



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
MAY 12, 2021**

**COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Chair John Phillips (excused at 7:00 p.m.), John Kenworthy, Sarah Hall, Laura Suesser, Bill Johnson, Christin Van Dine (joined the meeting at 7:00 p.m.)

**EX OFFICIO:** Alexandra Ananth, Senior City Planner; Rebecca Ward, Senior City Planner; Brendan Conboy, Senior City Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

**EXCUSED:** Doug Thimm

---

The Planning Commission meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom.  
The public was able to submit eComments during the meeting.

**NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC MEETING & HOW TO COMMENT VIRTUALLY:**

Chair Phillips read the Public Notice for Electronic Meetings and Exhibit A: Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk.

This meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location as permitted by Utah Code Open and Public Meetings Act section 52-4-207(4) as amended June 18, 2020, and Park City Resolution 18-2020, adopted March 19, 2020. The written determination of a substantial health and safety risk, required by Utah Code section 52-4-207(4) is attached as Exhibit A. Planning Commission members will connect electronically. Public comments will be accepted virtually as described below.

To comment virtually, raise your hand on Zoom. Written comments submitted before or during the meeting will be entered into the public record, but not read aloud. For more information on participating virtually and to listen live, please go to [www.parkcity.org/public-meetings](http://www.parkcity.org/public-meetings).

Exhibit A: Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk.

The Board Chair has determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Utah Code Section 52-4-207(4) requires this determination and the facts upon which it is based, which include:

- Statewide COVID cases and hospitalizations remain high;
- Based on metrics established by the statewide COVID-9 Transmission Index, Summit County moved to the High-Risk designation on October 22, 2020; and
- Park City is a resort community continually hosting visitors from areas that may be experiencing rapid COVID-19 spread.

This determination is valid for 30 days and is set to expire on May 14, 2021.

Dated: April 14, 2021

### 1. ROLL CALL

Chair Phillips called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Commissioner Thimm was excused from the meeting. Commissioner Van Dine was not present but was expected to join the meeting later. Chair Phillips indicated that he would have to leave the meeting at 7:00 p.m. but potentially rejoin later. At that time, Vice-Chair Suesser will assume the Chair. New Commission Member, Bill Johnson, was welcomed.

### 2. MINUTES APPROVAL

- A. **Consider Approval of the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of April 21, 2021, and April 28, 2021.**

The minutes of April 21, 2021, were reviewed and corrected.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Suesser moved to APPROVE the Minutes of April 21 and April 28, 2021, as corrected. Commissioner Hall seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

### 3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

No hands were raised on Zoom and no eComments were submitted.

#### 4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Chair Phillips reported that previously the Commission discussed the appropriate time to bring up new items. He suggested that future discussions on Master Planned Developments (“MPD”) be a requirement for applicants to provide a digital file of the 3D model. It is useful for staff and allows the Commissioner to have their own perspectives.

#### 5. REGULAR AGENDA - DISCUSSION/PUBLIC HEARINGS/ POSSIBLE ACTION

A. **3 and 5 Victoria Circle – Chatham Crossing Lots 52 and 53 Plat Amendment – Request to Adjust the Interior Lot Line Common to Both Lots. PL 21-04750.**

Senior City Planner, Alexandra Ananth was joined by Surveyor Martina Nelson and the property owner Graham Baker. She presented the staff report and stated that the request is for a plat amendment for 3 and 5 Victoria Circle. The applicant is proposing to adjust an interior lot line. It was noted that the applicant owns Lots 52 and 53 and planted trees on Lot 52. They live on Lot 53 and Lot 52 is currently vacant. They would like the trees to be part of Lot 53 and, therefore, protected. Both lots will remain compliant with the minimum lot and side requirements. Staff found good cause for the plat amendment and recommended consideration by the City Council.

Commissioner Suesser asked if the trees are mature. Ms. Nelson stated that she would consider them fairly mature and described them as fairly substantial trees. It was noted that the trees were planted by the property owner. The tree sizes were discussed. The trunk size was measured but the drip line canopy gives a better idea of how mature a tree is. Mr. Baker reported that the trees were planted in 2006 or 2007. They are 30 feet high and six to eight feet in diameter. Two are fir trees and the others are deciduous. He confirmed that they are mature trees. No objections were expressed by the neighbors.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Hall moved to forward a positive recommendation for the City Council’s consideration on May 27, 2021, for the plat amendment for 3 and 5 Victoria Circle subject to the following:

Findings of Fact:

1. The properties are part of the Chatham Crossing Subdivision, recorded in 1981.
2. These two lots are under common ownership and the owner is proposing to move an interior lot line to preserve trees on existing Lot 52 as part of Lot 53.
3. Lot 53 is improved with a single-family residence.
4. Lot 52 is a vacant buildable lot.
5. The applicant submitted a Letter from the Chatham Crossing HOA stating that the HOA voted to approve the applicant's application.
6. Staff finds Good Cause for this Plat Amendment as both lots will remain compliant with the Minimum Required Lot Size, and consistent with the Chatham Crossing Subdivision lot sizes.
7. No non-conformities will be created, and no changes in density will result from the proposed Plat Amendment.
8. The Plat Amendment will allow for the preservation of 8 mature trees as part of Lot 53.
9. No Public Streets, Right-of-Way, or easement has been vacated or amended.

Conclusions of Law:

1. There is good cause for this Plat Amendment as both lots will remain compliant with the Minimum Required Lot Size, no non-conformities will be created, and no changes in density will result from the proposed Plat Amendment.
2. The Plat Amendment is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding Subdivisions.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed Plat Amendment.

4. Approval of the Plat Amendment, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the Plat Amendment for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the Plat.
2. The applicant will record the Plat Amendment at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year's time, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is submitted in writing and approved by the City Council.
3. A Plat Note shall indicate that all Conditions of Approval of the original Chatham Crossing Subdivision continue to apply.
4. A Plat Note shall indicate that the Plat is subject to Ordinance 2021-XX.

Commissioner Kenworthy seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

**B. 147 Grant Avenue – Plat Amendment – Request to Remove Remnant Lot Line. PL 21-04774.**

Planner Ananth presented the staff report and stated that the applicant is proposing to remove an interior lot line that was leftover from the original plat. Staff found good cause for the plat amendment as it allows the lot to remain compliant with the lot and site requirements. Staff recommended the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Hall moved to forward a positive recommendation for the City Council's consideration on May 27, 2021, for the 147 Grant Avenue plat amendment subject to the following:

Findings of Fact:

1. The property is in the HR2B District and consists of a 3,634 square foot vacant lot.
2. The applicant is removing remnant interior lot lines and creating a new lot to be known as Lot 1, 200 Grant Avenue, PC-587.
3. The Plat Amendment does not affect the lot boundaries or lot size of the Parcel, and the Parcel will continue to be compliant with the HR2B Lot and Site Requirements.
4. The Minimum Lot Area is 1,875 for a Single-Family Dwelling. The Lot Area is not sufficient for a Duplex Dwelling. Commercial Uses require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).
5. The Lot Size is compatible with surrounding lots.
6. The lot is in the Historic District and a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) will be required prior to building permit.
7. Staff finds Good Cause for this Plat Amendment as the Amendment removes remnant interior lot lines and will remain compliant with the Lot and Site Requirements.
8. No Public Streets, Right-of-Way, or easement is being vacated or amended.

