

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION NOTES  
OCTOBER 13, 2010**

PRESENT: Chair Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Dick Peek, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Kirsten Whetstone, Francisco Astorga, Brooks Robinson, Roger Evans

**Work Session Items**

**Building Department Informational update of unfinished/abandoned construction**

Roger Evans, the Interim Building Official, remarked on the number of requests for extensions of building permits. He distributed a copy of the commentary in the Building Code that talks about time limitations on applications, validity of permits, and expirations. He noted that the State of Utah, under the Uniform Building Standards Act adopts the Codes and the Codes have associated time frames.

Mr. Evans stated that when he first started looking at the matter, he noticed that Park City Municipal Code, under Building and Building Regulations, has a definition of start-up construction. He assumed that was in the Municipal Code to clarify what constitutes the start of construction and when the 180 days begins. Mr. Evans noted that often developers believe that if they mark the limits of disturbance area and excavate, that constitutes starting construction. However, the Municipal Code describes specific activity defined as the start of construction.

Mr. Evans stated that in the last 60 days he asked all the inspectors to make a list of the projects that have stopped due to lack of money or the ability to obtain financing. He noted that a group of people have applied for permits but never requested that the permits be issued within that 180 day period. In the past, the Building Department has granted an extension if the extension request was submitted in writing. Mr. Evans remarked that he and the inspectors are currently working on compiling that list and he could update the Planning Commission at their next meeting.

Mr. Evans stated that he made a special request for an Eden Permit System, which tracks all the permits that have been issued in Park City, but have not had an inspection within the last 180 days. He would then compare that list with the files in the Building Department. He anticipated that he would be ready to provide an accurate list to the Planning Commission in the near future. His intent is to hold applicants to very specific dates. When an extension is requested, the Building Department requires that shoring must be in place and footings and foundations must be poured by a specific date before the extension is granted.

Mr. Evans encouraged the Commissioners to email him with questions or concerns they may have on specific projects. He needs everyone in the community to help with the process. Mr. Evans noted that he provides a monthly building inspection report on the radio. He commented on the difference between six months of 2010 compared with the same six months of 2009. He believed the numbers were gradually starting to increase for the building industry in Park City. Once he runs the projects on the Eden System, he would be able to compare the 180 days time frame with the "ugly list", where people call and inquire on a specific address.

Chair Wintzer stated that he originally raised the issue of unfinished projects and other

Commissioners shared his concern. He commented on a particular project on Main Street that is in its third winter of a temporary sidewalk. Two adjacent businesses have suffered for two years and there is no process to push the project to completion. Chair Wintzer suggested that the City find a way to limit the impact to adjacent property owners. If the developer runs out of money, there should be some mechanism that allows them to finish the facade.

Mr. Evans agreed. He stated that on private properties, the City collects 75 cents per square foot. For public ways, he is currently pushing for a guaranteed bond to guarantee that the construction area would be put back in place. He explained that the project on Main Street went into receivership and just sat there. The contractor came back and did interior work in an effort to completely enclose the building. Mr. Evans noted that there are several properties with similar situations in Park City that need to be pushed. Once he receives a complete list, he would like to take the most high profile projects through an abatement process.

Chair Wintzer clarified that the Planning Commission was not interested in policing unfinished projects. However, in the future, he would like to find a way to force people on Main Street and in other important areas to at least enclose the building and finish the facade to minimize impacts to the neighbors.

Commissioner Savage asked if someone could write down a statement of the objectives they hope to achieve from the process. Once a list is compiled it would be helpful to understand the state of repair or disrepair of a project, as well as a reasonable expectation of outcomes and time frames as a mechanism for monitoring. Mr. Evans replied that the Planning Commission should have that information prior to their next meeting.

### **Park City Heights - Master Planned Development (Application #PL-10-01028)**

Chair Wintzer announced that the Planning Commission would take public comment on the Park City Heights MPD during the regular meeting.

Planner Whetstone reported that the applicants had provided an overview of the project during the work session on September 22. The Planning Commission expressed concerns related to traffic and trails and the applicants offered to come back with an update on the traffic study. Planner Whetstone noted that the Staff report contained the first part of the 2007 Hales Engineering traffic impact study for Park City Heights in June 2007. The Staff report also included a letter updating that study based on the reduced density, revised site plan, and improvements that have been made since 2007.

Planner Whetstone stated that the applicant had also provided a trails and pedestrian circulation and connectivity plan, as well as revisions to the site plan based on direction at the last meeting.

