## Planning Commission Staff Report



Application #s:PL-15-02983Subject:One Empire PassAuthor:Kirsten Whetstone, AICP, Sr. PlannerDate:January 13, 2016Type of Item:Administrative - Conditional Use Permit

## Summary Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing, consider public input, and discuss the Conditional Use Permit for One Empire Pass (Building 5) of the Village at Empire Pass MPD. Staff has prepared findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval for the Commission's consideration.

## **Description**

Applicant:	Guardsman Lodge, LLC, represented by Bill Fiveash, managing partner
Location:	8910 Empire Club Drive- Pod A, Lot 15 Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision (Building 5)
Zoning:	Residential Development (RD) District as part of the Flagstaff Annexation and Master Planned Development (MPD)
Adjacent Land Uses:	Deer Valley Resort, condominiums, townhouses, and vacant development parcels of the Village at Empire Pass Pod A

## **Background**

On June 24, 1999, Council adopted Ordinance 99-30 and Resolution 20-99 approving the annexation and development agreement for the 1,655 acre Flagstaff Mountain area. Resolution 20-99 granted the equivalent of a "large-scale" master planned development (MPD) and set forth the types and locations of land use; maximum densities; timing of development; development approval process; as well as development conditions and amenities for each parcel. The Flagstaff Development Agreement was amended on March 2, 2007 (Exhibit H).

On July 28, 2004, the Planning Commission approved a MPD for the Village at Empire Pass (Pods A and B1), known as the Village Master Planned Development (VMPD) amended to include Pod B2 (Montage) (Exhibit F). As part of the 2004 Commission review of the VMPD, volumetric diagrams for the buildings within the VMPD Pod A were approved. A height exception was granted for Building 5 per these volumetric diagrams (Exhibit F).

Six buildings have been built, namely Shooting Star, Silver Strike, Flagstaff Lodge (was Snowberry Lodge), Arrowleaf A and Arrowleaf B, and Grand Lodge. Additionally, Larkspur East and Larkspur West and Ironwood Townhouses (attached homes) have been constructed. Paintbrush, Belles, and Nakoma PUD style homes, as well as 6 Bannerwoodsandade Northside single family homes have been platted and are Page 287 of 406 constructed. Four of the large lodge style buildings remain to be constructed, including the proposed One Empire Pass building. There are also approximately 24 attached homes remaining to be approved and constructed as part of the Village MPD (Exhibits I and J).

The VMPD was the first step in the development process for Pod A. The purpose of the VMPD was to establish unit mix and density for the Mountain Village, as well as addressing overall project infrastructure throughout the Annexation Area. The VMPD established building volumes, density, and location. The sale of this site by owner of the VMPD allows up to 65,537 sf of residential floor area on this Lot. The total residential floor area, excluding the affordable and ADA units, is 64,374 sf (32.2 UE).

The subsequent Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) required by the VMPD and subdivision plat, for each multi-family parcel and/or building are intended to provide final architectural review by the Park City Planning Department Staff and Planning Commission and to demonstrate compliance with the Village MPD and Large Scale MPD (LSMPD) documented in Flagstaff Annexation and Development Agreement (Exhibit H).

The Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision plat was approved by Council in 2005 and recorded at Summit County on August 12, 2005. This subdivision platted Lots 12-18 of the VMPD. The One Empire Pass CUP is proposed to be located on Lot 15 of the Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision. Lot 15 consists of 50,999 square feet of lot area. The subdivision notes require compliance with RD District zone setbacks, approval of a CUP for each building prior to issuance of a building permit, a declaration of condominium and a record of survey prior to individual sale of units, requires membership of the owner in the Empire Pass Master HOA, identifies Empire Club Drive as a private street, plats a 20 foot snow storage easement along the street frontages, requires water efficient landscape, and includes other utility and maintenance provisions.

On October 26, 2015, the Planning Department received an application for a CUP for a 27 unit residential building to be located on Lot 15 of the Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision (Exhibits A-E). The building is identified as Building 5 on the Village at Empire Pass MPD. The application was deemed complete on October 30, 2015. An application for a condominium plat was submitted on November 13, 2015 for concurrent review.

At the Planning Commission work session on December 9, 2015, the applicant presented an over view of the project and reviewed the site plan, building plans, and volumetric. Approved volumetric and building height diagrams are attached as Exhibit F.

## <u>Purpose</u>

The purpose of the Residential Development (RD) Zoning District is to:

(A) allow a variety of Residential Uses that are Compatible with the City's Development objectives, design standards, and growth capabilities,

(B) encourage the clustering of residential units to preserve natural Open Space, minimize Site disturbance and impacts of Development, and minimize the cost of municipal services,

(C) allow commercial and recreational activities that are in harmony with residential neighborhoods,

(D) minimize impacts of the automobile on architectural design,

(E) promote pedestrian connections within Developments and between adjacent Areas; and

(F) provide opportunities for variation in architectural design and housing types.

## Land Management Code (LMC) and Village MPD Analysis

The proposal complies with lot and site requirements of the RD Zoning District as described below.

	RD Zoning District and/or Village at Empire Pass MPD		
Lot Size	No minimum lot size. Lot is approximately 1.17 acres (50,999 square feet)		
Building Footprint- Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	Density is per the Flagstaff Annexation and Development Agreement and Village and Empire Pass MPD. Building 5 site was sold with up to 65,537 net residential square feet (32.8 UE). The proposed CUP is for 27 units (64,374 sf, utilizing 32.2 unit equivalents (UE). Density is based on 1 UE is equivalent to 2,000 sf of residential floor area. The Flagstaff annexation and Development Agreement tracks both UEs (each 2,000 sf) as well as total number of units. The gross building is 113,293 sf, including the parking garage, mechanical, circulation, common areas, storage, and other areas that do not use UE.		
Front yard setbacks	25 feet to front facing garage, 20 feet to building. Minimum of 25 foot front setbacks are proposed.		
Rear yard setbacks	15 feet. Minimum of 15 foot rear setbacks are proposed.		
Side yard setbacks	12 feet. Minimum of 12 foot side setbacks are proposed.		

Building Height	Per Village MPD Volumetric and Height Exception Diagrams (Exhibit F)
	For Building 5, 20% of the building was permitted to reach 80' above existing grade, 55% of the building to reach 92' above existing grade, and 25% of the building to reach 74' above existing grade. The volumetric diagram allows Building 5 to be four to six stories.
Parking	The Transit and Parking Management Plan requires a 25% reduction in parking from what would be normally required by the LMC. Based on unit sizes, fifty-five (55) spaces would be required for the 27 units based and one ADA unit. The 25% reduction is 42 spaces. The underground parking structure will have 38 spaces and 4-6 surface spaces will be provided near the front drop-off area.
Architectural Design	All construction is subject to Village at Empire Pass Design Review Board approval and LMC Chapter 15-5 Architectural Design Guidelines with final review conducted at the time of the Building Permit. The building complies with the Village MPD volumetric, including articulation and height exceptions.
Residential Units	27 units ranging in size from 1,140 sf to 3,164 sf, one 900 sf affordable housing unit, and one 944 sf ADA unit.
Commercial space	No commercial space is proposed.
Support space	Common amenity areas are provided for the unit owners, including storage areas, locker rooms, fitness area, lounge and lobby areas, children's room, and small business center areas.

Density Summary	The Mountain Village (Pods A, B1 and B2) was approved for a maximum of 785 UE of multi-family (550 multifamily units) and 16 single family units. A maximum of 60 PUD style units (i.e. Belles, Paintbrush, and Nakoma) were approved as part of the overall multi-family units.
	To date 352 multi-family units (558.3 UE) (of which 52 are PUD style units) and 16 single family units have been platted and/or built within the Mountain Village.
	Constructed lodge style buildings include Shooting Star, Silver Strike, Flagstaff, Arrowleaf A and B, and Grand Lodge. Still to be approved are Tower Residences (Building 1), Building 3, Building 4, and subject property One Empire Pass, as Building 5.
	There is sufficient remaining density in the MPD (226.7 UE), or 198 units, to accommodate the density of Building 5 (32.19 UE) as 27 units in a lodge style building. (see Exhibit J)

## Analysis of Conditional Use Criteria

Conditional Uses are subject to review according to the following criteria set forth in the LMC 15-1-10(E). Staff's analysis is in *italics.* 

## (1) Size and location of the Site;

One Empire Pass consists of a single multi-story building with 27 residential units ranging in size from 1,140 sf to 3,164 sf, one 900 sf affordable housing unit, and one 944 sf ADA unit. It is located north of the Silver Strike Lodge on Lot 15 of the Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision. The lot consists of approximately1.17 acres (50,999 square feet). Excluding the affordable and ADA units, the total residential floor area is 64,374 sf, utilizing 32.19 unit equivalents (UE). The Village MPD identified a pool of 785 residential Unit Equivalents for the Mountain Village (Pods A, B1 and B2) for a maximum total of 550 units. A total of 65,537 sf of residential floor area (32.8 UE) was purchased by this applicant from the MPD (owner).

The site slopes up from the street and the design proposes a single level underground parking structure with up to six stories of residential units above. The garage entrance is at grade with the street and built into the slope of the lot so that the back of the garage and first story is underground. The building pad is relatively level as it was graded and used during construction of surrounding buildings.

The building plan complies with setbacks, height, density, and parking. The building size and location are appropriate for the site and comply with parameters of the MPD. **No unmitigated impacts.** 

(2) Traffic considerations including capacity of the existing Streets in the Area;

The site will be served by Empire Club Drive, a private road that connects to Marsac Avenue, a public Right-of-Way. A traffic management plan was approved as part of the Technical Reports for the Flagstaff Annexation and Development Agreement to reduce overall traffic generated from the development. A Construction Mitigation Plan is required at the time of Building Permit issuance in compliance with the Flagstaff Development Agreement that reiterates that downhill truck traffic will use Royal Street, unless use of Marsac Avenue is approved by the City Engineer and Chief Building Official. The Construction Mitigation Plan shall also address where excavated materials will be hauled if they are not used on this site. The Development Agreement requires excavated materials to remain within the Annexation Area. **No unmitigated impacts.** 

## (3) Utility capacity;

A storm water plan is being reviewed by the City Engineer (Exhibit G). A final approved storm water plan, as well as a utility and grading plan, is required prior to issuance of a building permit. Adequate sewer, electric, gas, and phone service is available. **No unmitigated impacts.** 

## (4) Emergency vehicle Access;

Primary emergency access is from Marsac Avenue and Empire Club Drive that winds through the Village area with two access points onto Marsac Avenue. **No unmitigated impacts.** 

## (5) Location and amount of off-Street parking;

The Transit and Parking Management Plan requires a 25% reduction in parking from what would be normally required by the LMC. Fifty-five (55) spaces would be required for the 27 units and one ADA unit. The 25% reduction is rounded to 42 spaces. The underground parking structure will have 38 spaces and 4-6 surface spaces will be provided near the front drop-off area. **No unmitigated impacts.** 

## (6) Internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation system;

Access to One Empire is from Empire Club Drive, a private street. A drop-off area is located in the front of the building and a bus stop is located nearby on Marsac Avenue. A pedestrian path system is proposed consistent with the Village Master Plan of Trails. No unmitigated impacts.

(7) <u>Fencing, Screening, and landscaping to separate the Use from adjoining Uses;</u> A landscape plan that provides a buffer between buildings to the greatest extent possible is required as a condition precedent to Building Permit. Landscaping and irrigation will be water efficient, utilizing drought tolerant plantings, limited turf area, and drip irrigation. **No unmitigated impacts.**  (8) <u>Building mass, bulk, and orientation, and the location of Buildings on the Site;</u> including orientation to Buildings on adjoining Lots;

This building is one of ten lodge buildings clustered within Pod A. One Empire Pass has four to six floors of residential units with a single level parking structure under the building. Gross building area, including parking and all common areas is 113,293 square feet. Twenty-seven (27) units are proposed with a total of 64,374 square feet, not including the 900 square foot deed restricted affordable housing unit and the 944 square foot ADA unit. All zone required setbacks will be maintained. To the south, there are five existing buildings of a similar size, height, and volumetric, with four still to be constructed, for a total of ten similar lodge style buildings within the VMPD. The mass of the building steps across the lot and is well articulated both horizontally and vertically. **No unmitigated impacts.** 

## (9) Usable Open Space;

Both passive and active Open Space is provided in excess of 88% within the annexation boundary. The individual lots were not required to provide open space. The proposal includes useable open space plaza areas in the front, as well as adjacent to the ski run/lift area. **No unmitigated impacts.** 

## (10) Signs and lighting;

Signs and lighting must be in conformance with the Park City codes and the Flagstaff Mountain Resort Design Guidelines. Signs require a separate sign permit. Street lights must be approved by the City Engineer and will be privately maintained. **No unmitigated impacts.** 

## (11) <u>Physical design and Compatibility with surrounding Structures in mass, scale, style,</u> <u>design, and architectural detailing;</u>

In the immediate area, there are four existing similarly sized multi-story residential condominium buildings (Silver Strike, Flagstaff (aka Snowberry), Shooting Star, and Talisker Tower Club), as well as the two story Larkspur town homes and Paintbrush PUD style homes (single-family detached homes). The master developer is coordinating design elements for all phases of the project and all developments require approval by the Flagstaff Architectural Design Review Board. Staff has reviewed the proposed building for compliance with the Volumetric Diagram and height exceptions and finds that the building complies. The building is 4 to 6 stories and is lower in height by 8' to 15' from the allowed height exceptions. The building also complies with required horizontal and vertical building articulation. **No unmitigated impacts.** 

(12) <u>Noise, vibration, odors, steam, or other mechanical factors that might affect people</u> <u>and Property Off-Site</u>; *All uses are inside the residential building and there are no expected impacts on people or Property Off-Site. Staff recommends condition of approval related to the location of dry facilities on the property to ensure that the location of transformers and other utility infrastructure on the property is shown and can be adequately screened. Showing dry utilities on the final plans allows verification from*  utility companies that the location shown on the plans is viable for their installation. Staff recommends conditions of approval related to screening of mechanical equipment. No unmitigated impacts.

## (13) <u>Control of delivery and service vehicles, loading and unloading zones, and</u> <u>Screening of trash pickup Areas;</u>

Service and delivery will be minimal as there is no commercial or support commercial component in the building. It is anticipated that laundry/maid service will be needed on a weekly basis throughout the Village. Trash pickup will be in the parking garage. **No unmitigated impacts.** 

(14) <u>Expected Ownership and management of the project as primary residences</u>, <u>Condominiums, time interval Ownership, Nightly Rental, or commercial tenancies, how</u> <u>the form of Ownership affects taxing entities</u>;

The project will be platted as a condominium. Nightly rental is a permitted use within the RD zoning district. These units will primarily be second homes and it is unlikely that many will be full-time residences, although this possibility is not precluded. **No unmitigated impacts.** 

(15) <u>Within and adjoining the Site, impacts on Environmentally Sensitive Lands, Slope</u> retention, and appropriateness of the proposed Structure to the topography of the Site. There are no Environmentally Sensitive Lands within or adjoining the site. The building, as with most of the Village, is located on the flatter slopes within the Pod. The site is currently vacant with little significant vegetation as it was used during construction of the surrounding buildings, ski lift, and ski run. **No unmitigated impacts**.

## **Department Review**

This project has gone through an interdepartmental review. Staff is working with the applicant to address storm water issues. No further issues were brought up at that time.

## <u>Notice</u>

The property was posted and notices were mailed to property owners within 300 feet on December 23, 2015. A legal notice was published in the Park Record on December 26, 2015. No public input has been received at the time of this report.

## **Alternatives**

- 1. The Planning Commission may approve the Conditional Use Permit for One Empire Pass as conditioned or amended, or
- 2. The Planning Commission may deny the Conditional Use Permit for One Empire Pass and direct staff to make Findings for this decision, or
- 3. The Planning Commission may continue the discussion on the Conditional Use Permit for One Empire Pass.

## Significant Impacts

There are no significant fiscal or environmental impacts from this application that have not been mitigated with the Flagstaff Agreement and Master Planned Development conditions.

## **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing, consider public input, and discuss the Conditional Use Permit for One Empire Pass (Building 5) of the Village at Empire Pass MPD. Staff has prepared findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval for the Commission's consideration:

## Findings of Fact:

- 1. The One Empire Pass Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is located in the RD-MPD zoning district, within Pod A of the Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development.
- 2. The property is subject to the Flagstaff Mountain Annexation and Development Agreement approved by City Council per Resolution No. 99-30 on June 24, 1999 and amended on March 2, 2007.
- 3. The Development Agreement is the equivalent of a Large-Scale Master Plan. The Development Agreement sets forth maximum project densities, location of densities, and developer-offered amenities for the annexation area.
- 4. On July 28, 2004, the Planning Commission approved a Master Planned Development for the Village at Empire Pass (Village MPD) (Pods A and B1) within the Flagstaff Mountain Annexation and Development area. The MPD (known as Mountain Village) was amended to include Pod B2 (Montage). The Mountain Village (Pods A, B1 and B2) was approved for a maximum of 785 UE of multi-family (550 multifamily units) and 16 single family units. A maximum of 60 PUD style units (i.e. Belles, Paintbrush, and Nakoma) were approved as part of the overall multi-family units. To date 352 multi-family units (558.3 UE) (of which 52 are PUD style units) and 16 single family units have been platted and/or built.
- 5. Constructed lodge style buildings include Shooting Star, Silver Strike, Flagstaff, Arrowleaf A and B, and Grand Lodge. Still to be approved are Tower Residences (Building 1), Building 3, Building 4, and subject property One Empire Pass, as Building 5. There is sufficient remaining density (226.7 UE), or 198 units, to accommodate the density of Building 5 (32.19 UE) as 27 units in a lodge style building.
- 6. Approximately 368 certificates of occupancy for the entire Flagstaff Annexation and Development area (Pods A, B1, B2, and D) have been issued. According to the Annexation and Development Agreement, the affordable housing obligations come due for each 150 certificates of occupancy. The next housing obligation trigger point is 450 certificates of occupancy. The 27 certificates of occupancy for One Empire Pass would bring the total to 395 certificates of occupancy.