Conclusions of Law:

1. There is good cause for this Plat Amendment as it removes remnant interior lot lines, does not affect the lot boundaries or lot size of the Parcel, and the Parcel will continue to be compliant with the HR2B Lot and Site Requirements.
2. The Plat Amendment is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding Subdivisions.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed Plat Amendment.

4. Approval of the Plat Amendment, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the amended plat for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the Plat.
2. The applicant will record the Plat Amendment at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year's time, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is submitted in writing and approved by the City Council.
3. Approval of an HDDR application is a condition precedent to the issuance of a building permit for construction on the lot.
4. Approval of a Steep Slope Administrative CUP is a condition precedent to the issuance of a building permit for any structure with a footprint of more than 200 square feet.
5. A Plat Note shall indicate the Street address of Lot 1 is 200 Grant Avenue.
6. A Plat Note shall indicate the lot is subject to a 10-foot-wide public snow storage easement for the frontage along Grant Avenue.
7. A Plat Note shall indicate the property is located within the soils ordinance boundary and any soil removed from the property during excavation is required to be properly disposed of at a site approved to accept contaminated soils.

Commissioner Kenworthy seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- C. **1115 and 1117 Lowell Avenue – Plat Amendment – The Applicant Proposes Terminating the Historic Residential – 1 Zone District. PL 20-04633.**

Senior City Planner, Rebecca Ward, presented the staff report and stated that the next two items are related. The applicant, Shana Smith, was present. The applicant was proposing to convert a two-unit condominium into a duplex use. The location of the Pinion Pines project was identified. The two units are accessed by a private road. It was reported that 1115 and 1117 Lowell Avenue were constructed in the 1980s. No additional changes were proposed to the exterior of the structure. The request is to create two separate lots to convert the limited common area to private. The proposal complies with the Historic Residential -1 zoning district requirements and there is good cause for the plat amendment. There is no public street right-of-way or easement that is vacated or amended, and the amendment will create two separate lots and transfer the limited common area to private ownership.

Staff recommended approval subject to the conditions of approval as required under the Land Management Code (“LMC”) and as set forth in the staff report.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

In response to a question raised, Planner Hall indicated that approval is dependent on the approval of the next agenda item. It was noted that the lot is relatively flat where the buildable area is located. If there were any changes proposed to the exterior it would have to go through the approval process. A duplex use is being proposed because the two units share a common wall. If one of the owners wished to expand, the Party Wall Agreement would address any changes to the shared wall. Planner Hall explained that the Land Management Code would regulate the building footprint based on each lot. The owner would be allowed to build according to Code but any construction that would impact the common wall would be subject to the Party Wall Agreement.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Suesser moved to forward a positive recommendation for the City Council’s consideration on May 27, 2021, for the 1115 and 1117 Lowell Avenue Plat Amendment subject to the following conditions:

Findings of Fact

1. The Pinion Pines Condominium Plat—a two-unit condominium constructed in the 1980s—was recorded with Summit County in 1985 (Recorder Entry No. 234744) for 1115 and 1117 Lowell Avenue.

2. The Applicant proposes terminating the two-unit Pinion Pines Condominium to create two Lots for a Duplex.
3. 1115 and 1117 Lowell Avenue are in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District.
4. The Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District requires a 3,750-square-foot Lot minimum for a Duplex. 1115 Lowell Avenue is 4,752 square feet; 1117 Lowell Avenue is 4,873 square feet.
5. The Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District requires a 25-foot Lot width. 1115 Lowell Avenue is 33.82 feet; 1117 Lowell Avenue is 34.93 feet.
6. The Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District establishes a maximum Building Footprint pursuant to this formula: Maximum Building Footprint = (Area/2) x 0.9A/1875.
7. The maximum Building Footprint for 1115 Lowell Avenue is 1,819 square feet; the Maximum Building Footprint for 1117 Lowell Avenue is 1,852 square feet.
8. The Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District requires Front and Rear Setbacks of 15 feet for Lots with depth over 100 feet.
9. The Lot depth for 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue is 140 feet. Front Setbacks for 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue are 45 feet; Rear Setbacks comply and any additions must meet at least a 15-foot Rear Setback.
10. The Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District requires a three-foot Side Setback for Lots with a width up to 37.5 feet. 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue both have stairs and patios that slightly encroach into the Side Setbacks. LMC Section 15-2.2- 3(J)(6) exempts patios and steps not more than 30” in height above Final Grade, not including any required handrails.
11. Side Setbacks between connected Structures are not required where Structures are designed with a common wall on a Property line and the Lots are burdened with a Party Wall Agreement.
12. 1115, 1117, 1155, 1157, 1175, 1177, 1195, and 1197 Lowell Avenue are accessed by Northstar Road, a private ingress, egress, and utilities easement.

#### Conclusions of Law

1. There is Good Cause for this Plat amendment because the transition from a two-unit condominium to a Duplex alters private restrictions for the properties but does not change the use of the Structure or the applicable land use regulations for the properties.
2. The Plat Amendment is consistent with Land Management Code § 15-7.1-3(B), § 15-7.1-6, and Chapters 15-2.2 and 15-7.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed Plat Amendment.
4. Approval of the Plat Amendment, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

#### Conditions of Approval

1. The City Planner, City Attorney, and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the Conditions of Approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant shall record the plat at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.
3. The maximum Building Footprint for 1115 Lowell Avenue is 1,819 square feet; the Maximum Building Footprint for 1117 Lowell Avenue is 1,852 square feet.
4. The Applicant shall ensure the Duplex complies with all applicable Building and Fire Code requirements and shall complete a party wall agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney and Chief Building Official to be recorded on the same date as the amended plat.
5. The plat shall retain the private ingress, egress, and utilities easement.

6. The plat shall be titled Pinion Pines Subdivision, formerly known as the Pinion Pines Condominiums.
7. The Applicant shall enter into a civil agreement to address ownership and maintenance responsibilities of both retaining walls that encroach over the property lines.

Commissioner Hall seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

**D. 1115 and 1117 Lowell Avenue – Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) – The Applicant Seeks a Conditional Use Permit Approval for a Duplex Use in the Historical Residential-1 Zoning District. PL 21-04819.**

Planner Ward presented the staff report and explained that the next item involves the Conditional Use Permit to convert the two-unit condominium units to a duplex. Staff recommended approval subject to the conditions set forth in the staff report.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The public hearing was closed.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Suesser moved to approve the Conditional Use Permit for 1115 and 1117 Lowell Avenue for a duplex use in the Historic District subject to the following conditions:

Findings of Fact

1. The Pinion Pines Condominium Plat—a two-unit condominium constructed in the 1980s—was recorded with Summit County in 1985 (Recorder Entry No. 234744) for 1115 and 1117 Lowell Avenue.
2. The Applicant proposes terminating the two-unit Pinion Pines Condominium to create two Lots for a Duplex.
3. 1115 and 1117 Lowell Avenue are in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District.