Planner Whetstone reviewed the application for a master planned development for 160 market rate units and approximately 79 deed restricted work force housing units, for a total of 239 units on 249 acres. The project also includes 28 deed restricted housing for the IHC project. In addition, the market rate units carry an affordable housing obligation. There are also 35 additional City-sponsored units related in part to the Talisker obligation at Empire Pass that has not been satisfied

through actual units. Planner Whetstone noted that the Planning Commission had requested a greater integration of market and affordable units.

The project is located at the intersection of SR248 and US40, south of Richardson Flat and the Rail Trail.

Spencer White, representing the applicant, introduced Cordell Braley with Hales Engineering. Mr. Braley was present to explain the traffic study and answer any questions. Mr. White assumed the primary concern was traffic on SR248. He noted that the original traffic analysis that was prepared in 2007 was based off of 303 units and a worst case scenario that all 303 units would be year-round residences. The revised Park City Heights project proposes a maximum of 239 units, which includes all market and affordable units.

Mr. Spencer pointed out that the 28 affordable units from IHC would add traffic on SR248, regardless of where they are built.

Planner Whetstone noted that Brooks Robinson, the traffic representative from the City Transportation Department, was also present to answer questions.

Mr. Braley with Hales Engineering, provided a brief background of the original traffic study and the updates to the study. He noted that the study was originally conducted in 2006, before he was employed by Hales Engineering. He joined the company shortly after and has been involved in all the revision processes. He is also familiar with the area.

Mr. Braley explained that they looked at traffic volumes in 2006 and 2007, when the original study was done. They also looked at data collected by UDOT to see what has happened from that time to present day. He noted that the market statewide and nationwide have affected the number of trips on most roads. They have seen stagnation of growth on most UDOT roads in terms of traffic.

Mr. Braley remarked that they looked at data specific to the area of Park City that was studied in 2006 to see if that had been affected. They found that growth has occurred approximately 1% per year, which is close to flat over a few years period. Over several years it would be considered an increase in traffic. Mr. Braley stated that they also looked at the new land use, which decreased from 303 units to 239 units. That reduction effectively reduced the overall trips in and out of the development. They concluded that the mitigation measures and improvements recommended during the original study would still hold today, because traffic on SR248 has not significantly changed and the development project has decreased in size and intensity.

Commissioner Savage asked if the 1% growth takes into consideration a time frame associated with the peaks. Mr. Braley replied that it is based on annual average daily traffic. They add up all the traffic over 365 days and divide that number by 365 to reach the projected number. He pointed out that the number is the equivalent of what they would see half way between the shoulder season and a peak season. Commissioner Savage did not believe that was the most relevant number. Mr. Braley agreed, however, if they compare the same number in 2006 to the equivalent number in 2009, the determination is that traffic has stayed the same over the three year period with only 1% growth per year. It was possible that the peaks have fluctuated from year to year, but overall the traffic appears to have stayed the same. Commissioner Savage stated that based on his own

experiences at Quinn's Junction over the last few years, he believes there is significantly more early morning and late afternoon traffic now than in years past. He would be interested in knowing if that was just intuition or quantitatively the case. Mr. Braley replied that they only have the data to go off of and it shows that the traffic is approximately the same.

Commissioner Hontz questioned portions of the data. She noted that page 47 of the report references the 2006 traffic report and the fact that the counts were collected in August. She asked if the traffic counts were done with the cord you drive over of if they were counted by a live person. Mr. Braley replied that they were a.m. and p.m. peak counts and they are counted by a live person.

Commissioner Hontz clarified that the counts were only done in August. Mr. Braley replied that this was correct. Commissioner Hontz pointed out that August is not when Park City has its peak loads of tourists and school is not in session. She was unsure if August accurately reflected the times during the year when they would have problems. Commissioner Hontz referred to the 2009 ADT data from UDOT and asked if that study was done by running cars over a cord. Mr. Braley replied that it done by tube count and the count is averaged over a year period.

Commissioner Hontz stated that she has worked with other traffic engineers and she does not consider those studies apples to apples. She has been told by other traffic engineers that people who physically count cars do a much better job than the tubes. Commissioner Hontz remarked that the 2006 study was a good analysis of the data available, but it was not what she wanted to know. She wanted to know the apples to apples data. She preferred to have a study done when residents and visitors experience the worst traffic. Commissioner Hontz suggested a traffic count at a different time of year.