- 7. One affordable AUE is proposed as part of the One Empire Pass condominium plat, as part of the sale agreement for the 32.8 UEs the applicant purchased from the owner.
- 8. On October 26, 2015, the Planning Department received an application for a Conditional Use Permit for a twenty seven unit residential building to be located on Lot 15 of the Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision.
- 9. The application was deemed complete on October 30, 2015.
- 10. Access to the property is from Empire Club Drive, a private street, via Marsac Avenue, a public street.
- 11. The property is also known as Lot 15 of the Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision, approved by Council in 2005 and recorded at Summit County on August 12, 2005. Lot 15 consists of 50,999 square feet of lot area and is currently undeveloped.
- 12. The property is subject to subdivision plat notes that require compliance with RD zone setbacks, approval of a Conditional Use Permit for each building prior to issuance of a building permit, a declaration of condominium and a record of survey plat prior to individual sale of units, membership in the Empire Pass Master HOA, identifies Empire Club Drive as a private street, plats a 20' snow storage easement along the street frontages, requires water efficient landscape, and includes other utility and maintenance provisions.
- 13. The proposed One Empire Pass CUP consists of a single multi-story building with 27 residential units ranging in size from 1,140 sf to 3,164 sf, one 900 sf affordable housing unit, and one 944 sf ADA unit. The gross building area is 113,293 sf, including the parking garage, storage, mechanical, trash and recycling area, fire command closet, pool mechanical, and entry lobby, as well as circulation elevators and stairs, and common amenities on the upper floors that do not utilize UEs.
- 14. The building consists of 64,374 square feet of residential uses and utilizes 32.19 Unit Equivalents. Common amenities areas (exercise and recreation rooms, ski lockers, locker rooms, etc. are proposed at the south end of levels one and two. Common amenity areas do not require use of UEs.
- 15. No commercial uses are proposed.
- 16. The Transit and Parking Management Plan requires a 25% reduction in parking from what would be normally required by the LMC. Based on unit sizes, fifty-five (55) spaces would be required for the 27 units based and one ADA unit. The 25% reduction is 42 spaces. The underground parking structure will have 38 spaces and 4-6 surface spaces will be provided near the front drop-off area.
- 17. The elevation and climate of Flagstaff creates a harsh environment for utilities and their maintenance.
- 18. The maximum Building Height in the RD District is 28 feet (33 feet with a pitched roof). A height exception was approved with the Village Master Plan Development. Specific volumetric diagrams were approved for each Building Site. For Building 5, 20% of the building was permitted to reach 80' above existing grade, 55% of the building to reach 92' above existing grade, and 25% of the building to reach 74' above existing grade. The volumetric diagram allows Building 5 to be four to six stories.

- 19. The proposed building complies with the granted height exceptions and percentages, number of stories, and required vertical and horizontal articulation. The proposed building is 11.5' to 15' lower than the 80' allowance (20% of the building), approximately 9'-8" below the 92' allowance (55% of the building), and approximately 5' lower than the 74' allowance (25% of the building).
- 20. The building complies with all RD District zone setbacks maintaining a 25' front setback, 12' side setbacks, and 15' rear setbacks.
- 21. A Master Homeowners Association document and Maintenance Agreement for the Mountain Village were reviewed and approved by the City prior to issuance of building permits for buildings within the Mountain Village. This property is also subject to these documents, in addition to any declaration of condominium and CCRs recorded with the condominium plat.
- 22. The Construction Mitigation Plan for the Mountain Village reiterates downhill construction truck traffic for this Conditional Use Permit will use Royal Street, as opposed to Marsac Avenue.
- 23. Excavated soil will remain within the Flagstaff Annexation area as required by the Annexation Agreement.

## Conclusions of Law:

- 1. The CUP, as conditioned, is consistent with the Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development and Flagstaff Mountain Resort Master Planned Development, the Park City Land Management Code, and the General Plan.
- 2. The proposed use, as conditioned, will be compatible with the surrounding structures in use, scale, mass and circulation.
- 3. The effects of any differences in use or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

## Conditions of Approval:

- 1. All standard conditions of approval apply to this Conditional Use Permit.
- 2. A final water efficient landscape and irrigation plan that indicates required storm water facilities and snow storage areas, and that meets the defensible space requirements, shall be submitted with the building permit application for approval by the Planning, Building, and Engineering Departments.
- 3. All exterior lights must conform to the City lighting ordinance and the Flagstaff Mountain Resort Design Guidelines. Final compliance with the City's Lighting Ordinance will be verified at the time of building permit plan review and prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy.
- 4. All exterior signs require a sign permit prior to installation.
- 5. Materials color samples and final design details shall be approved by staff prior to building permit issuance and shall be in substantial compliance with the elevations reviewed by the Planning Commission on January 13, 2016.
- 6. All exterior mechanical equipment shall be painted and/or otherwise screened and shielded from public streets. All wall and roof top vents and protruding mechanical shall be painted to match the adjacent wall or roof.

- 7. All utility facilities must be located on site. A plan must be provided at the time of the building permit application showing all utility locations, including dry utilities. The applicant shall provide verification that the utility plan is viable and the utility boxes can be screened.
- 8. The final building plans and construction details for the project shall substantially comply with the drawings reviewed by the Planning Commission on January 13, 2016.
- 9. The applicant shall record a condominium Record of Survey prior to selling individual units.
- 10. Utility and grading plans, including storm water drainage plans, must be approved by the City Engineer prior to Building Permit issuance.
- 11. Affordable housing provided with this Conditional Use Permit shall comply with all requirements and stipulations of the Flagstaff Development Agreement and the City's affordable housing resolution in effect at the time of the Development Agreement prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the building.
- 12. All conditions of approval of the Village at Empire Pass MPD shall continue to apply.
- 13. All conditions of approval of the Flagstaff Annexation and Development Agreement shall continue to apply, including the restrictions on solid wood burning fireplaces, removal of excavated materials, construction of pedestrian connections to the transit hub within the Village, and provision of any required ADA and affordable housing units.

## <u>Exhibits</u>

- Exhibit A Project Description
- Exhibit B Existing Conditions
- Exhibit C Subdivision plat
- Exhibit D Site and Landscape Plans and Floor Plans
- Exhibit E Architectural Elevations and Materials
- Exhibit F Village at Empire Pass MPD approval and Volumetric Diagrams
- Exhibit G Utility Plans
- Exhibit H Flagstaff Annexation Agreement (related sections)
- Exhibit I Village Map
- Exhibit J– Density Summary

# EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

# BUILDING 5 EMPIRE PASS east west partners



Guardsman Lodge - Park City, Utah

## IBI Project # 38654

## CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

## OCTOBER 26, 2015



# EXHIBIT B

## Guardsman Lodge, LLC

PO Box 682023 Park City, Urah 84060 Phone: 435.714.0267 E-Mail: bfiveash@ewpartners.com

To: Park City Planning From: Bill Fiveash OBO Guardsman Lodge, LLC Date: October 21, 2015

Re: VEPWS - 15 - CUP Written Statement

Memo

Guardsman Lodge LLC is seeking a Conditional Use Permit for the development and construction of a residential building on VEPWS-15 at Empire Pass. The site is part of the land subject to the Amended and Restated Development Agreement for Flagstaff Mountain recorded in March 2007 which granted the Developer/Owner of the property a Large Scale Master Planned Development. This application seeks to move forward the approvals as required in the development agreement to the level considered a Small Scale Master Plan, for which, we believe a CUP is required.

Guardsman Lodge LLC is proposing to build a 109,479 SF structure consisting of 27 residential for sale properties (Not exceeding 65,537 SF), 1 Accessible Unit as required by town code (1 ADA Unit), 1 Employee Housing Unit (1 EHU Unit), 42 total parking spaces, and various Residential Accessory Uses as defined in the Development Agreement.

Below are answers to specific questions required in the CUP Application:

## How will the proposed use "fit-in" with surrounding uses?

The development of a resort style condominium property was specifically contemplated for this site within the previously granted MPD. The proposed building fits the approved massing and square footage allowances per previous approvals.

## What type of service will it provide to Park City?

The property is part of the resort residential development of Empire Pass Village.

## Is the proposed use consistent with the current zoning district and with the General Plan?

The proposed development is consistent with the Development Agreement recorded in March 2007 for Flagstaff Mountain.

## Is the proposed use similar or compatible with the other uses in the same area?

Yes, the proposed property has received preliminary approval from the Empire Pass HOA Design Review Board as being compliant with the expected design and use of the property.

Is the proposed use suitable for the proposed site?

Yes, the proposed property fits within the prescribed massing and maximum SF.

## Will the proposed use emit noise, glare, dust, pollutants, and odor?

The proposed use is similar in design to the other condominium buildings in Empire Pass Village. There are no extraordinary uses or mechanical systems that one would expect to produce any emissions dissimilar to the other existing properties.



## What will be the hour of operation and how many people will be employed?

As a residential property, it is expected to be occupied during all hours of the day. The developer is proposing to have Deer Valley Lodging operate the HOA and thus will employ at least one FTE employee as a lodge keeper, plus other support employees from existing staff of DV Lodging.

Are other special issues that need to be mitigated? No.



# EXHIBIT B

EXHIBIT B





# EXHIBIT C

#### SLIRVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

du harvey pertify that I am a Repistered Land Surv a 154491, as prescribed under the faws of the State

Dent.



### BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

6 15 05

PARCEL 1

A parcel of land located in the wells half of Section III and the locativest quarter of Section 28, Toenship 2 Souls, Range & East, Soil Love Base and Meridian, and parse being more particularly described is follow:

Benet if used a locate is the model held of ancient if a data pretrieved a source of action 28. benetice 3 source pretrieved a source of action 28. benetice 3 source pretrieved and source action 28. benetice 3 source 3 so

Description conton's 10.52 cores, more to test



### NOTES:

SUBDIVISION PLAT

THE VILLAGE AT EMPIRE PASS

WEST SIDE LOCATED IN SECTIONS 21 AND 28

1. As building astronom from prometry map are to be the relationship of much some (HT) and the source one

3. Constituted the period reprived and im re-3. A Monosther, of conductions and it found of monoy of conductances will be required for the horport of the last of administration and within the

a All utility and buil economics of Wales sublic works that would have

T. Polite +

much in reasons measured monor live invalidance of and think court fighty set he request to be find with Morenville Both

12. At this time of any emeritaries of Depter CAB Drive, the Worker Association is requested in calcular evolvement in contrasts is public processing their material and the December Decision Decision and any endowerse adjustment of contrasts within priority materials in public evolution of the recomposition of the December of Decision and American Science and A

A. The assessed in form of the damagedie Speciel Series Statistics for a worker prior Speciel spin spin (b) All personly survey to lot set streng livers that how all in per at the attenuities of the E.C. and public and about only one taking of the strengtheres.

18. Any community and letters where he impatters in letter afficient impatters, technic work, and defined matte 17. The Substances of the Arts Lytter is the annual resonantity of the Drury Poor Name Resonances Assessed

10. We will all the Mage of Dayse Free West non-one are send by a Converse transportation Management area. The Conversion of

## OWNER'S DEDICATION AND CONSENT TO RECORD AND AL ADD RT 1025 FORSULT has hard about the NL/AL LLC about which which all have the MLMADENE or dependent here as TRY LLCA 47 DWSF PAS, 425 TRX, wanding a 25 bits who have a Phote UBM common the new of a series of the NL/AL and the NL/AL

to alloway abaracil the uniteralized for a MOUNTAIN VILLAGE ALC

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

man 11 Hal

many is a free of the

his instrument wat actor CORP. II. a Detailde a CUTTER VENUTARY VILLAGE ILE IN Descuted process lines that the state of the later

have been and the first

Loger & R. Horney median in Dallan and

Wy command inghter \_\_\_\_\_\_

### OWNER'S DEDICATION AND CONSENT TO RECORD

Note all using the "less instantion" that less that off the set (control is denote a process of the set of th

in whome about the and expect the encoded this carible and definition they are they at the set 1000

HED DARK OTV MMEE COMPANY-Al A

All - hinter

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

these at the A

The partnershift are semiclarlying latence on the 22 mar of 12 mar

Colory RAME (Channel of State

many + ( Julsy under in the second second second second

### OWNER'S DEDICATION AND CONSENT TO RECORD

ALL MEN BY DECE PRESENTS THAT MOUNTAIN DIVELOPMENTS ), BC, a Despace properties, the same of a perior of the front of land even as The WENCE AT DEFER RACE, MEST SOC. Including a 25 hait wide Public & Rivers USE, Comment & Rivers Reprint Public net as LATING DUE DIVE, Service and Anti-control of LATING DUE DIVE, Service and Taken in recordstant of this Canadianan Wat, and dama has been benefit

In entress shared the assertigent has executed the settilizate and induction this of the day of

NOLIVIAN DEXLORADING ( INC. " the bittere

No Vice Rees deet

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

### man a lillet

2005 he dilled & dia and a standard All hand and have It is entrument was ecknowledged powtany conversion of the or Delo

A Milling Futto committing of Ution

many Mally Mal-Ma commune and any

	TOWNSHIP 2 SOUTH, RANG	E 4 EAST, SALT LAKE BASE AN Y, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH	ND MERIDIAN			SHEET 1 OF 2
SNYDEEVILLE BASIN WATER RECLAMATION DISTRICT BEVILWED FOR CONFORMANCE TO SHUDEFULLE BASIN WATER RECLAMATION DISTRICT STANDARDS ON THIS 22 DAT OF DIAMA 2005 A.D. BY $\mathcal{B}_{S,S,W,R,D}$	PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVED BY THE PARK CIT PLANNING COMMISSION THIS IS DAY OF COMMISSION THIS IS DAY OF COMMISSION THIS IS DAY OF COMMISSION THIS IS DAY OF COMMISSION	ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATE I FIND THIS PLAT TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH INFORMATION ON FILE IN W OFFICE THIS 2200 DAY OF JULY BY DEFICE THIS 2005 A.D. BY DEFICIENT ENGINEER	APPROVAL AS TO FORM APPROVED AS TO FORM THIS <u>I</u> <u>M</u> DAY OF <u>AUGUST</u> , 2005 A.D. BY <u>DARK CITY ATORNEY</u>	CERTIFICATE OF ATTEST I CERTIFY THIS RECORD OF SURVEY MAP WAS APPROVED BY FAAK CITY COURCL THEODS A.D. GFABK CITY BECORDER	COUNCIL APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE COUNCIL THIS COUNCIL THIS BY Dama Williams	M 108 NO.1 1-1-01 FILE 1 USA-ANDRED THE THE AND

Those of the owner





# EXHIBIT D





























# EXHIBIT E
















# EXHIBIT F



P.O. Box 561 5258 N. New Lane Oakley, UT 84055

# MEMO

To: Kirsten Whetstone

Re: Building 5 Volumetric Analysis

Date: 12/15/15

Kirsten, following up on our meeting of last week, I have attached some drawings that detail the façade and roof shifts in building number 5 of Empire Pass. The data in these drawings correspond to the volumetric analysis in that MPD approval. In short, the building meets or exceeds those design elements that were contemplated in the MPD. The volumetric analysis is essentially broken down into building height and façade shifts the dimensions of which are called out on the attached drawings. Beyond the volumetrics, the project square footage is controlled by the unit equivalent formula (UE) and the total unit count, which is a unique requirement of the Empire Pass approval. UEs and units float within the Village MPD approval and are not specific to any building. In short, every building can have as many units and UEs as can be contained in the volumetrics.

#### **Building Height:**

Maximum building height was detailed for each building and further broken down within each building to provide stepping of the building at each end. The height of the building was determined from existing grade and corresponded to visual analysis that was presented during the MPD approval. As can be seen in the attached drawing, the building is substantially under the maximum heights in all reaches of the building.

#### Volumetrics:

Each building (1-9) within the Village was associated with a specific volumetric drawing and subject to the Supplemental Project Description. The drawings themselves are representative of the anticipated forms and are sometimes repeated from one to another, albeit that no two buildings were meant to be identical.

Mountain Resort Consulting Services, LLC Douglas Clyde its Managing Member Phone: 435-333-8001 - Fax: 435-333-8002 - email: dclyde@allwest.net The Volumetric section of the Supplemental Project Description noted, among other things:

"The intent of the volumetric analysis is to define the architectural massing of a building and insure that the mass of the building is broken up by significant façade and roofline shifts...."

"The volumetrics generally depicts the location and heights modeled in the attached visual analysis, however there has been, and will continue to be, some changes in the shapes and approximate locations of the buildings as the plans evolve through the design process."

With respect to Building 5, the architecture in the CUP closely follows the volumetric diagram, so no extrapolation is required to interpret the building mass per se. The building has several façade and roof shifts that meet or exceed the expectations of the MPD approval and its overall height as a percentage of length is likewise compliant. Further, while the overall height of the building is lower than the total allowance, the mass of the building shifts as specified. See attached drawings.

There has been some specific questions about the roof zone (the "1/2 story") and what its utility is in the overall approval. The purpose of defining this zone was to prevent penthouse units from having large vaulted ceilings with associated glazing. In short, glazing and ceiling height were limited by the restriction on stem wall height or physical limitations on the size of dormers. If dwelling units were in the roof zone, this would drive roof forms that were consistent with "mountain" architecture. In addition, and for the same purpose, the floor to floor height restriction was also incorporated, again primarily to avoid excessive glazing and forms that were not in the vernacular of traditional mountain architecture. By and large, this restriction has caused the typical building in Empire Pass to avoid residential units in the "roof zone". Such is the case with this CUP.