4. The Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District requires a 3,750-square-foot Lot minimum for a Duplex. 1115 Lowell Avenue is 4,752 square feet; 1117 Lowell Avenue is 4,873 square feet.
5. The Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District requires a 25-foot Lot width. 1115 Lowell Avenue is 33.82 feet; 1117 Lowell Avenue is 34.93 feet.
6. The Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District establishes a maximum Building Footprint pursuant to this formula: Maximum Building Footprint =  $(\text{Area}/2) \times 0.9A/1875$ .
7. The maximum Building Footprint for 1115 Lowell Avenue is 1,819 square feet; the Maximum Building Footprint for 1117 Lowell Avenue is 1,852 square feet.
8. The Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District requires Front and Rear Setbacks of 15 feet for Lots with depth over 100 feet.
9. The Lot depth for 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue is 140 feet. Front Setbacks for 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue are 45 feet; Rear Setbacks comply and any additions must meet at least a 15-foot Rear Setback.
10. The Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District requires a three-foot Side Setback for Lots with a width up to 37.5 feet. 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue both have stairs and patios that slightly encroach into the Side Setbacks. LMC Section 15-2.2- 3(J)(6) exempts patios and steps not more than 30" in height above Final Grade, not including any required handrails.
11. Side Setbacks between connected Structures are not required where Structures are designed with a common wall on a Property line and the Lots are burdened with a Party Wall Agreement.
12. 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue are accessed by Northstar Road, a private ingress, egress, and utilities easement.
13. There is no required mitigation for the size and location of the site. 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue were constructed in the 1980s and comply with underlying Historic Residential – 1 (HR – 1) Zoning District regulations (see Section I above). Any modifications to the Structures must comply with the HR-1 regulations.

14. There is no required mitigation for traffic capacity. 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue are accessed by Northstar Road, a private ingress, egress, and utilities easement. The amended plat must retain the private ingress and egress easement.
15. There is no required mitigation for utility capacity. 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue are accessed by Northstar Road, which serves as a utility easement. The amended plat must retain the utility easement.
16. There is no required mitigation for emergency vehicle access. 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue are accessed by Northstar Road, a private ingress, egress, and utilities easement. The amended plat must retain the private ingress and egress easement. No change to the access is proposed.
17. There is no required mitigation for off-street parking. Duplexes require two off-street parking spaces per unit. Double-car garages must be at least 20 feet wide and 20 feet deep. 1115 & 1117 Lowell both provide two off-street parking spaces per unit and each garage is at least 23 feet wide and 21 feet deep.
18. There is no required mitigation for vehicle and pedestrian circulation. No change to internal vehicle and pedestrian circulation is proposed. Any changes must comply with the LMC.
19. There is no required mitigation for fencing, screening, or landscaping. No changes are proposed; any changes must comply with the LMC.
20. There is no required mitigation for Building mass, bulk, and orientation; no change is proposed.
21. There is no required mitigation for usable open space; there are no open space requirements for the Duplex Use.
22. Signs are prohibited for residential uses.
23. There is no required mitigation for physical design and compatibility with surrounding structures. 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue comply with the HR-1 Zoning District regulations.

24. There is no required mitigation for noise, vibration, odors, steam, or other mechanical factors. The existing use is residential; the proposed use is residential.
25. There is no required mitigation for delivery and service vehicles, loading and unloading, screening of trash, and recycling pickup areas. No changes are proposed for the site.
26. There is no required mitigation for expected ownership. Limited common area will be converted to private area and each Duplex unit will be located on its own Lot.
27. 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue are not located in the Sensitive Lands Overlay or Soils Ordinance Boundary.
28. 1115 & 1117 Lowell Avenue are Non-Historic Structures in the Old Town Neighborhood, a residential use near the Park City Mountain Resort, and the residential use is consistent with the General Plan.

#### Conclusions of Law

1. The Application complies with the requirements of the Land Management Code.
2. The Use will be Compatible with surrounding Structures in Use, scale, mass, and circulation.
3. The effects of any differences in Use or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

#### Condition of Approval

1. Approval of this Duplex Conditional Use Permit is contingent upon approval and recordation of the Amended Pinion Pines Subdivision Plat with the Summit County Recorder's Office by May 27, 2022.
2. The maximum Building Footprint for 1115 Lowell Avenue is 1,819 square feet; the Maximum Building Footprint for 1117 Lowell Avenue is 1,852 square feet.

3. The Applicant shall ensure the Duplex complies with all applicable Building and Fire Code requirements and shall complete a Party Wall Agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney and Chief Building Official to be recorded on the same date as the amended plat.
4. Signs are prohibited for residential uses. Outdoor lighting must comply with LMC § 15-5-5-(J). All outdoor lighting must be 3,000 degrees Kelvin or less by December 31, 2024. Fully Shielded outdoor lighting is recommended.

Commissioner Hall seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- E. **1660 and 1700 Three Kings Drive – Payday Condominiums – Plat Amendment – The Applicant is Requesting to Amend the Existing Plat to Rectify Inconsistencies and Clarify Developable Private Residential Space for Condominium Owners.**

Senior City Planner, Brendan Conboy, presented the staff report and stated that the subject property is located next to the Park City Golf Course on Three Kings Drive. It is a 52-unit condominium configured primarily in tri-plexes with a few single units. The original plat was displayed. The front and side setbacks and the density do not comply with the current standards, which results in the use being non-conforming. The applicants would like to maintain the ability to increase the overall square footage but not the number of units. The majority of the structures do not meet the setback requirements, which makes them non-conforming. The applicant is proposing to amend the plat to clarify locations within the existing platted footprints of the condominium units where individuals can convert space that was otherwise common area or limited common area into private residential space consisting of internal two-story vaulted interior spaces, covered entryways into the units, second-story decks over kitchens, and flat sloped roof areas.

Planner Conboy remarked that the plat itself is daunting and different for each unit. The applicant provided an explanation of what the various categories represent. The applicant was directed to submit a complete plat amendment for all of the units to rectify the outstanding converted space that was not in the original footprint and make an equitable allocation of square footage to the unit owners that had not yet expanded. Staff supported the request as it does not increase the non-conformity. There is good cause for the plat amendment because it rectifies the non-conformities and helps clarify the process moving

forward for condominium owners in a transparent and predictable manner. It also avoids the need for piecemeal plat amendments.

With regard to height, Chair Phillips questioned whether to grant an exception for the entire project just because other people did it in the past. By allowing more additions at the top end of the buildings is not in keeping with the Code. They would essentially be making an exception for the complex to ignore the Code with regard to height. Planner Conboy reported that the height is limited to 28 feet but in the MPD there is flexibility to adjust the height. The applicant is proposing to allow additions that would be consistent with the heights that are already established. While it does not increase the non-conformity, one could argue that it does increase the non-conformity by increasing the bulk and scale.