Mr. Braley believed Commissioner Hontz had raised valid points. He pointed out that they determined the growth rate by looking at the 2006 UDOT ADT numbers, which is an apples to apples comparison. It would be unfair to compare an August peak count with a daily count, and that would only be done as a last resort. Mr. Braley agreed that in a city like Park City and similar resort areas, it is difficult to define the design period. One school of thought is to study Presidents Day weekend in February. Others feel that summer is a higher traffic period because more people are out of school and traveling. There is also an argument for doing something in the middle to avoid over-designing the roads. He assumed Park City would rather have periods of congestion rather than wider boulevard type streets. Mr. Braley was open to suggestions in the event a re-study would occur.

Commissioner Hontz appreciated Mr. Braley's clarification because she had mis-interpreted the report as she read it.

Mr. White asked Brooks Robinson if the City had done recent studies with regard to numbers in that area. Brooks Robinson reported that currently InterPlan is working on the transportation master plan. More important than what might come from Park City Heights, is development outside of Park City in Wasatch and Summit Counties. The traffic patterns that occur now will only increase. The City is looking at ways to reduce the number of single occupancy cars and how to best manage it from a traffic and transit component. The philosophy for the City is not to increase road width. He used the example of creating a shopping mall with parking to accommodate the day after Thanksgiving crowds. The better scenario is to live with a little congestion at certain times and to look at acceptable levels of service in intersections and roadways. There is also the question of

whether congestion adds to the vibrancy of the town or just creates annoyance.

Chair Wintzer asked if Park City has a level of service standard. Mr. Robinson replied that currently there is not a standard level. He stated that A, B, and C levels for both intersections and roads are acceptable. When they begin getting to D level, a few less cars make it through the light and the wait time is longer. Mr. Robinson noted that the standards are based on average wait time in number of seconds. On roadways the levels are based on the amount of congestions and proximity to cars in front, behind and beside you. Levels E and F result in increased wait time at intersections.

Mr. Robinson stated that in resort or commuter towns, it is not uncommon to have Level of Service F for roads or intersections on specific days. The question is whether that is acceptable for 12-15 days a year, if the remainder of the year averages a Level C. Mechanisms for peak days or hours, such as police manpower or signalized methods, can make traffic flow a little better, but the Level of Service is still lower due to the number of cars and people.

Chair Wintzer remarked that a traffic study will say that any street works, however, the City has the responsibility to identify an acceptable Level of Service as a standard to adhere to. Chair Wintzer agreed that the streets should not be designed to accommodate three or four peak days a year. His question was whether or not the City was trying to achieve a specific level of service. He recognized that this was a larger issue beyond Park City Heights, but the City Council and the Planning Commission should look at ways to address this issue. Mr. Robinson stated that parts of that issue are being considered in the Transportation Master Plan process and modeling.

Chair Wintzer believed that the amount of traffic at the intersection of SR248 and US40 would not be affected by the subdivision. It will affect the tourists who come to ski and the workers. For that reason, level of service is not an immediate problem. However, in terms of long term planning, it would be helpful to have a model adopted by the City that is a standard for Park City. Mr. Robinson pointed out that as the surrounding areas builds out, that particular intersection becomes a smaller percentage of the total on that road. Chair Wintzer remarked that a target goal would help the City determine alternative transportation options to achieve that goal. Mr. Robinson stated that a concept plan includes the Park and Ride further down the road. The City will be providing bus service in the future to integrate with the Park City Heights project, the Park and Ride, the Hospital and the Recreation Fields on the other side of the highway, as a way to reduce traffic. They are also looking at methods for moving the buses through traffic at a quicker and easier pace to increase the desirability for using the transit system.

Mr. Robinson noted that the Transportation Master Plan would be presented to the Planning Commission and the City Council with the next few months.

Chair Wintzer remarked that the Dump Road has now turned into an entrance to Park City and it is much busier than in the past. He asked if the traffic study had considered that change in traffic. Mr. Braley did not believe that was considered with the original study because it was not seen as a problem at that time. Since then, Hales Engineering has done other work in that are for other clients and the Dump Road was considered in those studies based on the concern of increased cut-through traffic. Mr. Braley stated that he compared the Park City Heights traffic study with ones

done more recently, and the result did not change the Level of Service. He believed this was a valid concern and designing the development correctly could help mitigate the issues. Chair Wintzer clarified that he did not want to stop the cut-through on the road, but he wanted to make sure they accounted for the increased traffic at the intersection. He noted that it also affects the Rail Trail at the crossing.