Attachments:

Building 5 façade shift and height analysis Flagstaff MPD with attachments (Supplemental Project Description)

#### Village MPD Supplemental Project Description and Conditions

#### Site Plan

The site plan for the project shows the location of the nine condo-lodge buildings that have received additional height as established in the volumetrics. The shape and location of these buildings on the site plan are approximate and are more fully described in the attached volumetric analysis. The building locations for the nine condo lodges are controlled by the preliminary parcel map. Within the parcels on that map areas have been identified where reduced setbacks will be allowed. Final dimensions of these setback reductions will be determined at CUP approval for the individual buildings. Building location within the parcel is subject only to the zoned setbacks and the approved reductions, and general compliance with preservation of significant vegetation as shown on the MPD Limits of Disturbance exhibit.

#### Volumetrics

The intent of the volumetric analysis is to define the architectural massing of a building and insure that the mass of the building is broken up by significant façade and roofline shifts, as well as introducing architectural elements at the base of the building. The volumetrics define three distinct zones within the building: a parking zone, the intermediate floor plates and a roof zone. The roof zone is a region in which the roof shapes and architectural elements that appear in the project design guidelines are required to be employed in order to break up the building massing and provide architectural character. The roof zones are allowed as residential or mechanical space.

The volumetrics generally depicts the location and heights modeled in the attached visual analysis, however there has been, and will continue to be, some changes in the shapes and approximate locations of the buildings as the plans evolve through the design process.

The volumetrics will be used in conjunction with the approved project Design Guidelines to control final architecture that will be reviewed by the Planning Commission at a subsequent CUP.

1

#### **Building Height**

Building height is measured continuously from the highest point of the building to the existing grade directly below that point. The isometric diagrams establish maximum heights at various areas of the building. This height allow for three separate elements above existing grade as follows:

- 1. Height to accommodate the roof and residential units within the roof zone.
- 2. Height for the intervening full floors of residential below the roof zone, and
- Height for a varying amount of parking structure above the existing grade depending on where you draw the section through the building.

The sum of these three elements cannot exceed the maximum heights and are further restricted as follows:

#### Floor to Floor Height

The isometric diagram shows numbered full height floors that are sandwiched between the garage and roof zone. The floor to floor height of these floors is limited to 12'. The remaining height up to the maximum height of the building is available only for roof elements, garage, and the provision for residential units in the roof zone as described below.

#### The Roof Zone

In addition to the numbered floors that are between the roof zone and the garage, there is a provision for units in the roof. Residential units are encouraged within the roof to the extent that they add architectural interest by providing for dormers and window elements in the roof. Out of the maximum height allowed within each area of a building, up to 6' of that height can be allocated for a stem wall in order to accommodate a functional residential unit in the roof. The height of the stem wall is measured from the floor of the unit to where the units ceiling intersect the wall on the inside of the unit. The floor of the Roof Zone unit cannot be more then 12' above the floor of the lower unit. Acceptable roof forms are found in the approved Design Guidelines.

#### **Ground Floor Architectural Elements**

The volumetrics denote "entry structures" at possible locations that are intended to break down the mass of the structure at the entry points. In addition, a portion of the ground floor will have architectural elements such as covered balconies that will project out from the façade above in order to break down overall building scale.

2

#### **Building Appurtenances and Exceptions**

Beyond the height and massing shown in the volumetrics, some appurtenances are allowed outside of this envelope. Acceptable appurtenances include but are not limited to:

- Dormer with ridge heights not exceeding the ridge height of the roof to which they are attached
- Chimneys and chimney roof forms used for HVAC equipment and mechanical penthouses provided that they do not extend more the 5' above the top of the roof. Elevator penthouses may exceed the ridge height by 8'.
- 3. Skylights not exceeding 3' above the ridgeline of the roof that it is on
- 4. Code required parapet walls
- 5. Roof overhangs, brackets and bracing
- 6. Awnings
- 7. Covered and uncovered balconies
- 8. Grade level arcades not to exceed 15' in height
- Kiosks, pool and spa pavilions, outdoor food service not exceeding 15' in height
- Bay windows not exceeding 5' in depth measured perpendicular to the building
- 11. Screened and covered HVAC equipment
- 12. Porte Cochere structures not to exceed 28' in height
- Accessory buildings and other structures and appurtenances as allowed in the zone by the LMC

Appurtenances that fall outside of the building envelope must not remove significant vegetation as preserved in the Limits of Disturbance plan and are subject to Planning Commission approval through a CUP. All appurtenances are subject to the projects approved Design Guidelines.

#### **Conservation Easements and Conservation Parcels**

Conservation Easements and Conservation Parcels are to remain as open space. Their purpose is to maintain a vegetative buffer between the project and Marsac Avenue. No structures, accessory building or appurtenances are allowed in any Conservation Easement or Conservation Parcel. Only those utilities as approved by the MPD or as revised in subsequent CUPs are allowed. Signs, as allowed by the Land Management Code, which are adjacent to the road, are allowed provided they do not cause the removal of Significant Vegetation as defined by the LMC.

3









**ONE EMPIRE PASS** CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

SOUTH ELEVATION - MASSING DIARGAM



12





Page 335 of 406





**ONE EMPIRE PASS** CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

SOUTH ELEVATION - MASSING DIARGAM



DEER VALLEY, UTAH EMPIRE PASS DEC. 2899 336	6 of 4060F	2
---	------------	---









ONE EMPIRE PASS CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT

NORTH ELEVATION - MASSING DIARGAM



DEER VALLEY, UTAH EMPIRE PASS JAN. 2016





# EXHIBIT F

# Planning Commission Staff Report

Author: Subject:

Date: Type of Item: Brooks T. Robinson Village at Empire Pass, Master Planned Development July 28, 2004 Administrative



PLANNING DEPARTMENT

#### **Summary Recommendations:**

The Planning Department recommends the Planning Commission re-open the public hearing and take public comment. Staff has prepared Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval.

<u>Topic</u>	
Applicant	United Park City Mines / Talisker Corp.
Location	Village at Empire Pass (formerly known as Flagstaff
	Mountain Resort)
Zoning	Residential Development (RD) as part of the Flagstaff
-	Master Planned Development (MPD)
Adjacent Land Uses	Deer Valley Resort ski terrain, State Route 224

#### **Background**

On June 24, 1999, Council adopted Ordinance 99-30 approving the annexation and development agreement for the 1,655 acre Flagstaff Mountain area. Ordinance 99-30 granted the equivalent of a" large-scale" master planned development (MPD) and set forth the types and locations of land use; maximum densities; timing of development; development approval process; as well as development conditions and amenities for each parcel.

The Development Agreement specifies that only 147 acres of the 1,655 acre annexation may be developed. The remainder of the annexation area is to be retained as passive and recreational open space.

Prior to construction, the applicant must receive site-specific MPD and final plat approval from the City. The Planning Commission takes action on MPD applications and forwards a recommendation to Council on subdivision plats.

Ordinance 99-30 also required that the applicant submit 14 specific technical reports for review and approval by the City. The 14 studies, along with the Land Management Code and the Development Agreement (99-30) form the standards under which the subject MPD and preliminary/final plat will be reviewed.

During the Olympic break a subcommittee consisting of the applicant's design team, staff, and Commissioners Chris Larson, Bruce Erickson, and Michael O'Hara focused on a review of the preliminary road layout for the mountain village (Pods A, B-1, and B-2) and a building height analysis for the project build-out using the base RD-zone 33 foot height limit. These items were reviewed at a work session and a public hearing on March 27, 2002. No public comment was received. The Commission concluded that:

- The base RD-zone height analysis demonstrates that the maximum project densities set forth in Ord. 99-30 could potentially be constructed within the approved development pods without the necessity of a height increase above the 33-foot RD zone height limit; and
- 2. Building height increases for specific multi-family/resort-related buildings may be considered based on site-specific reviews and compliance with the standards set forth in the Master Planned Development section of the Land Management Code (LMC).

## **Proposal**

The applicant seeks Master Planned Development (MPD) approval for the Mountain Village (Pods A, B-1, and B-2), now called the Village at Empire Pass. Pod B-1 was previously approved in May 2002. B-2 is not far enough along in the planning process to have a clear idea of that part of the development. However, residual units and unit equivalents remain for a future B-2 MPD.

The Development Agreement constrains the mixed-use development in the Mountain Village area (Pods A, B-1, and B-2) to:

- The Mountain Village is to be contained within 84 acres.
- No more than 705 Unit Equivalents (2,000 square feet each) in no more that 470 residential units (including not more than 60 PUD-style units) and no more than 16 single-family home sites.
- 65% of the residential units (306) must be within Pod A.
- No more than 75,000 square feet of resort support commercial.
- A maximum 35,000 square foot day skier lodge in Pod B-2 with no public road access, no day skier parking, and limited parking to meet service and administrative requirements.

On May 22, 2002, the Planning Commission approved an MPD and final plats for portions of the Mountain Village including:

Lot	Unit Equivalents	Actual Units	Acres
Ten single family	Does not count		6.40 acres in Pod B-1
homes	towards 705 total		

A: Empire Day Lodge	None currently. Commercial activities outside of Day Skier use may require use of Commercial UEs.		1.33 acres in Pod B-2
B: PUD-style homes	27 UEs	18	16.99 acres in Pod B- 1
C: Ironwood Townhomes	37.5 UEs	25	3.63 acres in Pod B-1
D: Building H	33 UEs plus 1UE Support Commercial	22	1.34 acres in Pod A
Larkspur Townhomes (currently approved is a tri-plex and a duplex)	7.1 UEs or 14,052 sf	5	Pod A
Paintbrush PUD-style SFD	18.1 UEs or 36,139 sf	7	Pod A
TOTAL: 77 units (10 SFD homes do not count towards total)	123.7	77	28.35 acres outside of Pod A

Proposed Pod A Village (excludes Building H which is in Pod A; includes already approved Paintbrush and Larkspur units)

Lot	Unit Equivalents	Actual Units	Units as PUDs	Single Family
Buildings 1-9	225.6 UEs	217 Units		
PUD-style	85.4	30	30	
Townhomes	64	51	8	
Banner SFD				6
Total	375	298	38	6

# <u>Analysis</u>

# Master Planned Development Review

Staff has performed a final review of the proposed Master Planned Development per the Land Management Code Section 15-6-5: Master Planned Developments–MPD Requirements.

#### Length of Approval

Construction of the approved MPD will be required to commence within two (2) years of the approval date. After construction commences, the MPD remains valid as long as it is consistent with the approved MPD and any phasing plan.

#### MPD Modifications

Substantive changes to the MPD require a subsequent Planning Commission review and approval of the MPD and Development Agreement.

#### Site Specific Approvals

Conditional use permit approval including a specific density (square foot) allocation will be required prior to the construction of the PUD-style single-family units and the multifamily units. No conditional use permit is required for the proposed 6 single-family lots. Approval and recordation of the subdivision plat, as well as City Engineer approval of all public improvements is necessary prior to construction of the proposed subdivision.

#### Density

With the current approvals noted above, Pod A and the development parcel of Pod B-2 outside of the Empire Day Lodge is limited to 55.65 acres, 393 residential units and 563.3 Unit Equivalents. Pod A has 34 units (9 PUDs, 3 townhomes, and 22 condo-lodge units in Building H) already approved of the 306 residential units that are required to be in Pod A. Proposed for Pod A is 321.5 Units, which includes the 34 units, leaving up to 105.5 units unallotted. In addition, the remaining 6 single-family lots of the 16 allowed in the Village are proposed in Pod A.

#### Marsac Claim/Mayflower

Please refer to the July 14, 2004 report for discussion on the Marsac Claim and Mayflower holdings. The Court issued a ruling in the partition case between Mayflower and Unite Park. Staff will update the Commission as necessary, but it does not impact this application or approval.

#### Pod B-1

The density table allocates 90,000 square feet or 45 Unit Equivalents to Lot C. The previous MPD approval for these 18 PUD-style homes allocated 27 UEs to this lot, with each unit being up to 5,000 square feet. The footprints and sections that were reviewed by the Planning Commission were concepts of 5,000 square foot units. An amendment to the MPD will be required to adjust this number, however the density table recognizes that up to 90,000 square feet may be assigned to Lot C.

#### Pod B-2

The developer is unsure what this last development piece may look like. Several alternatives were presented in the Planning Commission binder. An MPD will be required when a UPK has a better idea of how this pod will develop. This MPD approval only applies to Pod A.

## Setbacks

The LMC requires a minimum 25-foot setback around the exterior boundary of a master planned development. The proposed Village MPD complies with this standard. Within the Village, the Planning Commission may reduce the RD zone setbacks. Exhibit 10 (Setback Exhibit) shows potential areas for setback reductions based on the conceptual site plans. Specific setbacks will be considered during the Conditional Use Permit process.

## Open Space

The Development Agreement limits the overall development to 147 acres out of the 1,655-acre project area. The 88% open space provision exceeds the normal 60% open space requirement set forth in the LMC. Within each of the pods, Conservation Easements will be placed on several lots to restrict development on platted lots. Staff finds that this restriction is consistent with the development acreage restriction and will not count the Conservation Easement areas as part of the development acreage.

## Off-Street Parking

The Parking and Transit Management Plans (adopted by the Planning Commission on October 24, 2001) establish specific parking requirements for the project area that include a 25% parking reduction from the normal LMC requirements for multi-family and commercial units. Parking for all single-family and PUD-style single-family units will meet or exceed the two-space/unit requirement. Specific parking requirements for the multi-family units and any commercial area will be subject to more specific analysis during the subsequent conditional use permit review process.

## **Building Height**

The single-family (both PUD and non-PUD) and townhouse units will be constructed pursuant to the 33' RD-zone height limitation. Height exceptions are being requested for the nine stacked-flat condo-lodges including the Empire (Alpine) Club. The applicant's request and discussion of the four required findings for additional height are discussed in the Volumetrics Analysis section of the application binder. The Planning Commission gave a final review of the Visual Analysis and building heights at the July 14, 2004 hearing and preliminarily determined the proposed heights comply with these criteria.

The LMC grants the Planning Commission the authority to allow additional building height based upon site-specific analysis provided the Commission can make the following four findings. The findings are listed below with Staff comments.

#### 1. The increase in building height does not result in an increase in square footage or building volume over what could be allowed under the zonerequired building height and density, including requirements for facade variation and design, but rather provides desired architectural variation.

**Complies.** In January 2002, a Planning Commission subcommittee and staff met with the applicant over the course of several meetings to review a base zone height analysis of the Flagstaff Mountain Resort (now Empire Pass) project. The

analysis was conducted to determine whether or not the density authorized in Development Agreement and Large-Scale MPD could be designed to meet the RD District 33-foot building height limits. Based on this analysis, it was determined that the Mountain Village area (Pods A, B-1, and B-2) could be designed utilizing 2-3 story, relatively-flat roof structures (4:12 roofs) and meet all necessary LMC height, setback, and facade shift requirements without the necessity of height exceptions. The result of such a design approach to the Mountain Village would be significantly greater site disturbance and loss of significant areas of vegetation. At the March 27, 2002 meeting, the Planning Commission reviewed the analysis and concluded that additional building height could be considered for multi-unit dwellings provided that proposal was consistent with the LMC.

Consistent with the base zone height analysis previously reviewed by Staff and the Planning Commission, the proposed buildings 1-9 volumetrics result in a unit count and overall square footage consistent with the density assigned to the Mountain Village area pursuant to the Development Agreement and Large-Scale MPD approval. Therefore, there is no increase in density or square footage as a result of the height increase. The additional height is also offset by increased setbacks that offer opportunities for greater landscape buffers to be established. The proposed roof design, including pitched roofs that step with grade, are consistent with LMC Architectural Design Guidelines, suggestive of pitched/sloping roofs found on historic mine structures originally located in the area, provide increased vertical breaks in the building mass, and increased architectural interest beyond that provided by a relatively flat roof building.

# 2. Buildings have been positioned to minimize visual impacts on adjacent structures. Potential problems on neighboring properties caused by shadows, loss of solar access, and loss of air circulation, have been mitigated to the extent possible as defined by the Planning Commission.

**Complies.** No structures currently exist on the neighboring properties. Townhouses and Single Family/PUD-style units are proposed to the south, east and west of the nine building core. The conceptual site plan is designed to orient the multi-family units to the central ski run and to mountain views to the west and east.

## 3. There is adequate landscaping and buffering from adjacent properties and uses. Increased setbacks and separations from adjacent projects are being proposed.

**Complies.** The proposed building exceeds the RD District setback requirements. The setback requirements of the RD District are 20 feet for front yards, 15 feet for rear yards, and 12 feet for side yards. The proposed setbacks are 25-55 feet for the front yard setback,15-25 feet for the rear setback, and 15-30 feet for the side yard setback. Staff finds that sufficient building separation between each

structure is provided. A specific landscaping/buffer plan will be required as part of the conditional use permit review for each of the nine buildings.

# 4. The additional building height has resulted in more than minimum open space required and has resulted in the open space being more usable.

**Complies.** The Mountain Village design clusters the majority of the Empire Pass density into Pods A, B-1, and B-2 in exchange for larger areas of project open space. The LMC requirement for MPD open space is 60%. Approximately 88% open space is provided pursuant to the Development Agreement. The bulk of the project open space is utilized for passive recreation areas, trails, ski terrain and improvements, wildlife areas, and sensitive terrain preservation.

In addition to the criteria outlined above, the Planning Commission subcommittee identified several vantage points during the Olympic break that are to be used during MPD and subsequent PUD reviews. The vantage points include views from King Road, two points from Stein Eriksen Lodge, the Marsac Building, Guardsman Road/Guardsman Road Connection intersection, the Daly West head frame, and American Flag Subdivision. A visual analysis of the Village from these vantage points has been included with this report as an attachment. As demonstrated by the visual analysis, the nine buildings are partially visible from the subcommittee's vantage points, but are mitigated by the current and potential tree canopy and the backdrop of the mountains behind. The buildings do not break any significant ridgelines.