Chair Phillips' primary concern was that it is already non-conforming and what is proposed could be considered an increase that non-conformity. He felt that keeping the rest of the zone at the height limit will preserve articulation. He estimated that the applicant could nearly double the volume. He would not object to continuing an existing roofline over existing floor space.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing.

*Eric Runions* reported that he works for PMA and they manage Payday. He stated that they worked very hard on the plat to specifically limit the third-story expansion that can occur. The area shown on the upper level was expanded for two units. The intent was to make sure that it was not being built over one of the triplex units that the room would not belong to and result in noise issues with the neighbor. They also considered how it will look from the parking lot and the street. With the approval, each unit would be limited in terms of what they could do. An Architect will draw the acceptable expansions and every owner will have to follow the guideline. The proposed additional pages on the plat amendment will limit the future convertible space to the areas defined. The intent was to level the playing field. Concern was expressed for future conflicts with additions that were done previously, many of which were not properly recorded. It was suggested that a condition be added that the HOA indemnifies the City. City Attorney, Mark Harrington, did not want to cross the regulatory approval with civil liability with respect to a past action. He was not sure it was needed at this level. The applicant's representative indicated that one has already been done on the third level of a single-unit building. Currently, it was estimated that every building is greater than 28 feet.

*Sherie Harding* expressed appreciation to the Commission for their adherence to the building height as identified in the Code. She hoped for consistency when addressing building height

at the Park City Mountain Resort (“PCMR”) base area development. She thanked them for their diligence.

Commissioner Suesser referenced a photo showing a roof angle that mimics what exists but allows for more room in the unit. The applicant, however, indicated that the rooflines are not part of the details of the proposed plat amendment and the rooflines will be designed by an Architect. It was suggested that the rooflines be included in the details. Chair Phillips suggested that staff be directed to align the photos with the exhibits. Commissioner Suesser recommended that the matter be continued and requested that the applicant bring back additional information about units that have already built additions, how many, and add specific details to the proposed plat amendments.

Commissioner Hall appreciated it being a joint application for the 51 units and streamlining the process. She was generally supportive of the enclosures, the building footprint, and enclosing the exterior spaces but was not found within the LMC justification for the building height exceptions. Planner Conboy explained that because there is no existing MPD approved, the applicant could be required to come in for CUP and MPD now. That would allow for the heights to be adjusted beyond the zone limitations.

Mr. Harrington explained that the interpretation was a non-expansion of the degree of non-compliance under the non-conforming section, which provides an alternate path. That determination was primarily based on the way prior building permits may have been administered in the past. Possible options were discussed. The intent was to find an equitable solution for all of the owners.

Commissioner Kenworthy agreed with the previous Commission comments and felt that they were leaning toward granting the majority of what they are asking for. If the applicant comes back with more specificity, especially for areas that exceed the zone height limit, it will give everyone time to look at the legal issues. He recognized that the applicant has put a great of thought into the plan but the Commission has to look at it from a different perspective. In areas where upper-level expansions are proposed, the Commission may need additional information to fully understand the impacts.

Timing issues were discussed. The applicant expected to need at least one month to prepare.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Suesser moved to continue the plat amendment for 1660 and 1700 Three Kings Drive to a date uncertain. Commissioner Hall seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

Commissioner VanDine joined the meeting. Chair Phillips was excused from the remainder of the meeting. Vice-Chair Suesser assumed the Chair.

**F. Park City Mountain Resort Base Parking Lots – MPD Modification Work Session – Replace Expired Exhibit D of the DA, the 1998 PCMR Base Area Master Plan Study Concept Master Plan, with a New Master Plan, known as the Park City Base Area Lot Redevelopment Master Plan Study. The Planning Commission Will Conduct a Work Session, with a Focus on the Applicant’s Requested Exceptions to Required Parking, in Accordance with the MPD, an Applicable LMC, and General Plan Criteria. PL 20-04475.**

Planner Ananth presented the staff report and stated that the Park City Base Area has submitted an application to amend the 1998 Development Agreement with a New Master Plan. The current discussion will focus on parking and an applicant request for exceptions to the off-street parking requirements. Planner Ananth noted that there would be a meeting the following week to discuss setbacks and building height, a meeting on June 16, 2021, to discuss transportation, circulation, and construction phasing as well as a July meeting to work through more detailed findings of facts and conditions of approval.

The applicant was seeking a 502 off-street parking stall exception with respect to the Land Management Code’s parking requirements for the uses. Planner Ananth asked that the Planning Commission focus on the following questions:

- Does the Planning Commission find the parking analysis, submitted by the applicant, supports the determination to decrease the required number of parking spaces?
- What degree of specificity is required now and what can be addressed through conditions of approval for the MPD or at future CUP applications?

Planner Ananth summarized the proposal. The applicant proposed to maintain the 1,200 existing day-skier parking stalls that are currently serving as surface parking. Those stalls will be in structures, primarily in Parcels B and E. There will be 760 day-skier parking stalls in Parcel B and 440 day-skier parking stalls in Parcel E. This will be in addition to the residential and commercial parking stalls that will be dispersed throughout the site. Planner Ananth explained that the applicant is intending to move to a pay-for-parking model for day-skier parking, which is a good way to help control vehicle traffic.

The Planning Commission will need to consider a condition of approval where the applicant and resort are responsible for managing parking through pricing. The AECOM recommendation is to manage parking to approximately 800 passenger vehicles to achieve both vehicle reduction goals and modal split goals. This management will be important for intersections and to address traffic congestion. Planner Ananth noted that the Planning Commission will also need to create conditions of approval that require meetings with the City to discuss parking demand, peak-day parking protocols, and pricing strategies. She added that a lot of details related to management still need to be worked out. Some can be discussed now and some will be part of an ongoing management process.

In addition to the day-skier parking, the applicant is proposing 521 parking stalls for both the residential and commercial uses. This is in contrast to the 1,000 parking stalls that are required based on the Land Management Code requirements for the various uses on the site. Planner Ananth reported that the applicant is proposing one stall per occupied hotel room, condominium unit, and affordable housing unit. Depending on the occupancy rate, this would be just over 400 parking stalls, where 550 stalls are required. That would leave approximately 100 stalls to satisfy the commercial parking requirement.

Vice-Chair Suesser noted that Hales Engineering provided a breakdown per building. She hoped that the chart would be included in the presentation. Planner Ananth reported that there were approximately 93,000 square feet of commercial space on the site as well as 250 hotel rooms. She believed there were 185 parking stalls earmarked for the hotel. The specifics could be explored further during the meeting.

Planner Ananth felt it was important to look at another ski resort that has similar uses on site. The Canyons is a fairly comparable ski resort. It reported a 95% capture ratio for commercial uses from the day-skiers already parked on site. Planner Ananth explained that since most of the commercial patrons were already captured, they did not need to be double-counted for parking. This was part of the reason the parking exception could be seen as allowable. She added that most commercial visitors who went specifically to dine or shop would not visit during peak ski hours. As a result, there would be day-skier parking available for commercial uses.