Planner Whetstone asked if the more recent traffic study considered traffic from the Park and Ride. Mr. Braley answered yes. Planner Whetstone suggested that Hales Engineering provide a summary of the improvements to that intersection that were recommended during the annexation process. That would help give an idea of whether those mitigations are still valid. Mr. Braley replied that the update conducted this year concluded that the recommendations are still valid because the traffic volumes have not changed significantly and the land use was reduced. Mr. Braley referred to comments regarding the Transportation Master Plan. He noted that the master plans are updated every few years and new developments and new planning issues are taken into account when those updates occur. He felt it was possible that at the end of the Transportation Master Plan process, the volumes may be different from what was shown in the original traffic study. At that point, they may need to re-look at the future long-term improvements.

Mr. Braley reviewed the recommendations on page 41 of the Staff report from the 2006 Traffic Study. He noted that the traffic study referred to the Old Dump road as Landfill Road. The traffic study found that the intersection would meet the warrants for traffic signalization with the Park City Heights project. A study conducted in 2005 or 2006 by Horrocks Engineers recommended a signal at that intersection. Hales Engineering agreed that overall a signal would be beneficial because signals along the corridor would slow traffic and improve traffic flow. Mr. Braley stated that Hales Engineering added recommendations for turn pocket lanes coming out of the Dump Road. He referred to UDOT guidelines for acceleration and deceleration lanes. The language talks about having a southbound lane coming into the project from US40, a northbound right-turn pocket, and a westbound to northbound right turn acceleration lane. Mr. Braley believed the acceleration lane would not be necessary with a signal. UDOT would require the acceleration lane without a signal.

Mr. Braley pointed out that the observations projected to 2020 were the same recommendations. Signalizing would improve the flow of traffic in the corridor, but without the project, that would not be as critical. For 2020, there was some discussion about one signal versus two signals. At the time of the original traffic report, Mr. Braley did not believe the signal going to the IHC property was installed. Mr. White recalled that the light was not installed but it was counted in the traffic study. He clarified that the recommendation for 2020 would be to add an additional signal at the intersection going in to IHC.

Commissioner Savage understood that the recommendation was for a signal. Mr. Robinson explained that the City has contracted with JB Engineering to do the design work for that intersection, using the recommendations from the Hales study regarding turns lanes, lights, distances, etc. The improvements should begin next year. When the signal itself will go in depends on build out of the Park City Heights project. Commissioner Savage asked Planner Whetstone to point out the existing signal. He thought it appeared that the two signals would be close in proximity. Chair Wintzer remarked that the existing signal is further down from where it looks on the map. Mr. Robinson stated that the initial turn that came into the sports complex off of US40 was too close by UDOT standards, and the intersection needed to be moved down for the light. He agreed

that the lights for IHC, the Sports Complex and the Dump Road are minimum distances for UDOT standards.

Chair Wintzer recalled that years earlier UDOT had agreed to put a signal at the Sports Park or the Dump Road and another signal at the Park Bonanza area. At that time, UDOT thought those would be sufficient signals for the entire road. He asked if they still had that same thought. Mr. Robinson explained that the City had entered into an agreement with UDOT on the Corridor Preservation Plan, and he believed one other signal may be installed somewhere in the Park Bonanza area. Chair Wintzer pointed out that the school has the greatest impact on traffic because it all stops in that area. He believed that would be somewhat improved with the tunnel.

Planner Whetstone pointed out that in the Park City Heights binder that were provided to all the Commissioners, the annexation agreement specifically outlines recommended traffic mitigation based on build out. Mr. White remarked that the traffic update supports the same recommendations from the 2007 study, due to the reduced number of units. He reiterated that in 2007, the study was based on the scenario that the units would be primary year-round residences.

Commissioner Peek asked about que lengths at the lights and how it would affect commuters on the Rail Trail and buses. Commissioner Hontz stated that when she read the traffic study she inferred that the study had not compared apples to apples. She was comfortable with the finding after hearing Mr. Braley's clarification. However, she suggested that they conduct a count at a different time of year. Commissioner Hontz thought the Planning Commission should provide feedback as to what they would like to see on that specific issue. Planner Whetstone remarked that they may already have that information. Mr. Robinson would see what dates and information the City could provide.

Mr. Braley understood that the bottleneck was occurring over by the school to the west. Looking at the intersections going into Park City Heights in a vacuum, there would not appear to be a problem.

