggested by a member of the public at the last meeting, almost all of the cliffscape will be obscured from the Town's view because the Project's buildings will be in front of the cliffscape and because of anticipated landscaping.

B. The SketchUp demonstration shows the effect of the Project's mass shift as compared with the original Woodruff concept. (**VISUAL**: SketchUp presentation by MPE - smaller scale buildings obscure cliffscapes from nearby residents and larger scale buildings from more distant residents, the 2009 CUP Application provides a topnotch skier experience).