Since day-skier parking stalls will be available during commercial peak hours, City Staff and AECOM feel there should be sufficient parking for the proposed residential and commercial uses. Day-skier parking plus the commercial and residential parking would total 1,721 stalls. This would be a 30% reduction to the parking requirements. Planner Ananth reported that the Planning Commission will need to create a condition of approval to ensure that there are Shared Parking Agreements among all the uses. Additionally, it is imperative that valet

parking be a condition of approval for the hotel. Planner Ananth also stressed the importance of a condition that specifies that the Parking Management Plan must be an ongoing document and meetings must take place with the City at least twice per year to review how parking is being managed effectively.

City Staff and AECOM are no longer recommending a reduction in day-skier parking. However, they are still recommending that the applicant work to manage parking to approximately 800 vehicles, primarily through pricing and transit services. The applicant submitted a revised Parking Management Plan and Transportation Demand Management Plan but it was not included in the Meeting Materials Packet. It would be reviewed in the future.

Commissioner Kenworthy wondered if the recommendation was for there to be 1,200 day-skier parking stalls, however, when the Bus Rapid Transit system and other variables came into place, PEG Development would be expected to use only 800 of those spaces. Planner Ananth confirmed this and explained that typically, the more parking stalls there are, the more vehicles there will be. She felt that with increased transit service, the number could be reduced to 800 stalls. Commissioner Kenworthy asked what would be done with the additional parking spaces. Planner Ananth believed they could be repurposed for pick up and drops offs or employee parking. A team would be put together to meet with the resort to set targets and review parking demand.

City Staff and AECOM believed paid parking would increase the average vehicle occupancy rate significantly. Planner Ananth stated that this will help ensure that there is sufficient parking on most days. In addition to not recommending additional parking, City Staff and AECOM were not recommending the additional 600 stalls that the MPD requires due to traffic and congestion concerns. The City is committed to serving the resort with better and faster express buses so the parking demand will decrease.

Planner Ananth discussed employee parking. The applicant was proposing to use 200 stalls at Quinn's Junction Park and Ride Monday through Thursday, and 300 stalls at Richardson Flats Friday through Sunday. The applicant proposed that Park City Transit take the employees from these parking areas to the site. Planner Ananth expressed concerns that the Quinn's Junction Park and Ride is limited to 450 parking stalls. The applicant is proposing a large portion of those stalls for themselves and those stalls cannot be reserved under the Lease Agreements that are currently in place. The City thinks that a more realistic option for the applicant is to expand Richardson Flats to accommodate employee parking and be available for construction parking. This area could also be used to meet overflow parking demand as necessary.

Vice-Chair Suesser wondered if the Quinn's Junction Park and Ride was already constructed. Planner Ananth clarified that it was on target to be constructed this summer. By the time the applicant is looking for construction contractors or resort employees, the lot will be ready. Discussions were had about the school parking lot. Planner Ananth reported that the resort currently leases approximately 450 stalls from the high school on weekends and holidays. This was done on a year-to-year basis. Should that lease end, the parking would need to be relocated.

Planner Ananth overviewed potential issues to consider during the remainder of the Planning Commission Meeting. For instance, the 502 parking stall exception, when a Parking Management Plan and Transportation Demand Management Plan would be most appropriate, employee parking, and the potential expansion of the Richardson Flats parking area. She also discussed the potential for a taller garage level to accommodate bicycles secured on top of vehicles.

The applicant, Robert Schmidt from PEG Development hoped to answer any Commissioner questions. He believed parking was important to the success of the project. Too many stalls would not prioritize transit and would be wasteful. Too few parking stalls could be damaging as well. Mr. Schmidt commented that an appropriate balance needs to be achieved. He felt as though they had achieved that balance.

Mr. Schmidt reported that the Parking Management Plan and Transportation Demand Management Plan had been updated since the last time he met with the Planning Commission. He clarified the information presented about employee parking. Employee parking was proposed at the Quinn's Junction Park and Ride, Monday through Thursday. The employees would use the City transit system on those days. However, when employee parking takes place on peak days at Richardson Flats, it was proposed that the employees be shuttled via a private shuttle service. This service would be provided in conjunction with the resort and other participating owners.

The on-site parking plan was reviewed. Parcel B will provide 760 day-skier stalls and the remaining parking will serve the uses on Parcel B. There are three entrances into Parcel B with one off of Shadow Ridge on Parking Level 3, one off of Empire Avenue on Parking Level 2, and one off of Manor Way on Parking Level 1. Parcel C will include parking to support the hotel. Parking will be accessed off of Lowell Avenue and there will be no public parking.

Parcel E will have 440 stalls provided for the day-skiers with the remaining provided for condominium and ski club users. Access for day-skiers will be on Parking Level 2 and Parking Level 3. There will be a valley drop-off for the condominium and ski club users as well as parking access on Parking Level 1. Parcel D will have 95 stalls to support uses in Parcel D, such as retail, commercial, and condominium.

Mr. Schmidt explained that the latest iteration of the Transportation Demand Management Plan stated that all parking in the day-skier lots will include 15 minutes of free parking. Part of that was due to the functional aspect of the payment system. They wanted to make sure there were no gates required to access the lots. They will be monitored and payment will be done via pay-on-foot stations. 15 minutes should provide sufficient time for people to load and unload. Additionally, there will be 20 stalls dedicated in Parcel B for 30 minutes of free parking. These will be placed near the pedestrian exits.

The earlier discussion related to 1,200 parking stalls versus 800 parking stalls was mentioned. Mr. Schmidt noted that part of that has to do with functional capacity. In the Transportation Demand Management Plan, the tools outlined could be used to achieve a 20% vehicle reduction. He reported that Peter Williams from SE Group and Ryan Hales from Hales Engineering were present to answer technical questions.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked Mr. Williams to address an earlier question about whether other resorts had successfully managed to reduce the number of parking spaces as a result of increased transit use. Mr. Williams did not know of any, but that did not mean it was not possible. He commented that some places addressed increased parking needs through transit. Mr. Williams shared a slide presentation with the Planning Commission. The three main methods to access mountain resorts included:

- Adjacent lodging (the most efficient and effective way to get skiers onto the mountain on any given morning);
- Transit (trains, gondolas, buses, ride-shares, or drop-offs can get skiers onto the mountain. Transit tends to be a bit slower for skiers, and traffic can be an issue); and
- Parking (the least efficient way to get skiers onto the mountain, but the dominant way that it is done. A large percentage of visitors arrive by driving.)

Mr. Williams commented that when it comes to parking and driving, the most significant factor to consider is average vehicle occupancy. Average vehicle occupancy rates around the country currently average somewhere around 2.3 skiers per car. Many examples show

that it is possible to increase those rates by incentivizing carpooling. He shared techniques to incentivize carpooling, such as:

- Priority parking locations;
- Pricing adjustments; and
- Other resort incentives.