To address the problem, they would need to study traffic all the way to the school. He pointed out that those issues are not related to this project. It is a result of traffic occurring in the west that backs up near the project. Commissioner Peek remarked that it also affects the que length of the light heading westbound and turning left on to SR248. Mr. Robinson stated that the City can computerize the numbers and adjust the signals accordingly as the area builds out.

Chair Wintzer reiterated his belief that the school, and not this project, creates the traffic problem. The bigger picture is the City standards and at what point they determine that a level of service is unacceptable, and what they need to do to make it acceptable.

Commissioner Peek remarked that trail connectivity is important because with 239 homes a fair number of children will be going to the sports fields, the Rail Trail, school, etc. Mr. White stated that having the Rail Trail paved to the project is a benefit. The transit stop hits the tipping point when transit starts running on a regular basis to Park City Heights and the Park and Ride Lot. As part of the project, they also plan on improving the Rail Trail as it crosses the Old Dump Road. Mr. White noted that the applicants looked at all the factors in an effort to mitigate the traffic. Commissioner Peek remarked that they also need to consider the other direction for the trail users to reach the Sports Complex. In his opinion, the connectivity does not appear to be adequate in the current plan. Commissioner Peek requested additional information on peak counts and que line lengths.

Commissioner Strachan asked about the current level of service on SR248. Mr. Robinson replied that it depends on the time of day and time of year. On average, it is probably a Level B or C, and a Level F at peak times. Commissioner Strachan asked if the levels of services are standardized throughout the industry. Mr. Braley stated that the standards that defines each level of service are the same nationwide. The acceptable level is determined by individual cities and situations.

Mr. White reviewed the revised site plan. On September 22<sup>nd</sup>, the Planning Commission requested a more grid-like pattern in placing the homes and combining connectivity with that layout. He had color coded the units for easy reference and identification. Purple were the Park City Municipal Corporation affordable housing units, bright green were the IHC affordable units, blue was the CT zone affordable units, and the salmon color were the market rate units. Mr. White explained how they tried to maintain a consistent mix of housing units and housing types, both affordable and market. He noted that the single-family detached units would be alley loaded and all would face into green space connected with sidewalks and trails. The intent is to create a community where people get to know their neighbors and their homes are accessible to the amenities at the entrance.

Mr. White presented a slide showing the connectivity with regards to sidewalks and trails. Sidewalks were only proposed on one side of the road to reduce the amount of impervious surface and as a cost-cutting benefit for the developer. Soft surface trails were identified in orange. To address Commissioner Peek's concern regarding access to the Sports Complex, Mr. White showed the current access from the Sports Complex to Old Dump Road. Part of the proposal has always been to improve the trail along Old Dump Road from the tunnel down to the Rail Trail on the north side of Old Dump Road. It would be an improved Rail Trail crossing across Old Dump Road. The improvements would include surfacing and possible signals. Coming from Park City Heights, there would be paved access from the clubhouse to the Rail Trail and from the Rail Trail in to the City. Mr. White indicated sidewalks all the way around the detached homes. The power line corridor will have a major trail that connects to Hidden Meadows. He presented a slide showing various trails connections proposed. They have spoken with the Snyderville Basin Recreation District about having an asphalt trail along the frontage road that would eventually connect to the Deer Valley gondola. From that point there would be access under Highway 40 to Jordanelle.

Mr. White pointed out that the larger green units are four-plexes with garages. The fronts of those units would face out to the open space. For the attached units shown in purple, the parking is along the back so the units would face into the project. Chair Wintzer asked for the size of those units. Mr. White replied that the units are eight-plexes and the square footage has not been decided. They are a stacked unit product with garages.

Commissioner Savage asked if Park City Municipal specifies the configuration of those particular units and IHC specifies the configuration of their units. Mr. White replied that IHC has their own unit type that they would like to have built. Ivory Builders would construct the units for IHC. The City units are a completely different product.

Commissioner Savage asked if the process for individuals to acquire those units is controlled by IHC and/or the City. Phyllis Robinson, representing the City, explained that the deed restrictions on the units for IHC would give first priority to employees of IHC. Any available units that are not purchased by IHC employees would go into the traditional City process, which includes length of tenure in town, being a City employee, a first time home buyer, income qualifications, etc.