#### Site Planning

The nine site planning criteria outlined in the LMC are intended to promote overall design that incorporates the development into the site's natural characteristics. Generally, the location of the proposed development parcels is consistent with the development pods approved as part of Development Agreement and Large-Scale MPD which clustered the development onto less-steep terrain and in the least visually sensitive areas. The open space areas designated in the Development Agreement are respected with this plan.

#### <u>Roads</u>

The roadway system has been reviewed by staff and is much preferable to the previous configurations. Three roads plus a frontage road on the north end townhouses serve Pod A. The previous configuration had dead-end cul de sacs serving the interior larger buildings. The present configuration allows for greater tree buffer along Marsac Avenue and reduced grading. However, a cul de sac in excess of 650 feet is created in the southwest quadrant. This is in conflict with the general policy and subdivision code of the City to limit the length of dead-end roads. The Chief Fire Marshall finds the plan to comply with the necessary standards for fire access and safety. The end of the cul de sac continues as an emergency access point as part of the Emergency Response Plan. The Commission reviewed this issue at the work session of April 14, 2004 and was

accepting of the Fire Marshall's recommendation. Approval of the proposed cul de sac will require a specific finding of the Planning Commission.

#### <u>Trails</u>

Existing and new trails are accommodated with the proposed plan. All "back-country" work is to be coordinated with the Mountain Trails Foundation. The proposed trail work is consistent with the Trails Master Plan adopted by the Planning Commission on October 24, 2001.

Overall pedestrian circulation is outlined in the applicant's packet. The internal pedestrian paths are intended to keep users off the roads as much as possible and to link the Empire Club with the outlying areas. There may be instances, particularly at the north and south ends, where sidewalks along the streets would be required in order to meet the subdivision regulations. The Planning Commission discussed this issue on April 14, 2004 and agreed to waive this requirement. Snow storage, landscaping, recycling, delivery access, and ADA access for multi-family units will also be analyzed during the subsequent conditional use permit process.

#### Landscape and Streetscape

Landscaping, streetscape, and lighting will be reviewed for the multi-family and PUDstyle single-family lots during the subsequent conditional use permit process. The applicant will need to clarify the amount and type of street lighting proposed along the residential streets. The lighting must comply with the City Engineer's specifications, the Municipal Lighting Code, and the Design Guidelines adopted by the Planning Commission on October 24, 2001. All streetlights will be privately maintained. Staff has added a Condition of Approval that each CUP application include a preliminary landscape plan with water-efficient irrigation systems.

#### Sensitive Lands Compliance

The Sensitive Lands (overlay) Zone did not specifically apply to the Empire Pass Large-Scale MPD and annexation; however, the locations of the development pods are based on Sensitive Lands principles.

#### Employee/Affordable Housing

Pursuant to the Flagstaff Mountain Resort Employee/Affordable Housing Plan, 15 employee/affordable housing units are required to be constructed or in-lieu fees paid with the Certificate of Occupancy of 150 Unit Equivalents. Review of the employee housing units and specific conditions of approval will take place during the conditional use permit review process.

**Recommendation:** The Planning Department recommends the Planning Commission re-open the public hearing and take public comment. Staff has prepared Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval for the Village at Empire Pass as follows:

## Findings of Fact

- 1. The Village at Empire Pass (Mountain Village) Master Planned Development is located in the RD-MPD and ROS-MPD Districts.
- The City Council approved the Development Agreement for Flagstaff Mountain Development Agreement/Annexation Resolution No. 99-30 on June 24, 1999. The Development Agreement is the equivalent of a Large-Scale Master Plan. The Development Agreement sets forth maximum project densities, location of densities, and developer-offered amenities.
- 3. The Flagstaff Mountain Annexation is approximately 1,655 acres. Mixed-used development is limited to approximately 147 acres in four (4) development areas identified as Pods A, B-1, B-2, and D. The remainder of the annexation area is to be retained as passive and/or recreational open space.
- 4. The Development Agreement limits development in Pods A, B-1, B-2 to:
  - No more than 705 Unit Equivalents in no more than 470 residential units (including not more than 60 PUD-style units) and no more than 16 single-family home sites.
  - no more than 75,000 square feet of resort support commercial; and
  - a maximum 35,000 square foot day skier lodge in Pod B-2.
- 5. The Development Agreement required City review and approval of fourteen (14) technical reports/studies. The reports include details on the following information:
  - Mine/Soil Hazard Mitigation
  - Architectural Design Guidelines
  - Transit
  - Parking
  - Open Space Management
  - Historic Preservation
  - Emergency Response
  - Trails
  - Private Road Access Limitations
  - Construction Phasing
  - Infrastructure and Public Improvement Design
  - Utilities
  - Wildlife Management
  - Affordable Housing
- 6. The Planning Commission completed the review and approval process for the technical reports/studies on December 12, 2001.

- 7. This Master Plan for Pod A consists of a total of 321.5 units and 435.6 Unit Equivalents, including the previously approved Paintbrush, Larkspur, and Building H; the Transit Hub, ski lift and ski trails, and the location of the Alpine Club.
- 8. Over 65% of the residential units (minimum 306) are within Pod A and within walking distance of the Transit Hub as required by the Development Agreement.
- 9. The 14 technical reports/studies, along with the Land Management Code and the Development Agreement (99-30) form the standards which the subject Master Planned Development and Phase 1 preliminary/final plat are reviewed.
- 10. The applicant has provided supplemental materials including Master Plan Development Project Description (dated July 2004, Exhibit A), Supplemental Project Description and Conditions (dated July 5, 2004, Exhibit B) Volumetric Analysis (dated July 5, 2004, Exhibit D and E), Visual Analysis dated July 4, 2004 (Exhibit F), Architectural Character dated March 19, 2004 (Exhibit G), and Supplemental Plans including Building Height Diagram, Vegetative Buffer, Trails, and Construction Sequencing (Exhibit H). Together with the Site Plans dated July 21, 2004 (Exhibit C), these Exhibits and this report comprise the Village at Empire Pass MPD.
- 11. The Village at Empire Pass MPD illustrates conceptual access and street layouts that have not been specifically approved by the City Engineer and City Fire Marshall. Final road layout will be subject to individual Subdivisions and Conditional Use Permits.
- 12. Conditional Use Permit approval is required prior to any development within the Village at Empire Pass MPD area.
- 13. The proposed Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development includes a maximum density assignment and conceptual site design for Thirty (30) detached single-family PUD-style units utilizing 85.4 Unit Equivalents.
- 14. The proposed Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development includes a maximum density assignment and conceptual site design for Fifty-One (51) Townhouse units utilizing 64 Unit Equivalents. Eight of these Townhouse units are in a duplex configuration and count towards the PUD limit of 60.
- 15. The proposed Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development includes a conceptual site design for Six (6) single-family homes.
- 16. Conservation Easements are proposed within platted lots. These Conservation Easement areas will not count towards the development acreage.
- 17. The PUD-style cluster homes and the Townhomes are to be platted as condominiums and not as individual lots.

- 18. Utility lines and ski trails will be routed in existing clearings and common utility corridors to the greatest extent practical upon the City Engineer's approval.
- 19. The Emergency Response Plan has been reviewed by the Chief Fire Marshall and the Planning Commission in order to allow fire access and safety at the end of the over length cul de sac.
- 20. The Planning Commission may decrease setbacks within an MPD. Setback variance is shown on Sheet 10 of 10 of Exhibit A, dated June June 15, 2004.
- 21. The maximum Building Height in the RD District is 28 feet (33 feet with a pitched roof).
- 22. The Land Management Code, Section 15-6-5(E) allows the Planning Commission to consider increased building height based upon a site specific analysis and determination.
- 23. The applicant has requested additional building height for the structures proposed as Buildings 1-9, inclusive. The proposed building volumetrics are detailed on Exhibit D dated June 14, 2004.
- 24. The proposed increase in building height for Buildings 1-9 does not result in an increase in square footage or building volume over what could be allowed under the zone-required building height and density, including requirements for facade variation and design, but rather provides desired architectural variation.
- 25. Proposed Buildings 1-9 has been positioned to minimize visual impacts on adjacent structures. Potential problems on neighboring properties caused by shadows, loss of solar access, and loss of air circulation, have been mitigated to the extent possible as defined by the Planning Commission.
- 26. The site plan for proposed Buildings 1-9 on includes adequate landscaping and buffering from adjacent properties and uses.
- 27. The additional building height for proposed Buildings 1-9 has resulted in more minimum open space than required and has resulted in the open space being more usable.
- 28. An MPD for pod B-2 will be reviewed under a separate MPD application.

## Conclusions of Law

1. The MPD, as conditioned, complies with all the requirements of the Land Management Code;

- 2. The MPD, as conditioned, meets the minimum requirements of Section 15-6-5 of this Code;
- 3. The MPD, as conditioned, is consistent with the Park City General Plan;
- 4. The MPD, as conditioned, provides the highest value of open space, as determined by the Planning Commission;
- 5. The MPD, as conditioned, strengthens and enhances the resort character of Park City;
- 6. The MPD, as conditioned, compliments the natural features on the Site and preserves significant features or vegetation to the extent possible;
- 7. The MPD, as conditioned, is Compatible in use, scale and mass with adjacent Properties, and promotes neighborhood Compatibility;
- 8. The MPD provides amenities to the community so that there is no net loss of community amenities;
- 9. The MPD, as conditioned is consistent with the employee Affordable Housing requirements as adopted by the City Council at the time the Application was filed.
- 10. The MPD, as conditioned, meets the provisions of the Sensitive Lands provisions of the Land Management Code. The project has been designed to place Development on the most Developable Land and least visually obtrusive portions of the Site:
- 11. The MPD, as conditioned promotes the Use of non-vehicular forms of transportation through design and by providing trail connections; and,
- 12. The MPD has been noticed and public hearings held in accordance with this Code.
- The requirements necessary for the Planning Commission to grant additional building height within the MPD pursuant to the Land Management Code Section 15-6-5 have been met.

## **Conditions of Approval**

1. A Conditional Use Permit is required prior to any development within the Village at Empire Pass MPD area. As per the Phasing Plan, only the nine large multi-family buildings require a CUP review by the Planning Commission. All other units are to be reviewed at a Staff level.

- 2. City Engineer approval of a utility and infrastructure plan is a condition precedent to the issuance of any building permits within the Village Master Planned Development area.
- 3. Utility lines and ski trails shall be routed in existing clearings and common utility corridors to the greatest extent practical upon the City Engineer's approval.
- 4. If and when the realigned Guardsman road is dedicated to the City, the Developer will execute an encroachment agreement, in a form acceptable to the City Attorney and City Engineer for the private improvements (ski bridges and/or tunnels) within the rights-of-way.
- 5. All essential municipal public utility buildings associated with the utility plan for the subdivision require a conditional use permit.
- 6. The proposed over-length cul de sac that ends in the six single family lots will have a secondary emergency access from the end of the road to Marsac Avenue. The emergency access will continue as a minimum 20-foot wide all-weather surface road.
- 7. A Construction Mitigation Plan, including truck routing, is a submittal requirement for each Conditional Use Permit.
- 8. A preliminary landscape plan, including provisions for water-efficient irrigation systems, shall be submitted with each CUP application.
- 9. All subsequent applications and approvals are subject to the Technical Reports as approved or amended,

## Exhibits

- A Master Plan Development Project Description (8 pages)
- B Supplemental Project Description and Conditions (3 pages)
- C Conceptual Plans (10 pages)
- D Volumetric Analysis (3 pages)
- E Volumetrics, Buildings 1-9 (19 pages)
- F Visual Analysis (5 pages)
- G Architectural Character (6 pages)
- H Supplemental Plans

M:\Brooks\Planning Comm\PC2004\Flagstaff Village MPD 072804.doc

# EXHIBIT F

Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of July 28, 2004 Page 10

Findings of Fact - Marsac Avenue & Chambers Street Right-of-Way

- 1. The property is located between platted Marsac Avenue at the Sandridge parking lots and the Guardsman Connection to Silver Lake.
- 2. The zoning along the road is HR-1 and ROS.
- 3. The City Council adopted Ordinance 99-20 on June 24, 1999, approving the annexation and development agreement for the 1,655-acre Flagstaff Mountain area.
- 4. The Flagstaff Annexation Development Agreement Section 2.10.2 stipulates certain road and intersection improvements, including widening the road, drainage improvements, a passing lane, and runaway truck ramp.

Conclusions of Law

- 1. There is good cause for this subdivision plat.
- 2. The subdivision plat is consistent with the Master Plan Development Agreement, Park City Land Management Code, the General Plan, and applicable State law regarding subdivision plats.
- 3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed subdivision plat.
- 4. Approval of the subdivision plat, 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 Subdivision 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 Subdivision Plat 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 and the plat will be void.

# 6. Empire Pass Master Planned Development

Planner Brooks Robinson commented on Pod A at Empire Pass and noted that the Planning Commission has discussed many details of his master planned development over several months. The public hearing was re-opened on July 14 and continued to this evening. The Staff has prepared findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval for the master plan for Pod A. Pod B1 was previously approved. The Staff finds that this application complies with the Land Management Code and the Development Agreement, which are the controlling documents. There will be additional units and density left over from this approval, and Pod B2 will come in at a later date with its own master plan once the applicants are further along in planning development for that area. The applicant had prepared a number of exhibits and updates for the Commissioners' binders which will comprise this approval. These includes the project description and minor grammatical

error and language revisions. Planner Robinson outlined other updates distributed this evening. The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission re-open the public hearing, consider public input, and provide direction to the Staff and applicant.

Chair Barth referred to Pages 115-123 of the staff report, Summary of Compliance with the Technical Reports, and noted that he did not see in the draft findings any reference to incorporate those pages into a motion. Planner Robinson recalled that on July 14 Commissioner Erickson requested compliance with technical reports, and the decision was made to provide them as a separate document. He offered to add them as a finding.

Doug Clyde, representing the applicant, distributed to the Commissioners a visual simulation from King Road that was inadvertently left out of their package. He was uncertain which phasing plan is included in their packets and wanted to be sure the one they have shows the right units. He noted that town home units 16 and 17 and cluster home units 11 and 12 are in Phase I. He referred to page 6 of the recent handouts and corrected the number of Townhomes and PUD's from 28 to 23 units in the first phase.

Chair Barth re-opened the public hearing.

There was no comment.

Chair Barth closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Erickson read the conditions of approval relative to traffic circulation based on the development agreement and asked if they are part of the transportation mitigation plan and part of the 14 technical reports. Mr. Clyde replied that they are reflected in the existing construction mitigation plans currently on file with the City. Planner Robinson explained that every CUP that comes forward will need its own construction mitigation plan which will be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

The Planning Commission and Mr. Clyde discussed enforcement procedures for downhill traffic.

Planner Robinson revised Finding of Fact 10 by inserting a comma after A(Exhibit H)@ and adding Aand a compliance matrix with the technical reports (Exhibit I).@

Mr. Clyde referred to the density indicated on page 104 of the staff report and noted that 563 takes into account the additional 18 PUD units. This is not reflected in the table above, and he suggested adding the language Acounting the additional 18 PUD units noted below.@

MOTION: Commissioner Erickson moved to APPROVE the MPD in accordance with the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval with the following revisions:

- 1) The incorporation of the revised July 28, 2004, project description as presented by Staff.
- 2. The revision to Finding of Fact 10 incorporating the compliance report with the 14 technical reports, Exhibit I.
- 3. The revision to the phasing plan incorporating the town home Units 16 & 17 and the cluster home Units 11 & 12.
- 4. Correction to the staff report, page 104, with regard to the density incorporating the phrase that the 563.3 units includes the 18 unit equivalents referenced in Pod B1 below.
- 5. Incorporation of Condition of Approval 10 that they incorporate the technical report updates and clarifications as presented in the staff report

Mr. Clyde stated that the PUD's were originally intended to be 5,000 square feet each, but they had a problem with the Unit Equivalent calculation. He will return with a revised UE calculation which raises the number by 18 additional UE's. It will not change the plan, but it will make it correspond with the way they interpret UE's.

Planner Robinson referred to the density in the Pod B1 section on page 104 and noted that the last sentence should recognize that 90,000 square feet should be assigned to Lot B and not Lot C.

Commissioner Erickson incorporated the change to Page 104 as described by Planning Robinson into his motion. Commissioner Powers seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Thomas abstained from the vote, and Commissioner Zimney was not present for the vote.

Commissioner Volkman referred to the status of the technical reports regarding the mine soils hazard plan and the language which states, AA draft work plan for the clean up of Empire Canyon was approved by the EPA and reviewed by the Park City Municipal Corporation. Work will begin this summer.@ Mr. Clyde explained that the Empire Canyon work referred to is the clean up of the creek below the Deer Valley Day Lodge and the top of Daly Avenue. It has no relation to moving the mine dump.

Findings of Fact - Empire Pass

- 1. The Village at Empire Pass (Mountain Village) Master Planned Development is located in the RD-MPD and ROS-MPD Districts.
- 2. The City Council approved the Development Agreement for Flagstaff Mountain Development Agreement/Annexation Resolution No. 99-30 on June 24, 1999. The Development Agreement is the equivalent of a Large-Scale Master Plan. The

Development agreement sets forth maximum project densities, location of densities, and developer-offered amenities.