Mr. Williams explained that paid parking increases average vehicle occupancy. He shared the example of Solitude. After implementing paid parking, they were on track (prior to the COVID-19 pandemic) to see an increase of 0.5 in average vehicle occupancy.

Mr. Williams overviewed the technique used to calculate parking demand. The first step was to calculate the comfortable carrying capacity (“CCC”) of the resort. He explained that CCC is not a peak day limit but is a planning perimeter to create a balanced resort capacity. Every resort in the country exceeds its CCC on peak days and that is by design. Once the capacity has been determined, the skiers staying in adjacent lodging are subtracted as are the transit riders. The remaining skiers require parking. The average vehicle occupancy is applied to determine the number of parking spaces needed.

The existing conditions for Park City Mountain were shared. Mr. Williams overviewed a chart that included the total CCC for the Park City side of Park City Mountain, which was 12,570. The number of visitors accessing the site from the Town Lift and Silver Star Lifts as well as guests within walking distance and transit drop-offs were then subtracted from that number. The total number of skiers that will require parking is 4,486. With an average vehicle occupancy of 2.3, the total number of parking stalls required is 1,950. Since there are currently 1,603 parking stalls, there is a deficient of 347.

The upgrade plan for Park City Mountain was shared. Mr. Williams overviewed a chart that included the upgraded CCC, which was 13,440. That number includes all of the projects that Park City Mountain intends to do on that side of the mountain. The number of visitors accessing the site from the Town Lift and Silver Star Lifts as well as guests within walking distance and transit and drop-offs were then subtracted from that number. The total number of skiers that will require parking is 3,951. With an average vehicle occupancy of 2.7, the total number of parking stalls required is 1,463. Since there would be 1,589 proposed parking stalls, there would be a surplus of 126.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked about the average number of people on a bus. Mr. Williams noted that on peak days, the buses tend to be full during the key drop-off and pick-up times. Commissioner Kenworthy estimated that there would need to be 35 people per bus and 25 buses an hour with drop-offs approximately every two minutes. Planner Ananth believed the numbers on the chart were somewhat conservative because they did not show the modal split goals in the transit drop-off numbers. She expected more people to take transit and noted that transit service would be increased.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked for clarification related to the Town Lift upgrade. He wondered how there would be 500 more people riding the Town Lift if additional parking was not provided nearby. Mr. Schmidt explained that part of the Mountain Upgrade Plan included those improvements but it was not part of the application. The analysis was based on what future conditions will look like. Additional analysis could avoid factoring in those upgrades. However, it would only increase the excess parking number.

Commissioner Kenworthy commented that the resort often has a full parking lot and the high school is typically full on weekend powder days. He understood the math shared by Mr. Williams but wanted to apply it to real-life situations. For instance, the number of buses that will be needed. While Mr. Williams agreed that demand is increasing, that did not change the fact that there could not be more people at a resort than there was capacity for. There are only so many buses, parking spaces, and lodging units.

Mr. Schmidt commented that if the project does not happen, nothing will change. The same parking situation that occurs now will continue to occur in the future. The project could improve the overall situation. Commissioner Kenworthy wondered whether Mr. Schmidt agreed that parking could be reduced to 800 stalls. He explained that 1,200 parking stalls are needed short-term. He believed that transit improvements are coming and the 20% modal split would be achieved. Over time, the demand for parking will be reduced. He discussed the current parking area and noted that snow piles could reduce the amount of available parking. Providing covered and managed parking structures would be a practical improvement.

Commissioner Kenworthy believed that everyone wants to make transit work and reduce the number of vehicles. However, he expressed concerns about the math and the year-to-year lease with the high school. He was also concerned about where the additional buses for transit would come from. Commissioner Kenworthy noted that Richardson Flats has been a great drop-off spot for construction workers but did not believe it worked for transit. He asked for more specifics.

Discussions were had about traffic. Commissioner Kenworthy reported that the Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) study on SR-248 indicated that traffic will increase by 7% annually. Those numbers need to be addressed. He believed the project was something that everyone wants but he felt it was important to do it right.

Mr. Schmidt stated that they did not want to get the parking wrong. In terms of transit and transportation, PEG Development was told by City staff that the plan is to increase bus service from 25 buses per hour up to 35 to 39 buses per hour over a certain period of time. The transit center has been sized to accommodate that number of buses. He clarified that PEG Development has no control over UDOT or City processes, but they were able to provide the necessary infrastructure for transit at the resort. He posed the following questions to the Planning Commission:

- Do we stop this project because we can’t answer a few very detailed questions?
- Do we move forward and work together to answer those questions?

Mr. Schmidt believed the latter was the correct choice. The solutions proposed are functional, practical, and provide flexibility. He added that Richardson Flats and Quinn’s Junction may not be parking solutions for guests, but they are appropriate solutions for employees. He added that there would be 521 stalls to support development parking. Commissioner Kenworthy agreed that everyone needs to work together on the project. However, he still had concerns related to the proposed amount of parking.

Mr. Hales shared a parking analysis for the development use. He reported that Josh Gibbons was also present at the meeting and could answer additional questions. Mr. Hales explained the breakdown of the presentation:

- City requirements for parking;
- Parking demand data;
- Time-of-day demand data;
- Internal capture; and
- Unit occupancy.

The City requirements for parking were discussed. Mr. Hales explained that 2,223 parking stalls were required for the project, according to City Code requirements. That equals 1,023 required for the new project uses in addition to the 1,200 day-skier stalls. However, the

proposed number of parking stalls is 1,721. That number includes 1,200 day-skier parking stalls with the remaining 521 parking stalls for residential and commercial use.

Mr. Hales discussed how the numbers were arrived at. Hales Engineering collected overnight parking demand data at a nearby ski resort. Based on the data collected over four peak nights between 2017 and 2019, the overnight demand was an average of 0.68 stalls per occupied unit and an 85<sup>th</sup> percentile of 0.99 stalls per occupied unit. One stall per unit had been used within the Hales Engineering analysis of the project to remain close to the 0.99 stalls. Mr. Hales explained the reason for the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile.

Time-of-day parking demand was discussed. Mr. Hales reported that parking demands fluctuate throughout the day. For example, when day-skiers arrive, they usually come in the morning, remain fairly constant throughout the day, and then taper off at the end of the day. Mr. Hales explained that the data had been examined through the following two scenarios:

- 1,200 stalls for day-skiers are held constant; and
- Day-skier demand fluctuates in the morning and at night.

National data from The Institute of Transportation Engineers ("ITE") Parking Generation (5th Edition, 2019) manual was used for the scenarios. Mr. Hales overviewed the first scenario and shared a graph with the Planning Commission. He reported that if the 1,200 stalls for day-skiers held constant and the stalls do not fluctuate for Parcels B or E. There would be a 7% differentiation or 127 stalls. The second scenario was overviewed. Shared-use parking by the time of day would result in an 11% differentiation or 196 extra stalls. Mr. Hales concluded that sufficient parking was being proposed for the demand that would exist. He felt that the shared-use parking was appropriate for the site because there are uses that peak at different times. The parking can be managed to lower demand on average days with implemented Parking Management Plan strategies.