Commissioner Savage asked about the PCMC units or the CT zone units. Ms. Robinson replied that the deed restriction used by the City apply to all affordable units in terms of priority. Commissioner Savage clarified that being a City employee would not have any advantage for purchasing an affordable unit labeled PCMC. Ms. Robinson replied that this was correct in terms of the CT zone units. When the Snow Creek Cottages were constructed, the City set aside two units for City employees because there was a direct City contribution into that project. Whether or not that would be the case with this project still needs to be decided by the City Council. She clarified that the Park City Heights units were not being designed as City employee workforce housing. Commissioner Savage wanted to know what distinguishes a PCMC affordable unit from a CT zone affordable unit. Ms. Robinson replied that the CT zone units are developed within the MPD and the PCMC units will be developed by the City.

Commissioner Savage asked if the specifications for the CT zone units would be determined by Boyer Company. Ms. Robinson explained that the CT zone units would also be determined by the City Council acting as the Housing Authority. The applicant would still need to present an affordable housing plan to the City Council sitting as the Housing Authority. Commissioner Savage asked if Ms. Robinson expected a differentiation between the PCMC and the CT zone affordable units in terms of design or quality of construction. Ms. Robinson stated that the only difference is that the footprints of the CT zone units appear to be larger than the PCMC units. She would come back at a future work session with the design guidelines that would apply to all the units.

Commissioner Strachan asked about the mechanics of the sale from one bonafide purchaser to another for the affordable units. Ms. Robinson explained that Park City Municipal retains the right of first refusal for all units that are put up for sale. This assures that the City is always notified of a unit that is being proposed for sale. Commissioner Strachan asked if the seller would ever get equity. Ms. Robinson stated that the current existing units have a 3% equity cap per year based on the purchase price of the unit, not the equity investment of the unit. If a house was purchased for \$100,000 it could be sold the next year for \$103,000. Commissioner Peek noted that it is based on equity growth. If someone owns their home for 20 or 30 years, they would have a hundred percent equity at a 3% growth cap per year. Ms. Robinson replied that this was correct.

Planner Whetstone asked if a draft affordable housing plan would be available in the near future. Ms. Robinson remarked that the presentation before the Planning Commission on October 27<sup>th</sup> would be a more global discussion of the City Housing Resolution and the affordable housing element of the LMC, as well as a market demand analysis. She would come back with an affordable discussion specific to the Park City Heights project as they begin to discuss design guidelines and architectural criteria.

Chair Wintzer clarified that the market rate units and the affordable units were the same size. Mr. White replied that this was correct. Chair Wintzer understood that the affordable units shown in purple could be intermixed with the market rate units. Mr. White clarified that the placement of the color coded units was more for the purpose of keeping track of the unit count. He stated that the intention is to mix the affordable and market rate units and to also mix the affordable units ranging from the four-plexes to stacked flats, to single family detached. There is also a range in size for the market rate units to achieve different price points within the market rate units. The project proposes a wide variety of unit types and unit styles.

Ms. Robinson explained that the way they ultimately decide to intersperse the units will depend on infrastructure more than timing.

Mr. White presented a utilities plan showing power lines, sewer lines, etc. Chair Wintzer preferred to address the utility issues later in the design process.

Commissioner Peek was still uncomfortable with the connectivity issue. He asked if the improved trail proposed north of the Dump Road would be separate from the wide shoulder. Mr. White remarked that there are issues with wetlands and narrow road right-of-way widths. State Parks is the adjacent property owner. Mr. White explained that the trail is within the road right-of-way and it is not separated from the travel lanes. The asphalt would extend to include its own painted lines for the trail itself, but it would be part of all the asphalt surface in that location. Commissioner Peek noted that the existing trail going to the tunnel that pops out at the road, appears to be the UDOT parcel. The adjacent parcel to that is Park City Municipal designated open space. The next is the State Parks and Recreation property. He assumed an easement by those groups would create a safe connective Rail Trail from this project to the sports fields. Chair Wintzer agreed with Commissioner Peek on the importance of separating the trails from the roads if possible.

Commissioner Strachan stated that a separation would be a determinative issue in his opinion. It is important to have safe access for children walking or biking to the sports fields. In his opinion, if safe access cannot be achieved, it could be a deal breaker. Commissioner Strachan suggested that this might be an opportunity for ingenuity. Tunnels are a preferred method in Park City, but this may be a good time to consider a bridge.

Mr. White pointed out that the trails are completely separated from the road on the south side. Commissioner Peek asked if the existing berm adjacent to the parcel next to the Old Dump Road would be removed. Mr. White replied that the berm would be removed in order to separate the trail from the road.

Planner Whetstone clarified that there was consensus by the Planning Commission to explore separation from the road to the trails.

The Planning Commission held further comments until after the public hearing scheduled for the regular meeting.

The work session was adjourned.