- 3. The Flagstaff Mountain Annexation is approximately1,655 acres. Mixed-use development is limited to approximately 147 acres in four (4) development areas identified as Pods A, B-1, B-2 and D. The remainder of the annexation area is to be retained as passive and/or recreational open space.
- 4. The Development Agreement limits development in Pods A, B-1, B-2 to:
  No more than 705 Unit Equivalents in no more than 470 residential units (including not more than 60 PUD-style units) and no more than 16 single-family home sites;
  no more than 85,000 square feet of resort support commercial; and
  - a maximum 35,000 square foot day skier lodge in Pod B-2.
- 5. The Development Agreement required City review and approval of fourteen (14) technical reports/studies. The reports include details on the following information:
  - Mine/Soil Hazard Mitigation
  - Architectural Design Guidelines
  - Transit
  - Parking
  - Open Space Management
  - Historic Preservation
  - Emergency Response
  - Trails
  - Private Road Access Limitations
  - Construction Phasing
  - Infrastructure and Public Improvement Design
  - Utilities
  - Wildlife Management
  - Affordable Housing
- 6. The Planning Commission completed the review and approval process for the technical reports/studies on December 12, 2001.
- 7. This Master Plan for Pod A consists of a total of 321.5 units and 435.6 unit equivalents, including the previously approved Paintbrush, Larkspur, and Building H; the Transit Hub, ski lift and ski trails, and the location of the Alpine Club.
- 8. Over 65% of the residential units (minimum 306) are within Pod A and within walking distance of the Transit Hub as required by the Development Agreement.
- 9. The 14 technical reports/studies along with the Land Management Code and the Development Agreement (99-30) for the standard which the subject Master Planned Development and Phase 1 preliminary/final plat are reviewed.
- The applicant has provided supplemental materials including Master Plan Development Project Description (dated July 2004, Exhibit A), Supplemental Project Description and Conditions (dated July 5, 2004, Exhibit B), Volumetric Analysis (dated July 5, 2004, Exhibits D and E), Visual Analysis dated July 4, 2004 (Exhibit F), Architectural Character dated March 19, 2004 (Exhibit G), Supplemental Plans

including Building Height Diagram, Vegetative Buffer, Trails, and construction Sequencing (Exhibit H), and a Compliance Matrix with the Technical Reports (Exhibit I). Together with the Site Plans dated July 21, 2004, (Exhibit C), these Exhibits and this report comprise the Village at Empire Pass MPD.

- 11. The Village at Empire Pass MPD illustrates conceptual access and street layouts that have not been specifically approved by the City Engineer and the City Fire Marshall. Final road layout will be subject to individual Subdivisions and Conditional Use Permits.
- 12. Conditional Use Permit approval is required prior to any development within the Village at Empire Pass MPD area.
- 13. The proposed Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development includes a maximum density assignment and conceptual site design for Thirty (30) detached single-family PUD-style units utilizing 85.4 Unit Equivalents.
- 14. The proposed Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development includes a maximum density assignment and conceptual site design for Fifty-One (51) Townhouse units utilizing 64 Unit Equivalents. Eight of these Townhouse units are in a duplex configuration and count toward the PUD limits of 60.
- 15. The proposed Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development includes a conceptual site design for six (6) single-family homes.
- 16. Conservation Easements are proposed within platted lots. These Conservation Easement areas will not count toward the development acreage.
- 17. The PUD-style cluster homes and the Townhomes are to be platted as condominiums and not as individual lots.
- 18. Utility lines and ski trails will be routed in existing clearings and common utility corridors to the greatest extent practical upon the City Engineer's approval.
- 19. The Emergency Response Plan has been reviewed by the Chief Fire Marshall and the Planning Commission in order to allow fire access and safety at the end of the over-length cul-de-sac.
- 20. The Planning Commission may decrease setbacks within an MPD. Setback variance is shown on Sheet 10 of 10 of Exhibit A, dated June 15, 2004.
- 21. The Maximum Building Height in the RD District is 28 feet (33 feet with a pitched roof.
- 22. The Land Management Code, Section 15-6-5(E) allows the Planning Commission to consider increased building height based upon a site specific analysis and determination.
- 23. The applicant has requested additional building height for the structures proposed as Buildings 109, inclusive. The proposed building volumetrics are detailed on Exhibit D dated June 14, 2004.
- 24. The proposed increase in building height for Buildings 1-9 does not result in an increase in square footage or building volume over what could be allowed under the zone-required building height and density, including requirements for facade variation and design, but rather provides desired architectural variation.

- 25. Proposed Buildings 1-9 have been positioned to minimize visual impacts on adjacent structures. Potential problems on neighboring properties caused by shadows, loss of solar access, and loss of air circulation have been mitigated to the extent possible as defined by the Planning Commission.
- 26. The site plan for proposed Buildings 1-9 includes adequate landscaping and buffering from adjacent properties and uses.
- 27. The additional building height for proposed Buildings 1-9 has resulted in more minimum open space than required and has resulted in the open space being more usable.
- 28. An MPD for pod B-2 will be reviewed under a separate MPD application.

Conclusions of Law - Empire Pass

- 1. The MPD, as conditioned, complies with all the requirements of the Land Management Code.
- 2. The MPD, as conditioned, meets the minimum requirements of Section 15-6-5 of this Code.
- 3. The MPD, as conditioned, is consistent with the Park City General Plan.
- 4. The MPD, as conditioned, provides the highest value of open space as determined by the Planning Commission.
- 5. The MPD, as conditioned, strengthens and enhances the resort character of Park City.
- 6. The MPD, as conditioned, compliments the natural features on the Site and preserves significant features or vegetation to the extent possible.
- 7. The MPD, as conditioned, is compatible in use, scale, and mass with adjacent properties and promotes neighborhood compatibility.
- 8. The MPD provides amenities to the community so that there is no net loss of community amenities.
- 9. The MPD, as conditioned, is consistent with the employee Affordable Housing requirements as adopted by the City Council at the time the Application was filed.
- 10. The MPD, as conditioned, meets the provisions of the Sensitive Lands provisions of the Land Management Code. The project has been designed to place development on the most developable land and least visually obtrusive portions of the site.
- 11. The MPD, as conditioned, promotes the use of non-vehicular forms of transportation through design and by providing trail connections.
- 12. The MPD has been noticed and public hearings held in accordance with this Code.
- 13. The requirements necessary for the Planning Commission to grant additional building height within the MPD pursuant to the Land Management Code Section 15-6-5 have been met.

Conditions of Approval - Empire Pass

1. A Conditional Use Permit is required prior to any development within the Village at Empire Pass MPD area. As per the Phasing Plan, only the nine large multi-family
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes of July 28, 2004 Page 16

buildings require a CUP review by the Planning Commission. All other units are to be reviewed at a Staff level.

- 2. City Engineer approval of a utility and infrastructure plan is a condition precedent to the issuance of any building permits within the Village Master Planned Development area.
- 3. Utility lines and ski trails shall be routed in existing clearings and common utility corridors to the greatest extent practical upon the City Engineer's approval.
- 4. If and when the realigned Guardsman Road is dedicated to the City, the Developer will execute an encroachment agreement in a form acceptable to the City Attorney and City Engineer for the private improvements (ski bridges and/or tunnels) within the rights-of-way.
- 5. All essential municipal public utility buildings associated with the utility plan for the subdivision require a conditional use permit.
- 6. The proposed over-length cul de sac that ends in the six single-family lots will have a secondary emergency access from the end of the road to Marsac Avenue. The emergency access will continue as a minimum 20-foot-wide all-weather surface road.
- 7. A Construction Mitigation Plan, including truck routing, is a submittal requirement for each Conditional Use Permit.
- 8. A preliminary landscape plan, including provisions for water-efficient irrigation systems, shall be submitted with each CUP application.
- 9. All subsequent applications and approvals are subject to the Technical Reports as approved or amended.
- 10. The technical report updates and clarifications as presented in the staff report shall be incorporated in this approval.
- 7. Red Cloud Subdivision

Planner Robinson noted that Red Cloud, commonly called Pod D, is the third and final Empire Pass application. Thirty single-family lots are proposed on the land owned and controlled by Talisker and the United Park City Mine Company. At the July 14 work session, the Planning Commission discussed the Enchanted Forest and how to apply the statement in the development agreement that no development should occur in the Enchanted Forest. Planner Robinson understood there to be general consensus from the Commission that having a ski easement/conservation easement across an area to be determined would constitute adequate protection. The language will prohibit snowmobiles but will allow skiing in the winter for people coming off the Red Cloud lift. The other issue discussed on July 14 was whether to amend the development agreement and Exhibit A of the development agreement which shows the pod boundaries to move the boundaries further south and west. This would not change the density or average lot size. The Staff analyzed that proposal for separation from ski runs and a visual analysis, and it is the Staff's opinion that the development agreement would have to be amended to allow that to

# EXHIBIT G

EXHIBIT G





**CONSULTING ENGINEERS** 

LAND PLANNERS

SURVEYORS

12/10/15

Mr. Cassel Park City Engineer Po Box 1480 Park City Utah, 84060

RE: One Empire Pass storm water management

Dear Mr. Cassel:

As a follow up to our meeting on December 3, 2015, the purpose of this letter is to address the storm water management for the One Empire Pass lodge located on Lot 15, the Village at Empire Pass west side subdivision.

The master plan approval of Empire Pass and the subsequent infrastructure, including roads, utilities and a storm water detention pond occurred more or less between 2000 and 2007. The design for the detention pond located just south of the water tank in Empire Canyon (Daly Avenue) was to contain the increase runoff for the 100 year storm event due to the entire Empire Pass Development, which includes all of Village at Empire Pass, the development adjacent to the Northside chairlift at Deer Valley as well as the Montage and the Red Cloud Subdivision. The detention pond accounted for all hardscape areas of the development. The detention pond and the storm drain piping and inlets have been installed and the system is currently operating.

The proposed plan for One Empire Pass is to utilize the existing storm drain system for the driveway and south plaza area for storm water runoff as originally intended for the development. Portions of the building area, such as the north, east and west side of the building is proposed for on-site storm water detention and infiltration within the landscape areas outside of the building that is consistent with current Park City storm water management requirements.

The storm water management of One Empire Pass is consistent with the original and current Park City storm water management requirements and will utilize the storm drain and detention pond system as well as isolate areas of the new development for on-site detention and infiltration within the landscape areas.

Sincerely,

ALLIANCE ENGINEERING, INC.

Michael Demkowicz, PE

X:\empire\dwg\lot15vep\exhibits\OEPswm.doc Planning Commission Packet January 13, 2016 323 Main Street P.O. Box 2664

Park City, Utah 84060

435-649-9467

Page 361 of 406 435-649-9475





#### EXHTBTT H



Recorded at the request of and return to: Park City Municipal Corp. Attn: City Recorder P.O. Box 1480, Park City, UT 84060

AMENDED AND RESTATED DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR FLAGSTAFF MOUNTAIN, BONANZA FLATS, RICHARDSON FLATS, THE 20-Acre QUINN'S JUNCTION PARCEL AND IRON MOUNTAIN

/02/2007 02:42:51 PM B: 1850 P: 1897

/ 49

ALAN SPRIGGS SUMMIT COUNTY RECORDER FEE \$ 0.00 BY PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORP

ecment PAGE 1

0806100

THIS AMENDED AND RESTATED DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT ("Agreement") is entered into as of the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of March, 2007, by and between UNITED PARK CITY MINES COMPANY, ("UPCM" or "DEVELOPER"), DEER VALLEY RESORT COMPANY, ("DEER VALLEY"), and PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION, a third class city of the State of Utah ("City") (collectively, the "Parties").

#### RECITALS

WHEREAS, DEVELOPER and DEER VALLEY own approximately: 1,600 of Α. 1,750 acres of patented mining claims located in the unincorporated Flagstaff Mountain area of Summit County, more particularly described and depicted in Exhibit A attached hereto (hereafter. "Flagstaff Mountain"); approximately 106 acres of patented mining claims located on Iron Mountain within an unincorporated area of Summit County more particularly described and depicted in Exhibit B attached hereto (hereafter, "the Iron Mountain Parcels"); approximately 1.500 acres of patented mining claims, constituting all of UPCM's land located in the unincorporated Bonanza Flats area of Wasatch County more particularly described and depicted in Exhibit C attached hereto (hereafter, "Bonanza Flats"); all of UPCM's land east of U.S. 40 and south of S.R. 248 constituting approximately 650 acres of real property owned in fee simple located immediately east of U.S. 40 and south of S.R. 248 within an unincorporated area

. 1. . .

of Summit County more particularly described and depicted in Exhibit D attached hereto (hereafter, "Richardson Flats"); and approximately 20-Acres of real property owned in fee simple located west of U.S. 40 and south of S.R. 248 within an unincorporated area of Summit County more particularly described and depicted in Exhibit E attached hereto (hereafter, "the 20-Acre Quinn's Junction Parcel");

- B. WHEREAS, on May 17, 1994 DEVELOPER filed an application for annexation to Park City of Flagstaff Mountain, consisting of DEVELOPER's, DEER VALLEY's and Northside Neighborhood Property Owners' land, together totaling an area of approximately 1,750 acres;
  - C. WHEREAS, on May 10, 1997 the Park City Council unanimously resolved by Resolution 10-97 to annex Flagstaff Mountain under certain Development Parameters;
  - D. WHEREAS, on July 8, 1998 DEVELOPER requested reconsideration by the City of Resolution 10-97 and offered certain incentives for limiting development of the Bonanza Flats, Richardson Flats and the Iron Mountain Parcels;
- E. WHEREAS, on September 10, 1998 the Park City Council unanimously adopted a resolution to rescind Resolution No. 10-97 and to adopt new development parameters for Flagstaff Mountain, Bonanza Flats, Richardson Flats and the Iron Mountain Parcels, as set forth in this Agreement;
- F. WHEREAS, in the intervening months since the City Council adopted the September 10, 1998 development parameters, the DEVELOPER further refined its proposal by offering to move 16 single family homes from the sensitive Prospect Ridge area to the Mountain Village and to constrain development in the Northside Neighborhood to reduce site disturbance and to facilitate sale to a conservation buyer for a time certain;
- G. WHEREAS, the Parties intended to enter into the original Agreement to establish new development parameters for Flagstaff Mountain, Bonanza Flats. Richardson Flats, the 20-Acre Quinn's Junction Parcel, and the Iron Mountain Parcels and to establish a time certain for annexation of Flagstaff Mountain (now referred to generally as Empire Pass) into the City;

- WHEREAS, the Parties in fact entered into the original Agreement on or about June 24, 1999; and
- WHEREAS, the Parties desire to amend and restate the original Agreement in connection with the development of a project known as the Montage Resort & Spa which is presently planned to include 192 hotel rooms and suites, with spa, restaurant and conference facilities, and a residential component that consists of resort condominiums.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing recitals and the covenants hereafter set forth, the sufficiency of which the Parties hereby acknowledge, the Parties agree as follows:

#### SECTION I. DEFINITIONS

Unless the context requires a different meaning, any term or phrase used in this Agreement that has its first letter capitalized shall have that meaning given to it by the Park City Land Management Code (LMC) in effect on the date of a complete application or, if different, by this Agreement. Certain such terms and phrases are referenced below; others are defined where they appear in the text of this Agreement.

- Annexation Property" means that approximately 1,750 acres of property known as Flagstaff Mountain, described and depicted on Exhibit A.
- 1.2 "Bonanza Flats" means that approximately 1,500 acres of UPCM property commonly referred to as Bonanza Flats, consituting all of UPCM's holdings in Bonanza Flats and described and depicted on Exhibit C.
- 1.3 "DEER VALLEY" means the Deer Valley Resort Company, a Utah limited Partnership and each of its assigns, joint venture partners, and successors in interest, whether in whole or in part. DEER VALLEY shall cause its employees and agents to act in accordance with the terms of this Agreement.
- 1.4 "DEVELOPER" means United Park City Mines Company, a publicly traded Delaware corporation, and each of its assigns, joint venture partners, and successors in interest, whether in whole or in part. DEVELOPER shall cause its employees and agents to act in accordance

with the terms of this Agreement.

1.5 "Inaction" provisionally' means (a) DEVELOPER's failure to pursue a sequential permit (i.e. Small Scale MPD permit, conditional use permit, subdivision application, or building permit) by failing to submit a complete application for such a permit or by failing to respond to the City's written requests for information which the City deems is necessary to process the application; or (b) DEVELOPER's failure to sustain permitted construction such that the permit under which construction is allowed, expires or is otherwise suspended or revoked.

1.6 "Meeting Accessory Uses" provisionally<sup>2</sup> means uses normally associated and necessary to serve meeting and banquet space. Meeting Accessory Uses do not require the use of Unit Equivalents and include:

- 1.6.1 Administrative and Banquet Offices
- 1.6.2 Banquet Storage Areas
- 1.6.3 Banquet Prep Areas Storage Areas
- 1.6.4 Common A/V Storage Areas
- 1.6.5 Coat Check Areas
- 1.6.6 Public Restrooms
- 1.6.7 Public Telephone Areas
- 1.6.8 Public Hallways
- 1.6.9 Public Circulation Areas.
- 1.7 "Mountain Village" means that mixed-use portion of Flagstaff Mountain described and depicted as the Mountain Village in Exhibit A attached hereto and limited to a total of 87 acres, within three development Pods (A, B<sub>1</sub>, and B<sub>2</sub>) and maximum densities, unit equivalencies and configuration more fully described herein.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This definition has been inserted in anticipation of its inclusion in a new revision of the Land Management Code. This definition will be superceded by an LMC definition of the term.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> This definition has been inserted in anticipation of its inclusion in a new revision of the Land Management Code. This definition will be superceded by an LMC definition of the term.