Vice-Chair Suesser asked about the parking required for Parcel C. Mr. Gibbons shared Appendix B from the Hales Engineering report. Parcel C showed a peak deficiency of approximately 48 stalls. However, at the same time of day on Parcel E, approximately 53 stalls were available. Since the parcels are close to one another, they can share stalls.

Vice-Chair Suesser pointed out that based on the spreadsheet, Parcel C has a parking requirement of 520 stalls and PEG Development is proposing 185. She felt that the disparity was too great and that the numbers need to be explained further. There were concerns that the lack of parking available for Parcel C would interfere with the parking allocated to the

public in Parcel E. Mr. Gibbons discussed the internal capture rate. He explained that similar resorts have an internal capture rate of 95%. Hales Engineering had been conservative with the numbers and assumed an 80% internal capture rate for Park City Mountain Resort. The large decrease in commercial parking needs had to do with the internal capture rate. Any deficiencies could be shared with the adjacent parcel.

Mr. Schmidt read the following information related to a sensitivity analysis from the Staff Report:

- AECOM performed a sensitivity analysis, which demonstrates that although Building C is over-parked for a few hours in the afternoon (which can be accommodated with valet parking), there is excess parking within the entire site overall, including during peak hours. AECOM estimates the site is close to 90% parked, which is functionally considered at capacity.

He added that valet parking, which the hotel will have, could accommodate for over parking. Mr. Schmidt also noted that many people arrived at the resort using services such as Uber and Lyft. Since the hotel charges for parking, many visitors prefer those types of services rather than driving or renting a vehicle. Mr. Schmidt reported that the reservation page for the hotel contained information about transit and how to arrive at the resort.

Commissioner Hall asked how the 95% internal capture rate was calculated. Mr. Hales explained that it was calculated based on data from other resorts. Commissioner Hall wondered about the resort size and occupancy compared to Park City Mountain Resort. Mr. Hales reported that some of that data was proprietary to the resorts. However, they spoke to Planner Ananth and she understood where the data came from. Commissioner Hall wanted to know if the data could be shared without revealing specific resort names. Mr. Hales noted that some anonymous data may be able to be shared. He would look into the request. Further discussions were had about capture rate data.

Commissioner Hall asked how many times the resort reached full capacity in the last few years. Mr. Williams explained that Commissioner Hall was referring to the utilization rate, which is based on the overall capacity on a daily basis. The utilization rate is largely dependent on the number of days the capacity number is reached. Commissioner Hall felt there were a lot more peak days or days where the resort reached capacity than the data suggested. Mr. Williams noted that the SE Group data did not make claims about how often the resort reached capacity. However, the resort could be hitting its capacity numbers every day and still be within the working capacity number. Commissioner Hall believed more information was needed.

Vice-Chair Suesser discussed the 1,200 day-skier parking stalls. She asked if there had been an analysis that 1,200 was the appropriate number. Mr. Williams reported that the analysis showed that the number of day-skier parking stalls was appropriate. He referenced his earlier presentation and the planning parameters.

Commissioner Van Dine made note of the number of people currently visiting the resort. She did not believe that 1,200 day-skier parking stalls were enough. Mr. Williams explained that there is only so much capacity that the mountains can support. Commissioner Hall commented that just because the resort says it can only fit a certain number of skiers does not mean there is not an excess of that on a regular basis. She felt that many people in the community would see a drastic reduction in parking as undesirable. Mr. Williams clarified that there was no reduction in skier parking.

Vice-Chair Suesser noted that PEG Development is asking for a 502 parking stall exception. Mr. Schmidt reported that if only the commercial areas, hotel, and condominium are being built, 1,000 parking stalls would be needed according to the Land Management Code. However, since there are shared uses on the site, only 521 parking stalls are needed to support those uses. There is no reduction to the 1,200 day-skier stalls. Mr. Schmidt explained that the proposed changes would improve the current situation.

Commissioner Hall struggled with the idea of reducing the amount of parking required by the Land Management Code. Mr. Schmidt noted that there was no way to achieve a 20% mode split if additional parking stalls were added to the site. Planner Ananth added that the ski areas do not have the capacity for additional vehicles and neither do the roadways. Adding more parking stalls will not help. She stressed the importance of increasing average vehicle occupancy and incentivizing carpooling.

The Staff Report mentioned that the Transportation Demand Management Plan provides limited information on how day-skiers will be incentivized to carpool or take transit. Vice-Chair Suesser asked PEG Development to address the issue. Mr. Schmidt outlined several potential strategies in the Transportation Management Plan, such as:

- Paid Parking: This has been shown to be an effective tool to increase the average vehicle occupancy;
- Communication: Parking stalls will be monitored within the structure and the number of available parking stalls will be shared. For instance, through increased signage and parking apps. There may be an opportunity to purchase parking in advance;

- Preferred Parking for Higher Occupancy Vehicles: There is the possibility of preferred parking spots or price reductions for those that carpool, especially on high-demand days. There is also the possibility that there may be other incentives offered by the businesses at the base;
- Public Lockers at the Base: Lockers would be available to people riding the bus;
- Annual Meetings: These meetings would take place to identify what is and is not working and to make necessary adjustments to the Parking Management Plan.

Kristin Williams from PEG Development shared a brief presentation with the Planning Commission to summarize the information shared. Ms. Williams reported that they were asked to reduce the number of cars accessing the site by 20%. However, a parking reduction of nearly 40% was proposed. This would require a change in behavior, which is difficult, but she believed it could be achieved. Ms. Williams noted that parking is just one component of the project, however, it is important to PEG Development, the City, and the community. Ms. Williams discussed the need to take a transit-first approach.

Ms. Williams explained that the project comes with a 150,000 square foot density reduction. She also made note of the housing program and reviewed the proposed number of parking stalls. There were approximately 200 off-site parking stalls proposed for employee use. Ms. Williams discussed tweaks to the pedestrian and transit center. There would be ongoing discussions about sidewalks and crosswalks as well as bicycle racks, electric bicycle stations, and increased bus space. She reported that further transit discussions would take place in June.

Vice-Chair Suesser reminded Commissioners of the questions posed by Planner Ananth earlier in the Planning Commission Meeting:

- Does the Planning Commission find the parking analysis, submitted by the applicant, supports the determination to decrease the required number of parking spaces?
- What degree of specificity is required now and what can be addressed through conditions of approval for the MPD or at future CUP applications?

Vice-Chair Suesser opened the public hearing.

*Nancy* agreed with several of the Commissioners. She felt it was important that everyone work together to make sure that the project is a success. However, she wanted to understand the difference between the calculations and the reality of the parking issues. The calculations from the CCC deducted people that came to the resort via Lyft, walking, and so on. She wondered how those estimated numbers came to be and also asked about the deficit parking on Parcel C as well as the potential rollover to Parcel E. The spots that would roll over onto Parcel E were coming from either hotel or condominium guests. Those guests would not leave in the morning, which would create a deficit for the day-skiers.