- 1.8 "Northside Neighborhood" means that 63-acre portion of Flagstaff Mountain described and depicted as the Northside Neighborhood in Exhibit A attached hereto and limited to the maximum density, unit equivalency, and configuration more fully described herein.
- 1.9 "Northside Neighborhood Property Owners" means, in addition to UPCM and DEER VALLEY. Park City Star Mining Company, Inc., a Utah corporation, Bransford Land Company, representing the interests of Anne Bransford Newhall, Mary Bransford Leader and Carolyn Bransford MacDonald, and Stichting Beheer Mayflower Project, a legal entity representing the interests of Stichting Mayflower Recreational Fonds and of Stichting Mayflower Mountain Fonds.
- 1.10 "Pedestrian Village" means an area configured within Pod A of the Mountain Village for the mixed use of residential, Residential Accessory, Resort Support Commercial, Resort Accessory, meeting and Meeting Accessory Uses within which at least fifty percent (50%) of the residential properties are clustered within walking distance (5 minutes) of a Transportation Hub for such residential properties, which can be directly accessed by pathways or sidewalks.
- 1.11 "Planned Unit Development" or "PUD" means a master planned development consisting of clustered, detached, single family or duplex units with common open space and coordinated architecture.
  - 1.12 "Pod Z" means that area, depicted on Exhibit F that is limited for skirelated uses as further defined herein.
  - 1.13 "Project" means the residential, recreational and commercial real estate development to be constructed within Flagstaff Mountain.
  - 1.14 "Residential Accessory Uses" provisionally<sup>3</sup> means uses that are for the benefit of the residents of a commercial residential use, such as a hotel or nightly rental condominium project. Residential Accessory Uses do not require the use of Unit Equivalents. Residential Accessory Uses include:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> This definition has been inserted in anticipation of its inclusion in a new revision of the Land Management Code. This definition will be superceded by an LMC definition of the term.

- 1.14.1 Common Ski Lockers
  - 1.14.2 Common Lobbies
  - 1.14.3 Registration
  - 1.14,4 Concierge
  - 1.14.5 Bell Stand/Luggage Storage
  - 1.14.6 Common Maintenance Areas
  - 1.14.7 Mechanical Rooms
  - 1.14.8 Common Laundry Facilities and Common Storage Areas
  - 1.14.9 Employee Facilities
  - 1.14.10 Common Pools, Saunas and Hot Tubs
- 1.14.11 Public Telephone Areas
- 1.14.12 Public Restrooms
  - 1.14.13 Administrative Offices
    - 1.14.14 Public Hallways and Circulation Areas

1.15 "Resort Accessory Uses" provisionally<sup>4</sup> means uses that are clearly incidental to and customarily found in connection with the principal resort building or use and are operated for the convenience of the owners, occupants, employees, customers or visitors to the principal resort use. Resort Accessory Uses do not require the use of Unit Equivalents. They include such uses as:

- 1.15.1 Information
- 1.15.2 Lost and Found
- 1.15.3 Mountain Patrol
- 1.15.4 Mountain Administration
- 1.15.5 Mountain Maintenance and Storage Facilities
- 1.15.6 Mountain Patrol and Emergency Medical Facilities
- 1.15.7 Public Lockers
- 1.15.8 Public Restrooms
- 1.15.9 Employee Lockers
- 1.15.10 Ski School/Day Care

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> This definition has been inserted in anticipation of its inclusion in a new revision of the Land-Management Code. This definition will be superceded by an LMC definition of the term.

- 1.15.11 Ticket Sales Areas
- 1.15.12 Ski Check Areas
- 1.15.13 Public Circulation Areas and Hallways
- 1.16 "Richardson Flats" means all of UPCM's property at the southeast corner of U.S. 40 and S.R. 248, more fully described and depicted on Exhibit D.
- 1.17 "Transportation Hub" means the terminus of a public and/or private transportation system that is located at a convenient location within the Mountain Village.
- 1.18 "Unit Equivalent," with respect to commercial structures and multifamily and PUD structures, has the meaning set forth in the LMC.<sup>5</sup> Each single family residential structure (excluding PUDs) approved by the City pursuant to this Agreement for construction within the Project shall have a Unit Equivalent of 1.00, regardless of the size or the location of the single family residential structure. Each commercial structure or portion thereof (as such may be determined in applicable MPD approvals) shall consume 1 Unit Equivalent for each 1000 square feet. Each multifamily and PUD residential structure shall consume 1 Unit Equivalent for each 2000 square feet.

#### SECTION II. LARGE SCALE MPD-FLAGSTAFF MOUNTAIN

2.1. DEVELOPER is hereby granted the equivalent of a Large Scale Master Planned Development (Large Scale MPD) for Flagstaff Mountain. This Large Scale MPD sets forth maximum densities, location of densities and DEVELOPER-offered amenities and is subject to all normally-applicable City processes, and in addition thereto, such processes defined below, including DEVELOPER's responsibility, prior to or concurrent with the Small Scale MPD process, to submit and ultimately to obtain (upon modification, if necessary) City approval, of satisfactory plans detailed below:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Hotel rooms of 500 square feet or less constitute ¼ Unit Equivalent.

- 2.1.1. Mine/Soil Hazard Mitigation Plan--which plan shall include an inventory of all mine sites, potential sources of release of hazardous materials into the environment, and a plan and schedule for their remediation;
- Detailed Design Guidelines, with strong architectural themes, for the entire Flagstaff Mountain Project;
- 2.1.3. Specific Transit Plan:
- 2.1.4. Parking Management Plan:
- 2.1.5. Detailed Open Space Management Plan;
- 2.1.6. Historic Preservation Plan:
- 2.1.7. Emergency Response Plan, including DEVELOPER's commitments to provide infrastructure necessary to serve the Project and Bonanza Flats and phasing therefor;
- Trails Master Plan setting forth trail locations, specifications, phasing and timing of public easements;
- 2.1.9. Private Road Access Limitation Procedures;
- 2.1.10. Construction Phasing Plan—including construction milestones for project amenities, including Richardson Flats development;
- 2.1.11. General Infrastructure and Public Improvements Design and Phasing Plan, which calls for the efficient extension of services, concentrating initial infrastructure development in the Mountain Village, and secondarily in the Northside Neighborhood. Such plan shall allow for the construction of a variety of housing types in each phase;
- 2.1.12. Utilities Master Plan—including the timing, alignment and service strategy for water and sewer service, as well as storm water management throughout the Project and Bonanza Flats;
- 2.1.13. Wildlife Management Plan; and
- 2.1.14. Affordable Housing Plan, including phasing.
- 2.2. Maximum Development Parameters--Flagstaff Mountain. Flagstaff Mountain is composed of the Mountain Village, the Northside

Neighborhood; various ski related improvements, and the Silver Mine Adventure. Upon annexation, Flagstaff Mountain will be zoned as shown on the zoning map attached hereto as Exhibit P. The following maximum development parameters apply to Flagstaff Mountain:

- 2.2.1 Mountain Village: The Mountain Village is constrained as follows:
  - 2.2.1.1 Small Scale MPD. Site specific volumetrics and configuration will be established in the Small Scale MPD process.
  - 2.2.1.2. Maximum Development Area. In the Small Scale MPD process, the entire Mountain Village development shall be constrained within a total of 87 acres.
  - 2.2.1.3. Maximum Density. The maximum density within the Mountain Village is 785 Unit Equivalents configured in no more than 550 dwelling units.<sup>6</sup> Such density shall be configured as multi-family, hotel, or PUD units, provided the PUD units do not exceed 60. PUD units consume Unit Equivalents in the same respect as multifamily units. Additionally, the Mountain Village may contain up to 16 detached single family home sites.
  - 2.2.1.4. Pedestrian Village. At least 50% of the residential units within the Mountain Village must be clustered within the primary development pod (Pod A), and must be located within a five-minute walk of the Transportation Hub. All three development pods (Pods A, B<sub>1</sub>, and B<sub>2</sub>) within the Mountain Village must be linked by transit.
  - 2.2.1.5. Commercial. The Mountain Village may additionally include up to 75,000-sq. ft. of Resort Support Commercial uses, which shall include Neighborhood

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Hotel rooms of 500 square feet or less constitute ½ Unit Equivalent. In the case of the Montage, the 192 Montage hotel rooms shall count as Unit Equivalents at the rate of 1 Unit Equivalent per 2,000 square feet of hotel rooms, but such hotel rooms shall not have kitchens and shall not count as dwelling units.

Convenience Commercial uses for residents and visitors such as groceries and sundries.

- 2.2.1.6. Mine Site Reclamation. To the greatest extent possible. DEVELOPER shall locate density in disturbed areas. This provision applies primarily to potential density at the Daly West site. Additionally, DEVELOPER shall reclaim<sup>7</sup> all mining and mining overburden sites within Flagstaff Mountain, in accordance with state and federal regulatory agency review.
- 2.2.1.7. Public Trails. DEVELOPER shall construct and dedicate public trails designated on an accepted Trails Master Plan. Many trails will be constructed on land ultimately owned by DEER VALLEY. In those areas, DEER VALLEY shall be responsible for trail maintenance and for enforcing reasonable rules and regulations for public trail use. Such rules may not exclude free public access to the public trail systems identified on the Trails Master Plan.
  - 2.2.1.8. Deed Restricted Open Space. Within 30 days of issuance of a Small Scale MPD, DEVELOPER and/or DEER VALLEY shall execute for the benefit of the City perpetual covenants and restrictions with respect to all designated open space associated with the Small Scale MPD and which, at a minimum, shall prevent the construction thereon of residential, commercial and retail structures but shall provide for ski-related uses consistent with paragraph 2.5 herein.
  - 2.2.1.9. Parking. Each Small Scale MPD submittal shall include a parking management plan with respect to the portion of the property covered by such Small Scale MPD submittal.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Reclamation shall include, at a minimum, revegetation of exposed areas.

The goal of the plan is to design the Mountain Village in such a way as to reduce parking demand by 25%. DEVELOPER shall plan and encourage within the Mountain Village portion of the Project programs such as parking management, paid parking for commercial uses, shuttles and other programs designed to reduce the demand for private vehicles and parking. DEVELOPER shall provide for shared parking in all commercial, shortterm residential and mixed-use buildings. Assigned or reserved spaces within commercial, short-term residential and mixed-use buildings are prohibited except that in the case of the Montage, one parking space may be assigned for each dwelling unit (excluding the 192 hotel rooms). The majority of the required parking areas will be fully enclosed and/or constructed underground.

Prospect Ridge. DEVELOPER considers the Prospect Ridge area depicted in Exhibit K to be a critical viewshed area for Old Town.

- 2.3.1 Public Trails. Consistent with the Trails Mater Plan, DEVELOPER shall construct and dedicate to the City public trails designated within the Prospect Ridge area.
- 2.3.2 Deed Restricted Open Space. Within 30 days of issuance of the first Small Scale MPD, DEVELOPER shall cause to be recorded a document, approved by the City, which shall impose perpetual covenants and use restrictions for that portion of Prospect Ridge depicted as "Recreation Open Space Dedication" on Exhibit K which shall prevent the construction thereon of residential, commercial and/or retail structures, ski lifts, and developed alpine ski runs.
- 2.4. Northside Neighborhood. The Northside Neighborhood is composed of property owned by five separate Northside Neighborhood Property Owners and, upon their written acceptance of the terms of this Agreement,

2.3

16







Master Plan - Summer

May 6, 2004

HART HOWERTON

THE VILLAGE AT EMPIRE PASS Park City, Utab

#### Empire Pass within Flagstaff Development Agreement Density Summary

#### 1. Residential

ocation	Building		Average Sq Ft	Туре	MF Total Net	MF Unit Equivalent	Total MF Units	Total MF Units as	Total Single	
Pod	or lot	Desc.	per Unit		sq ft	total per proj	Lodge, PUD, TH	PUDs	Family	Notes
	COMPLETE		1 740							
A	2	Shooting Star	1,719	Lodge	36,109			0	(	
Å	5*	East West One Empire Pass (aka Snowberry)	2,427	Lodge	65,537			0		Plus 1 ADA unit plus 1 EHU (Employee Housing U
Å	6	Silver Strike (Koson)	2,097	Lodge	71,305			0		Plus 1 ADA unit plus 2 EHU.
A	6	Flagstaff Lodge	1,987	Lodge	73,506			0		Plus 1 EHU.
A	8	Arrowleaf A	1,659	Lodge	46,458			0		Plus 3 EHU
A	9	Arrowleaf B	1,741	Lodge	48,746			0		Plus 2 ADA
A	Н	Grand Lodge	2,420	Lodge	65,344			0	(	Plus 1 ADA unit
A	13-30	Belles (aka Friends of Bannerwood) PUD	5,294	PUD	90,000	45.0		17	(	Max SF per PSA. 17 homes platted.
A	1-12	Paintbrush PUD style	5,256	PUD	63,074	31.6		12	(	Includes garages over 600 sf
A	1-15	Larkspur East Townhouses	3,246	TH	48,696	24.4	15	6		Duplex TH use two PUDs.
A	21-32	Larkspur West Townhouses	3,439	TH	41,273	20.7	12	0	(	
A	SF	Bannerwood- Single Family	10,000	SF			0	0	e	31 SF = 1 UE
B1	Lot B	Nakoma (aka Spagot) PUD style	5,294	PUD	90,000	45.0	17	17		Max SF per PSA. 17 homes platted.
B1	Lot C	Ironwood Townhouses	3,223	TH	74,130	37.1	23	0	(	Plus 1 EHU. Platted as 24 units, but two combined
B1		Northside Village- Single Family		SF			0	0		1 SF = 1 UE
npire Villa	age Subtota	I (Pods A and B1)			814,178	407.6	298	52	16	
D		Red Cloud Subdivision all Single Family	10,000	SF					30	1 SF = 1 UE
		(not part of the MV)								All platted, 8 built/being built (6 COs)- double check
B2	West	Montage Hotel 174 rooms	809		100.150					n onen Markenanden an en
B2	West	Montage 81 Condos	2,812		139,150	All and a second se		0		Counts as 1 CO
2 Subtotal		Montage of Condos	2,012		227,800			0		As built stats from condo map.
Subiola					366,950	183.5	81	0	C	All built and platted
ountain Vi	illage (Pods	A, B1 and B2)			all MF	all MF	all MF F	UD MF	SF	4
Totals Density Platted or Sold (includes One Empire Pass)					1,181,128	591.1	379	52	16	1
MV only Development Agreement Limits					1,570,000	785.0	550	60	16	
172		Density = 179 units			388,873			8	0	1

Totals Certificates of Occupancy with One Empire Pass (without One Empire Pass) = 395 (368)

MF= 346

SF= 22

Notes: 1. The remaining unplatted and/or unbuilt buildings are Empire Village Sites 1 (Tower Residence), 3, 4, and 5 (One Empire Pass); Nakoma (4 left); Belles (3 left); Marsac Horseshoe (TH); VEMP-1-1 and VEMP-1-2 (TH); and POD B2 East (MF). Larkspur "18-20" will not be built by EWP as EW used density elsewhere and recorded no-build restriction on land. Ironwood was originally platted as 24 units but 2 were combined. Nakoma and Belles each platted as 17 units (45 UE).

2. Net Square Footage refers to the interior square footage of a condominium (that which is privately owned) and excludes exterior hallways, and other common and limited common space within the building.

3. Total UE (built/platted) in Pods A, B1 and B2 = 607.1 Total UE (built/platted) in Pod A (includes One Empire Pass) = 331.5 (>50%)

Total Units Pods A, B1, B2, (minus 3 Belles, 4 Nak Plus 6 CO issued in Pod D

Page 378 of 406

## Planning Commission Staff Report



Application #s:PL-15-03003Subject:One Empire PassAuthor:Kirsten Whetstone, AICP, Sr. PlannerDate:January 13, 2016Type of Item:Legislative - Condominium Record of Survey Plat

#### Summary Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing, consider public input, and forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the One Empire Pass Condominiums record of survey plat. Staff has prepared findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval for the Commission's consideration.

<b>Description</b>	
Applicant:	Guardsman Lodge, LLC, represented by Bill Fiveash, managing partner
Location:	8910 Empire Club Drive- Pod A, Lot 15 Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision (Building 5)
Zoning:	Residential Development (RD) District as part of the Flagstaff Annexation and Master Planned Development
Adjacent Land Uses:	Deer Valley Resort, condominiums, townhouses, and other development parcels of the Village at Empire Pass Pod A

#### **Background**

On June 24, 1999, Council adopted Ordinance 99-30 and Resolution 20-99 approving the annexation and development agreement for the 1,655 acre Flagstaff Mountain Area. Resolution 20-99 granted the equivalent of a "large-scale" master planned development (MPD) and set forth the types and locations of land use; maximum densities; timing of development; development approval process; as well as development conditions and amenities for each parcel. The Flagstaff Development Agreement was amended on March 2, 2007.

On July 28, 2004, the Planning Commission approved a MPD for the Village at Empire Pass (Pods A and B1), known as the Village Master Planned Development (VMPD) amended to include Pod B2 (Montage). As part of the 2004 Commission review of the VMPD, volumetric diagrams for the buildings within the VMPD Pod A were approved. A height exception was granted for Building 5 per these volumetric diagrams. (See CUP report for these Exhibits).

Six buildings have been built, namely Shooting Star, Silver Strike, Flagstaff Lodge (was Snowberry Lodge), Arrowleaf A and Arrowleaf B, and Grand Lodge. Additionally, Larkspur East and Larkspur West and Ironwood Townhouses (attached homes) have been constructed. Paintbrush, Belles, and Nakoma PUD style homes, as well as 6 Bannerwood and 10 Northside single-family homes have been platted and are constructed. Four of the large lodge style buildings remain, including the proposed One Empire Bass-buildingua There, are also approximately 24 attached homes remainings to of 406 be approved and constructed as part of the VMPD.

The VMPD was the first step in the development process for Pod A. The purpose of the VMPD was to establish unit mix and density for the Mountain Village, as well as addressing overall project infrastructure throughout the Annexation Area. The VMPD established building volumes, density, and location. The VMPD allows up to 65,537 sf of residential floor area on this Lot. The total residential floor area, excluding the affordable and ADA units, is 64,374 sf (32.19 UE).

The subsequent Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) required by the VMPD and subdivision plat, for each multi-family parcel and/or building are intended to provide final architectural review by the Park City Planning Department Staff and Planning Commission and to demonstrate compliance with the Village MPD and Large Scale MPD (LSMPD) documented in Flagstaff Annexation and Development Agreement.

The Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision plat was approved by Council in 2005 and recorded at Summit County on August 12, 2005 (Exhibit C). This subdivision platted Lots 12-18 of the VMPD. The One Empire Pass CUP is proposed to be located on Lot 15 of the Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision. Lot 15 consists of 50,999 square feet of lot area. The Village at Empire West Side Subdivision notes require compliance with RD zone setbacks, approval of a CUP for each building prior to issuance of a building permit, a declaration of condominium and a record of survey prior to individual sale of units, requires membership of the owner in the Empire Pass Master Home Owner's Association (HOA), identifies Empire Club Drive as a private street, plats a 20' snow storage easement along the street frontages, requires water efficient landscape, and includes other utility and maintenance provisions.

On November 13, 2015, the Planning Department received an application for a Condominium Record of Survey plat (Exhibit A) for a twenty seven unit residential building to be located on Lot 15 of the Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision (Exhibit C). The building is identified as Building 5 on the Village at Empire Pass MPD. The application was deemed complete on November 20, 2015. An application for a CUP was submitted on October 26, 2015, and is being reviewed concurrent with the record of survey plat. An existing conditions survey, aerial photo, and photos of the site were also submitted with the application (Exhibits B and D).

### <u>Purpose</u>

The purpose of the Residential Development (RD) Zoning District is to:

(A) allow a variety of Residential Uses that are Compatible with the City's Development objectives, design standards, and growth capabilities,

(B) encourage the clustering of residential units to preserve natural Open Space, minimize Site disturbance and impacts of Development, and minimize the cost of municipal services,

(C) allow commercial and recreational activities that are in harmony with residential neighborhoods,

(D) minimize impacts of the automobile on architectural design, Planning Commission Packet January 13, 2016 (E) promote pedestrian connections within Developments and between adjacent Areas; and

(F) provide opportunities for variation in architectural design and housing types.

### Land Management Code (LMC) and Village MPD Analysis

The proposal complies with lot and site requirements of the RD Zoning District as described below.

	RD Zoning District and/or Village at Empire Pass MPD
Lot Size	No minimum lot size. Lot 15 is 1.17 acres (50,999 square feet)
Building Footprint- Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	Density is per the Flagstaff Annexation and Development Agreement and Village and Empire Pass MPD. Building 5 site was sold with up to 65,537 net residential square feet (32.8 UE). The proposed CUP is for 27 units (64,374 sf, utilizing 32.19 unit equivalents (UE). Density is based on 1 UE is equivalent to 2,000 sf of residential floor area. The Flagstaff Annexation and Development Agreement tracks both UEs (each 2,000 sf) as well as total number of units. The gross building is 113,293 sf, including the parking garage, mechanical, circulation, common areas, storage, and other common areas that do not use UE.
Front yard setbacks	25 feet to front facing garage, 20 feet to building. Minimum of 25 foot front setbacks are proposed.
Rear yard setbacks	15 feet. Minimum of 15 foot rear setbacks are proposed.
Side yard setbacks	12 feet. Minimum of 12 foot side setbacks are proposed.

Building Height	Per Village MPD Volumetric and Height Exception Diagrams (See CUP report) For Building 5, 20% of the building was permitted to reach 80' above existing grade, 55% of the building to reach 92' above existing grade, and 25% of the building to reach 74' above existing grade. The volumetric diagram allows Building 5 to be four to six stories.
Parking	The Transit and Parking Management Plan requires a 25% reduction in parking from what would be normally required by the LMC. Based on unit sizes, fifty-five (55) spaces would be required for the 27 units based and one ADA unit. The 25% reduction is 42 spaces. The underground parking structure will have 38 spaces and 4-6 surface spaces will be provided near the front drop-off area.
Architectural Design	All construction is subject to Village at Empire Pass Design Review Board approval and LMC Chapter 15-5- Architectural Design Guidelines with final review conducted at the time of the Building Permit.
Residential Units	27 units ranging in size from 1,140 sf to 3,164 sf, one 900 sf affordable housing unit, and one 944 sf ADA unit.
Commercial space	No commercial space is proposed.
Support space	Common amenity areas are provided for the unit owners, including storage areas, locker rooms, fitness area, lounge and lobby areas, children's room, and small business center areas.

Density Summary	The Mountain Village (Pods A, B1 and B2) was approved for a maximum of 785 UE of multi-family (550 multifamily units) and 16 single family units. A maximum of 60 PUD style units (i.e. Belles, Paintbrush, and Nakoma) were approved as part of the overall multi-family units. To date 352 multi-family units (558.3 UE) (of which 52 are PUD style units) and 16 single family units have been platted
	and/or built. Constructed lodge style buildings include Shooting Star, Silver Strike, Flagstaff, Arrowleaf A and B, and Grand Lodge. Still to be approved are Tower Residences (Building 1), Building 3, Building 4, and subject property One Empire Pass, aka Building 5.
	There is sufficient remaining density in the MPD (226.7 UE), or 198 units, to accommodate the density of Building 5 (31.8 UE) as 27 units in a lodge style building.

This application meets the requisite subdivision requirements of Title 15-7 of the Park City Municipal Code and is consistent with the CUP application for One Empire Pass Lodge.

The total residential square footage is 64,374 sf, utilizing 32.2 Unit Equivalents (UEs). In addition, an Employee Housing Unit (EHU) of 900 square feet (Unit #104) and one ADA accessible unit of 944 square feet (Unit #103) are provided. The applicant requests that the EHU unit be platted as private space so that the unit can be managed and rented out by the project owners/applicant rather than turn it over to the 27 members of the future HOA. The applicant has had good success leasing the affordable units in their other buildings, typically to a manager of the property or to someone employed in the Empire Pass area. A deed restriction for the EHU unit, acceptable to the City, is a Condition of Approval prior to plat recordation. The deed restriction should outline and resolve concerns that may have come up on other affordable units platted as private. The ADA unit is platted as Common Area.

Parking is provided at 75% of the Code requirement consistent with the Development Agreement that requires a 25% reduction in parking.

Staff finds good cause for this record of survey as this condominium plat is consistent with the development pattern envisioned in the MPD and the 14 Technical Reports. Planning Commission Packet January 13, 2016 Page 3

#### **Department Review**

This application has gone through an interdepartmental review. Issues raised at the review have been addressed with revisions to the application and conditions of approval.

#### **Notice**

The property was posted and notices were mailed to property owners within 300 feet on December 23, 2015. A legal notice was published in the Park Record on December 26, 2015. No public input has been received at the time of this report.

#### **Alternatives**

- The Planning Commission may forward a positive recommendation to City Council to approve the Condominium Record of Survey plat for One Empire Pass Condominiums, as conditioned or amended, or
- 2. The Planning Commission may forward a negative recommendation to deny the Condominium Record of Survey plat and direct staff to make Findings for this decision, or
- 3. The Planning Commission may continue the discussion on the Condominium Record of Survey plat One Empire Pass Condominiums to a date certain and provide Staff and the applicant with direction regarding additional information needed in order to make a recommendation to City Council.

#### **Significant Impacts**

There are no significant fiscal or environmental impacts from this application that have not been mitigated with the Flagstaff Agreement and Master Planned Development conditions and recommended conditions of approval.

#### Consequences of not taking the Suggested Recommendation

The units could not be separately sold.

#### **Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing, consider public input, and forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the One Empire Pass Condominiums record of survey plat. Staff has prepared findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval for the Commission's consideration.

#### <u>Exhibits</u>

#### Ordinance

- Exhibit A Proposed record of survey plat
- Exhibit B Existing Conditions
- Exhibit C Subdivision plat
- Exhibit D Photos of the Site

Note- for other Exhibits please refer to the Staff Report and Exhibits for the One Empire Pass Conditional Use Permit in this same packet.

#### Ordinance 16-

#### AN ORDINANCE APPROVING THE ONE EMPIRE PASS CONDOMINIUMS RECORD OF SURVEY PLAT LOCATED AT 8910 EMPIRE CLUB DRIVE, PARK CITY, UTAH.

WHEREAS, the owners of the property known as the One Empire Pass, located at 8910 Empire Club Drive, Lot 15 of the Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision, have petitioned the City Council for approval of the One Empire Pass Condominiums record of survey; and

WHEREAS, the property was noticed on December 26, 2015 and posted on December 23, 2015, according to the requirements of the Land Management Code; and

WHEREAS, proper legal notice was sent to all affected property owners on December 23, 2015; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on January 13, 2016, to receive input on the One Empire Pass Condominiums record of survey;

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission, on January 13, 2016, forwarded a recommendation to the City Council; and,

WHEREAS, on February 10, 2016, the City Council held a public hearing on the One Empire Pass Condominiums record of survey; and

WHEREAS, it is in the best interest of Park City, Utah to approve the One Empire Pass Condominiums record of survey.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of Park City, Utah as follows:

**SECTION 1. APPROVAL.** The above recitals are hereby incorporated as findings of fact. The One Empire Pass Condominiums record of survey as shown in Exhibit A is approved subject to the following Findings of Facts, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

#### Findings of Fact:

- 1. The One Empire Pass Condominiums are proposed on Lot 15 of the Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision, within Pod A of the Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development.
- 2. The property is located at 8910 Empire Club Drive.
- 3. The property is in the Residential Development (RD) Zoning District.
- 4. The property is subject to the Flagstaff Mountain Annexation and Development Agreement approved by City Council per Resolution No. 99-30 on June 24, 1999 as amended on March 2, 2007.

- 5. On July 28, 2004, the Planning Commission approved a Master Planned Development for the Village at Empire Pass (Village MPD) (Pods A and B1) within the Flagstaff Mountain Annexation and Development area. The MPD (known as Mountain Village) was amended to include Pod B2 (Montage).
- 6. The Mountain Village (Pods A, B1 and B2) was approved for a maximum of 785 UE of multi-family (550 multi-family units) and 16 single-family units. A maximum of 60 PUD style units (i.e. Belles, Paintbrush, and Nakoma) were approved as part of the overall multi-family units.
- 7. To date 352 multi-family units (558.3 UE) (of which 52 are PUD style units) and 16 single family units have been platted and/or built within the Mountain Village.
- 8. Constructed lodge style buildings include Shooting Star, Silver Strike, Flagstaff, Arrowleaf A and B, and Grand Lodge. Condominium record of survey plats have been approved and recorded for these buildings.
- 9. Still to be approved as Conditional Use Permits are Tower Residences (Building 1), Building 3, Building 4, and subject property One Empire Pass, as Building 5.
- 10. A Conditional Use Permit application for One Empire Pass, aka Building 5 was received on October 26, 2015 and is being reviewed concurrently with this application.
- 11. There is sufficient remaining density (226.7 UE), or 198 units, to accommodate the density of Building 5 (31.8 UE) as 27 units in a lodge style building.
- 12. Approximately 368 certificates of occupancy for the entire Flagstaff Annexation and Development area (Pods A, B1, B2, and D) have been issued. According to the Annexation and Development Agreement, the affordable housing obligations come due for each 150 certificates of occupancy. The next housing obligation trigger point is 450 certificates of occupancy. The 27 certificates of occupancy for One Empire Pass would bring the total to 395 certificates of occupancy.
- 13. On November 13, 2015, the Planning Department received an application for a Condominium Record of Survey plat for the 27 unit residential building to be located on Lot 15 of the Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision.
- 14. The application was deemed complete on November 20, 2015.
- 15. The Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision was approved by Council in 2005 and recorded at Summit County on August 12, 2005. Lot 15 consists of 50,999 square feet of lot area and is currently undeveloped.
- 16. The property is subject to subdivision plat notes that require compliance with RD District zone setbacks, approval of a Conditional Use Permit for each building prior to issuance of a building permit, a declaration of condominium and a record of survey plat prior to individual sale of units, membership in the Empire Pass Master HOA, identifies Empire Club Drive as a private street, plats a 20' snow storage easement along the street frontages, requires water efficient landscape, and includes other utility and maintenance provisions.
- 17. The proposed One Empire Pass Lodge building is a multi-story building with 27 residential units ranging in size from 1,140 sf to 3,164 sf, one 900 sf affordable housing unit, and one 944 sf ADA unit. The ADA unit is platted as Common Area. The affordable unit is platted as Private Area and a deed restriction acceptable to the City will be recorded prior to recordation of the plat.

- 18. The proposed gross building area, including parking and all common areas is 113,293 square feet. The total residential area subject to Unit Equivalents is 64,374 square feet utilizing 32.19 Unit Equivalents. Common amenities areas (exercise and recreation rooms, ski lockers, locker rooms, etc. are proposed at the south end of levels one and two. No commercial uses are proposed.
- 19. The Transit and Parking Management Plan requires a 25% reduction in parking from what would be normally required by the LMC. Based on unit sizes, 55 spaces would be required for the 27 units based and one ADA unit. The 25% reduction is 42 spaces. The underground parking structure will have 38 spaces and 4-6 surface spaces will be provided near the front drop-off area.
- 20. The elevation and climate of Flagstaff creates a harsh environment for utilities and their maintenance.
- 21. The maximum Building Height in the RD District is 28 feet (33 feet with a pitched roof). A height exception was approved with the Village Master Plan Development. Specific volumetric diagrams were approved for each Building Site. For Building 5, 20% of the building was permitted to reach 80' above existing grade, 55% of the building to reach 92' above existing grade, and 25% of the building to reach 74' above existing grade. The volumetric diagram allows Building 5 to be four to six stories.
- 22. The proposed building complies with the granted height exceptions and percentages, number of stories, and required vertical and horizontal articulation. The proposed building is 11.5' to 15' lower than the 80' allowance (20% of the building), approximately 9'-8" below the 92' allowance (55% of the building), and approximately 5' lower than the 74' allowance (25% of the building).
- 23. The building complies with all RD District zone setbacks maintaining a 25' front setback, 12' side setbacks, and 15' rear setbacks.
- 24. A Master Homeowners Association document and Maintenance Agreement for the Mountain Village were reviewed and approved by the City prior to issuance of building permits for buildings within the Mountain Village. This property is also subject to these documents, in addition to any declaration of condominium and CCRs recorded with the condominium plat.
- 25. Staff finds good cause for this record of survey plat as the proposed condominium building and development is consistent with the development pattern envisioned in the MPD and the 14 Technical Reports.

### Conclusions of Law:

- 1. There is good cause for this record of survey.
- 2. The record of survey is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding condominium plats.
- 3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed record of survey.
- 4. Approval of the record of survey, 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 record of survey 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 record of survey plat 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 written request for an extension is submitted to the City prior to the expiration date and the City Council grants an extension.
- 3. The record of survey plat will note that all conditions of approval of the Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development, the Village at Empire Pass West Side subdivision plat, and the One Empire Pass Conditional Use Permit shall continue to apply.
- 4. A deed restriction for the Employee Housing Unit acceptable to the City is required prior to plat recordation. The plat will note that the EHU is subject to a deed restriction. The CCRs shall reflect a lower par-value to reflect the reduced cost of the unit (or exempt the unit from HOA fees) to ensure that the unit doesn't lose its affordability due to HOA fees.
- 5. The plat will note the Employee Housing Unit and the ADA accessible unit.

**SECTION 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.** This Ordinance shall take effect upon publication.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of February, 2016.

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

Jack Thomas, Mayor

ATTEST:

Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Mark Harrington, City Attorney

#### <u>Exhibits</u>

Exhibit A – Proposed record of survey plat



SURVEYOR'S IFICATE EXHIBIT A	
I, Marlin A. Marrison, certify that I am a Registered Land Surveyor and that I hold Certificate No. 739, as prescribed by the laws of the State of Utah, and that by authority of the anners, I have ared this Record of Survey map of ONE EMPIRE PASS CONDOMINIUMS has been prepared under my tion and that the same has been or will be manumented on the ground as shown on this plat. I er certify that the information on this plat is accurate.	
er certify that the information on this plot is accurate.	
LEGAL DESCRIPTION	I
LOT 15, THE VILLAGE AT EMPIRE PASS WEST SIDE, according to the official plat thereof e and of record in the office of the Summit County Recorder.	
OWNER'S DEDICATION AND CONSENT TO RECORD	
KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS that <u>(Company Name)</u> , LLC, a limited liability company, the undersigned owner of the herein described of land, to be known hereafter as <u>does hereby</u> that it has caused this Plat Amendment to be prepared, and does hereby int to the recordation of this Plat.	
In witness whereof, the undersigned set his/her hand this day of	
Manager LLC, a limited liability company	
ACKNOWLEDGMENT	
y of)	
On this day of 2015,	
On this day of 2015,	
e is the managing member of LLC, a LLC, a limited liability company, and that he/she signed the above Owner's attion and Consent to Record freely and voluntarily.	
tion and consent to Record Treely and voluntarily.	
ory Public commissioned in	
d Nome	
ng in:	
mmission expires:	
dimensions of the private spaces and equiper feotage colculations are based on drawings supplied by IBI Group. The square footages we an this plot area calculated in accordance with the Utah Condomnhum Act and the Declaration of Condominium for One Empire S.A. Utah Condominium Project. Such colculations typically differs accmeantal from the square footage determined by the architect or structed, different matheds of determining unit size. It is the Intent that the private ownership area of the units will be as structed.	
common structural elements are designated as Common Areas and Facilities, as described in the Declaration of Condominium	
ding lies on this sheet are from the property line to the building foundation as shown. Common Area and Facilities is dedicated as non-exclusive ensembed in Park City Municipal Consecutive. Society, S	
Common Area and Facilities is dedicated as non-exclusive essement to Park City Municipal Corporation, Snyderville Basin Water Jonation District. Park City Fire Service District, and Summit County for the purpose of providing access for utility and droklage alfalian, use, maintenance, and eventual replesement.	
ess to the units is by private roads and is not warranted by Park City. units of One Empire Pass Condominium Development are served by a Common Privats Lateral Wastewater Line. The Empire Pass lef Omerá Association, inc. (he "Moster Association") shall be responsible for the maintenance and replacement of sold Private and Association, inc. or part of the common separase.	
ers Association, inc. or port of the common segments. property comers at Empire Club Drive are set at the intersection of the 9.5' wide public and private utility easement and the lot of as shown hereon.	
or as shown hereon. 104: Deed Restricted Employee/Alfordable Housing Unit (Entl).	
conditions of opproval of the Village at Empire Pass (Pod A) Master Planned Development, the Village at Empire Pase West Side Swision Plat, and the One Empire Pase Conditional Use Permit shall continue to apply.	
the time of resurfacing of Empire Club Drive, the Master Association shall be responsible to adjust westewater manholes to grade adding to Snyderville Basin Water Rectamation District Standarde.	
Ski Ecesament and Skiwoy Buffer Zone shown on this pilot identifies certain partion of the Common Area that may be used for mer and whiter access to trails, aki runs, and other adjacent recreation areas. The Ski Ecesament and Skiway Buffer Zone may be i by all owners of The Village at Empire Pass development, and as atherwise permitted in the Declaration of Condominium for One	
527.73' White Scoula Minus conta	
NUV 1 3 2015	
PLAUNING DEPT.	
M Pierzs conies	
20' 0 20' 40'	
SHEET 1 OF 10	
11/12/13 JOB NO.: 15-9-15 FILE: X:\Empire\dwg\srv\plo12015\150915.dwg	
CERTIFICATE OF ATTEST RECORDED CERTIFY THIS RECORD OF SURVEY STATE OF UTAH, COUNTY OF SUMMIT, AND FILED	
MAP WAS APPROVED BY PARK CITY COUNCIL THIS DAY	
OF 2016 DATE TIME ENTRY NO	
BY PARK CITY RECORDER FEE Page 389 of 406	
, IN SECONDER	






















## EXHIBIT B

## SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE



I, Martin A. Morrison, do hereby cartify that I am a registered land surveyor and that I hold certification no. 4938739 as prescribed under the laws of the State of Utah. I further cartify that a topographic survey hes been made under my direction of the lands shown and described hereon. I further cartify that this topographic survey is a correct representation of the land surveyed at the time the field work was completed and is in compliance with generally accepted industry standards for accuracy.