Additionally, at the April 26, 2021, Planning Commission Meeting, several concerns were raised. Many of them were addressed but some were still outstanding:

- The Planning Department recommends shifting more of the parking on Parcel B to below grade in order to reduce the apparent mass and height of the structures; and
- The Planning Department recommends a more equitable distribution of parking throughout the parcels. This may ease circulation and congestion throughout the site, particularly in front of the transit stop. The Planning Department recommends exploring if some density, as well as day-skier parking, could be shifted away from Parcel B and potentially relocated to Parcel D.

Concerns were expressed that the increased parking in Parcel B will cause visitors to drive to the furthest part of the resort to park. She felt there were a lot of unanswered questions and unaddressed concerns. As such, she hoped the Commissioners would take their time and get the necessary answers before taking a vote.

*Deborah Hickey* disagreed with the facts and figures presented. She had seen the resort reach capacity every day, even with limited ski passes. Ms. Hickey did not believe the proposed 1,200 day-skier parking stalls were enough. Reducing parking spots for the public would be damaging and would not make it more attractive for visitors. She noted that it was uncomfortable for people to unload all of their ski equipment on public transportation and suggested that an overhaul of the entire transportation situation was needed. It would have to be a user-friendly experience, otherwise, visitors will not come to Park City. Ms. Hickey encouraged new transportation ideas.

*Reid* expressed appreciation for conversations he had with representatives from PEG Development. However, he noted that PEG Development is not in the position to make certain commitments concerning parking policies. That would remain with the firm that will

manage the parking, which he assumed would be Vail Resorts. He felt it was important for Vail Resorts to make reasonable parking policy commitments in order to assure residents and visitors that they will continue to have reasonable access to mountain trails and the trailhead.

He also discussed independently owned businesses at the resort. Parking regulations could be damaging to those businesses. He felt there needed to be further discussions about the parking rates and policies during the non-winter periods. Parking during the construction period was also mentioned. It was noted that some of the businesses opposite Parcel B could be negatively impacted during the construction period. There should be discussions to provide parking during the construction period, otherwise, businesses that depend on summer use will be negatively impacted. He also wondered whether the data used for the projections was current. Additionally, he felt that mass transit needs to be convenient.

*Steven McComb* identified himself as the owner of the Baja Cantina. He appreciated all of the graphs and spreadsheets but had a difficult time understanding how a project could add 650,000 square feet and not include significant amounts of parking. He believed that mass transit and shared parking would be essential. He appreciated the previous comments related to parking during the construction period.

*Marsh* believed that discussions related to parking stall reductions were premature. Many of the outstanding transit issues would dictate how many parking stalls would be needed. She commented that there were also major issues with respect to the transit center design. It would not fit into the limited space allocated and may require that an entire floor of the Building B parking garage be reduced. Ms. Marsh felt that the City needed to put transit solutions in place first. Those solutions would then dictate the parking and building designs.

Ms. Marsh did not believe that the Commissioners could agree to any parking reductions based on the information provided by the developer. She discussed the staff question regarding what needs to be provided and when. She referenced Section 15.6 5E of the Land Management Code, which states that the Planning Commission can only agree to parking reductions if the developer provides a parking analysis at the time of the Master Plan Development submittal. It must also meet several requirements. Ms. Marsh did not believe the Parking Master Plan or Transportation Demand Management Plan meets those requirements. She discussed the differences between Park City Mountain Resort and the Canyons Resort.

*Ed* agreed that transit needs to be the main focus and that the average vehicle occupancy needs to be increased with incentives. He did not believe the analysis seen during the

Planning Commission Meeting was based on reality. He asked what would happen if the data considered the increasing number of skiers over a longer period of time. For instance, 10 years, 20 years, 30 years, and so on. Additionally, he felt that since Vail Resorts is a big company, they would want to continue to increase the number of skiers. As a result, he did not see the reported numbers as accurate.

*Deb Renfrow* wondered if Vail Resorts had agreed to come to the table. She felt that should be determined before moving forward. Ms. Renfrow explained that she attended the open house at the library and found that the SR-224 expansion with dedicated bus lanes was still 5 to 10 years out. She expressed concerns for bicyclists and suggested that a higher clearance for parking could be added to Parcel B. Ms. Renfrow asked how PEG Development could guarantee excess parking when there is not enough parking currently. She estimated that there were 12 days in the last ski season where the parking lots were not completely full by 9:00 a.m.

Ms. Renfrow also addressed comments made by Mr. Schmidt that the current situation will not improve without the project. However, she noted that the City is already planning for the SR-224 expansion, the SR-248 expansion, and a more robust transit program. Ms. Renfrow read from Page 86 of the General Plan. She did not believe the proposal matches the desires outlined in the General Plan document.

*Lisa Paul* agreed with the concerns raised by the Commission and members of the public. She believed the reality of the parking situation is drastically different from the numbers presented. Ms. Paul explained that the parking lots are always full and traffic continues to be an issue. She believed the transit issues and traffic issues need to be addressed first. If there are no dedicated bus lanes to get into the resort, it will not matter how many extra buses are available. Ms. Paul stated that it would be difficult to get people to use public transportation unless it benefits them. She wondered how issues within the nearby neighborhoods will be resolved. While she appreciated that everyone was trying to work together, it was important for Vail Resorts to also come to the table.

*Tana Toly* commented that parking lots are not just full on peak days. She reviewed text messages and found that in February 2021 alone, on 23 out of 28 days, the resort parking lot was full by 10:00 a.m. On 20 of those 23 days, the resort was full by 9:40 a.m. She felt that this kind of data should be available for review. Ms. Toly discussed the number of people on each bus and wondered whether those estimates factored in ski equipment. She also suggested that there be a study of the out-of-state license plates in the parking lot as well as the number of rental car license plates. This would benefit the education piece of

the proposal. Ms. Toly made note of the conditions on Eighth Street. Adding more people to the Town Lift would create more problems.

*Sherie Harding* believed that the parking should be underground. She asked the Planning Commission to consider the 1998 Development Agreement. Ms. Harding was concerned that the parking lots will be above grade.

There were no further public comments. The public hearing was closed.

Vice-Chair Suesser explained that the Commissioners could reserve their comments until the next Planning Commission Meeting. Commissioner Kenworthy suggested that per the guidance of the General Plan, that AECOM obtain a study that lays out the ingress and egress options on east-west connections. He discussed issues on Eighth Street. Vice-Chair Suesser noted that 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> Streets exit from the resort and may need to be factored into the circulation plans.

Commissioner Hall suggested that the next Planning Commission Meeting start earlier. It was noted that the next Planning Commission Meeting was dedicated to the PEG Development proposal and it would commence at 5:30 p.m.

**6. ADJOURN**

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 10:24 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: \_\_\_\_\_

PENDING APPROVAL