1. Site Benchmark: Sanitary Sewer Manhole Elevation=8058.46'

2. See record of survey plat for easements and restrictions.

3. The architect is responsible for varifying building setbacks, zoning requirements and building heights.

4. This topographic map is based on a field survey performed on June 19, 2015.

5. Property corners were set or found during a previous survey.

6. The required 25' setback for master planned developments is measured from the Flagstoff annexation boundary. The internal setback lines shown hereon are standard RD zone setbacks. RD zone setbacks are as follows: 25' front yard (front facing garages). 20' front yard (residence), 12' side yard, & 15' rear yard.





		And and a second s	
	I, John Demkowicz, do hereby certify that I am a Registered Land Surveyor and that I hold Certificate No. 154491, as prescribed under the laws of the State of Utah. I further certify that by the authority of the awners I have made a survey of the tract of land shown on this plat and described herein and subdivided sold tract of land into late, private right—of-way, and easements to be hereafter known as THE VILAGE AT EMPIRE PASS, WEST SIDE and that the same has been or will be correctly located on the ground as shown on this plat. I further certify this plat accurately represents the surveyed property. John Demkowicz Date	Transfer (197	KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE P lend described herein as ThE VILL to be known as EWNITE CLUD Det consent to the recertation of Mi altuded on althe altic de of Empire In witness whereof the unde EWNITE MCUNTAIN WILLAGE, LLC, A Delaware limited libelity compar By df HCDING CORP. III, A Colorada compartien, Its Mchager By df UC Astronomics, The of the Constant of the second The of the Constant of the second The of the Second Second Second The of the Second Second Second Second Second Second The of the Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Second Secon
	BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION	SCALE PHONE	State of (Hal)
	PARCEL 1 A parcel of land located in the south half of Section 21 and the northwest quarter of Section 28, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Soit Lake Base and Meridian, said parcel being more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point that is North 80'09'24" East 8.13 feet along section line and North 262.11 feet from the north quarter corner of Section 28, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Sait Lake Base and Meridian; and running thence South 27'16'27' West 56.07' feet 1a a point on a curve to the laft having a radius of 150.00 feet, of which the radius point bears South 62'43'33" East; thence along the orc of soid aurve 75.83 feet through a central angle of 25'37'57' to a point of carmpound curve to the laft having a radius of 30:00 feet, of which the radius point bears North 88'18'05" East; thence southerify along the are of soid curve 20.22 feet through a central angle of 05'31'42"; thence South 05'33'11" East 15'7.15' feet to a point on a curve to the laft having a radius of 220.00 feet, of which the radius point bears North 84'26'48" East; thence along the arc of said curve 32.29 feet through a central angle of 21'00'4". to a point of reverse curve to the right having a radius of 7.27' feet to a point on a curve to the laft having a radius of 220.00 feet, of which the radius point bears South 70'22'32" East; thence asoutherly along the or of said curve 38.87 feet through a central angle of 21'00'1", thenes South 70'22'32" East; thence asoutherly along the or of a soid curve 38.87 feet through a central angle of 20'10'1.1', thenes South 70'22'32" East; thene durber go not the recorder. Sournh (24'30') west (21'15'). So the afficial plat thereof on file and of record in the office of the racio feet. Sourh 64'30'50' to a point also being on a non tangent curve to the right having a radius soid 18'12.0' feet, of which the radius point bears North 41'20'50'. East, thence northwesterly along the arc of a said curve 18'15'.1' feet to a point on a curve to the laft having a radius of 50	NOTES: A subject of constantial main many subject to an traver of the subject to its form. The subject to its form of the subject to its form. The subject to its form of the subject to its form. The subject to its form of the subject to its form. The subject to its form of the subject to its form. The subject to its form of the subject to its form. The subjec	Stole of Mark County of Accession 25 This instrument was acknown HOLDRY Public commissioned by Anotyp Public commissioned by Anotyp Public commissioned by Anotyp Public commissioned by Printed Nome Residence in Call Andrey Mark My commission expires: Mark Not an action of the Subdivious on other side of ERM CUB DRV In white side of ERM Cub DRV Drug Andre Comparison Dry Mark City Mines Coupean A Mark City Mines Coupean State of Mark County of Accession This instrument was conned UNITED PARK City Mines Coupean A Mark City Mi
of 118.63 feet, of which the radius point bears South 87°13′28° East; thence 7) northeasterly along the arc of said curve 107.81 feet through a central angle of 52′04′13° to a point on the northerly sideline of the Little Me mining claim, Lat 53A in the Unitah Mining District; thence along the northerly sideline of the Little Me mining claim the following two (2) courses: 1) South 85°20'00° East 21.17 feet; thence 2) South 68°50'00° East 289.99 feet to the point of beginning.	8. The property is facated within a water source protection some. All sever construction must comply with the State of Utch driving water regulations. 9. A 20° may slowaye assemble is hereby dedicated along the frontage of all lats. 10. A line extension agreement (LEA) will be required to be field with Snytervite Basim Water Reclamation District (20MMD) with the development of	My commission expires	
	Description contains 10.52 acres, more or less.	each lot. It. Empire Club Drive is a private root to be sensed, operated, melatoined and reported by the Moster Association for the use and benefit of the sensers of property in proper Pars of Deer Velay. In eccordance with Master Dedoration. The problem is not a public root of right-load or right-root of way. This Record of Survey May shall not be deemed to grant day rights in the public to use Empire Club Drive or create any obligations on the part of Period Vulnicipal Componentian to maintain or report Private Club Drive. At such use and mentionance shall be gravered by the terms and providence of the Master Declaration and the Waitshorence Agreest and deal Marks 17, 2001 (and so empired form time to time) between Park City Municipal Composition. United fork City Mines Compony, flow Each Composition and the Master Association.	KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE P described herein os THE VILLAGE be known os EMPIRE CLUB DRIVE, to the recordation of this Subdivi on either side of Empire CUD Drive
		12. At the time of any resurfacing of Empire Cub Drive, the Master Association is responsible to adjust exetensiter manhates to grade according to Snytervite Bosh Water Redemation Datict Standards Wahtemace adjustment of manhates within private radeways included as part of specific developments that be the responsibility of the homeowners association for such development.	on either side of Empire Club Driv In witness whereof the under
		13. The Master Association what be reasonable for the mannenance experience of according to the part of the Start of th	MOUNTAIN DEVELOPMENTS I, INC. A DISONGRE OUTPORTY INC. By MULL M. MULL
		unity, or consomnum subsciptions served by such literate, in operatione with the Mester Declaration. 14. The assement in favor of the Jordansile Special Service District is for a water drain tunnel situated approximately 500 feet below the surface of the property.	THE Vice Presiden
		15. All property corners to be set along Empire Club Drive will be set at the intersection of the 9.5' wide public and private utility element and the lat line or as shown hereon.	
		18. Any landscoping shall utilize either no krigolion ar water efficient irrigation, limited turi, and limited disturbance.	STATIST NO SARANGE - 100
		17. The mointenance of the water system is the private responsibility of the Empire Pass Mester Hamesweers Assessible.	State of Illal

(

URVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

SUBDIVISION PLAT THE VILLAGE AT EMPIRE PASS WEST SIDE

LOCATED IN SECTIONS 21 AND 28, TOWNSHIP 2 SOUTH, RANGE 4 EAST, SALT LAKE BASE AND MERIDIAN PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH

(435) 649-9467 SNYDERVILLE BASIN WATER RECLAMATION DISTRICT PLANNING COMMISSION ENGINEER'S CERTIFICATE CERTIFICATE OF ATTEST APPROVAL AS TO FORM COUNCIL APPROV I FIND THIS PLAT TO BE IN ACCORDANCE WITH INFORMATION ON FILE IN MY OFFICE THIS 222-DAY OF JULY BY DILL, 2005 A.D. BY DILL WILL AN PE PARK CITY ENGINEER REVIEWED FOR CONFORMANCE TO SNYDERVILLE BASIN WATER RECLAMATION DISTRICT STANDARDS ON THIS 22 PPROVED AS TO FORM THIS APPROVED BY THE PARK CITY FLANNING COMMISSION THIS IS DAY OF AUXAST, 2005 A.D. AMAINC APPROVAL AND ACCEPT cogineenig inc DAY OF AUGUST \_\_\_, 2005 A.D. BY DA BY MADHA BY BOS.B.W.R.D. CONSULTING ENGINEERS LAND PLANNERS SURVEYORS Planning Commission Packet January 13, 2016

Description       Description       Acceleration of the second se	EX	C C	
Rest of the second s	KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS THAT EMPIRE MOUNTAIN VILLAGE, LLC, load described herein as The VILLAGE AT EMPIRE PASS, MEST SDCL including a 2 to be known on EMMINE CLUI DAIVE, hereity certifies that it has caused this Sub consent to the reactation of this Subdivision Plat, and does hereby dedicate as situated on millers side of Empire Club Drive as shown herein.	a Delaware limited Hobbity company, the owner of a portion of the tract of to belaware limited Hobbity company, the owner of a portion of the tract of to be wide Public & Private Utility Economics & Private Road Right-of-Way Sociation Polic containing of the (2) starts to be prepared a close hereby a public and private utility eccentration 9.5 fool wide porce of property	
The definition of the definit	EMPRIE MOUITAIN VILLACE, LLC, A Delavare limited liability company A Calegories corporation, Ita Mehager		
Converte and an analysis of the converte data and and the converte and the	THE LIVE REPORT	DGMENT	
<form>The difference of the control of th</form>	State of 1Hall		
The set of the definition of the set of the se	This instrument ess acknowledged before me this 1/2 day of 1/2/2/ HOLDING COMP. III, a Calorado corporation, Manager of EWFIRE MOUNTAIN VALACE A Notory Public commissioned in Ujan	and $\frac{1}{1}$ , 2005 by $\frac{\nabla_{1,01}}{\Delta_{1,0}}$ the $\frac{\Delta_{1,02}}{\Delta_{1,02}}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ of HF $\frac{1}{2}$ , LLC, a pelaware limited liability company.	
Address of the the description of the description of the second with a description of the control of the description of th	Residing In: CARCIER, Islandia	17 I 8	
Bit and Addite Cut and State and a state of the subject on the su	OWNER'S DEDICATION AND	CONSENT TO RECORD	
	be known as EMPIRE CLUB DRIVE, hereby certifies that it has caused this Subdivi to the recordation of this Subdivision Plot, and does hereby dedicate as a public	VIY, a Delaware corporation, the owner of a portion of the tract of land st wide Public & Private Utility Economent & Private Road Right-of-Way to sign Pait consisting of the (2) sheets to be prepared, does hereby consent 2 and private utility economent the 0.5 foot wide parcel of property situated	
Inter of Link	UNITED PARK CITY LINES COMPANY		
Been of Left	1008 <u>2</u>		
Contrast of character 1. The	State Stat	DOMENT	
OWNER'S DEDICATION AND CONSENT TO RECORD         OWNER'S PRESENTS THE WOOKNER DESTROMMENTS IS I. M. A Schwarze erepresent of the method of the state of indiance erepresent of the indiance of the state of indiance erepresent of the indiance of the state of indiance erepresent of the indiance of the state of indiance erepresent of the indiance of the indin of the indiance of the indiance of the i	County of <u>Amazon 1988</u> This instrument was rechnoledged before me this <u>14</u> ° day of <u>Jacob</u> UNITED PARK OUT WHITE COMPANY, a Decenter corporation. Antonicy Public geometry of the Utah <u>Antonicy Public geometry of the Utah</u> <u>Printed Nome</u> <u>Jacob</u>	2005 by To Junes Fratework, the Unite Answers of	
ACKNOWLEDGMENT         State of IIIa IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	OWNER'S DEDICATION AND FROM ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS THAT MOUNTAN DEVELOPMENTS 1, INC. Gescrödel herein on The VILLOR AT EMPIRE PASS, MEST SIDT, Including a 23 foo be Moorn on EMPIRE CLUB DRIVE, hereby certifies that it has accused this Subdiv to the recordition of this Subdivision Pflst, and does hereby dedicate as a public on either side of Empire Club Drive as shown hereon. In witness whereof the undersigned has executed this certificate and dedica Mountain Drive Defuncts I with:	a Delawore corporation, the owner of a partian of the tract of land at wide public & Private Utility Fasement & Private Road Right-of-Way to ision Poit consulting of two (2) sheets to be prepared, does hereby consent ; and private utility easement the 9.5 foot wide parcel of property situated	
Stete of <u>files</u> County of <u>files</u> would be below a conversion as approximate a Motor, full <u>conversion of the state of the file of the</u>			
Councy of files and the set of the part of the set of t	ACKNOWLE	DGMENT	
COUNCIL APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE  APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE  APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE BY THE PARK CITY COUNCIL THIS  DOAY OF 2005 A.D.  BY Dama William  BY Dama William  COUNCIL THIS  BY DAMA COUNCIL THIS  BY DAMA COUNCIL THIS  DOAY OF COUNCIL TH	County of Additional Antiper States and Addition and Addi	anne 2005 og <u>Aldek R. Herne</u> , me <u>leite Alandant</u> or	
COUNCIL APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE  APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE  APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE BY THE PARK CITY COUNCIL THIS  DOAY OF 2005 A.D.  BY Dama William  BY Dama William  COUNCIL THIS  BY DAMA COUNCIL THIS  BY DAMA COUNCIL THIS  DOAY OF COUNCIL TH			
COUNCIL APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE  APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE  APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE BY THE PARK CITY COUNCIL THIS  DOAY OF 2005 A.D.  BY Dama William  BY Dama William  COUNCIL THIS  BY DAMA COUNCIL THIS  BY DAMA COUNCIL THIS  DOAY OF COUNCIL TH			
COUNCIL APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE  APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE  APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE BY THE PARK CITY COUNCIL THIS  DOAY OF 2005 A.D.  BY Dama William  BY Dama William  COUNCIL THIS  BY DAMA COUNCIL THIS  BY DAMA COUNCIL THIS  DOAY OF COUNCIL TH			
COUNCIL APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE  APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE  APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE BY THE PARK CITY COUNCIL THIS  DOAY OF 2005 A.D.  BY Dama William  BY Dama William  COUNCIL THIS  BY DAMA COUNCIL THIS  BY DAMA COUNCIL THIS  DOAY OF COUNCIL TH		SHEET 1 OF 2	
APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE BY THE PARK CITY COUNCIL THIS DAY OF STATE OF UTAH, COUNTY OF SUMMIT, AND FILED AT THE REDUEST OF PACK City Tst/s DATE 8-12-05_ TIME 16:02, page PAGE		JOB NO.: 1-1-01 FILE: #\Import/arg\\Import/I	
BY Dana Williams DATE 8-12-05 TIME 16:02 MBOOK PAGE	APPROVAL AND ACCEPTANCE BY THE PARK CITY COUNCIL THIS DAY OF	STATE OF UTAH, COUNTY OF SUMMIT, AND FILED	
FEE FEE Rage A01 of 406 Pro	BY Dana Williams MAYOR	DATE 8-12-05_ TIME 16:02 ABOOK PAGE	

( )

VICINITY MAP

18. The units of The Vilage of Empire Pass West Side are served by a Common Private Lateral Wastewater Line. The Empire Pass Master Association shall be responsible for awnership, operation and maintenance of all Common Private Lateral Wastewater Lines.



## EXHIBIT D



The Village at Empire Pass - West Side, Lot 15 looking northerly



The Village at Empire Pass – West Side, Lot 15 looking southeasterly

 $\bigcirc$ 



The Village at Empire Pass – West Side, Lot 15 looking easterly

O



The Village at Empire Pass – West Side, Lot 15 looking westerly

 $\bigcirc$ 

1