

Notes from DRC Meeting - May 1, 2014

Only 3 DRC members were present (Kevin Strange, Judy Carini, Barbara Wilcox)

The only items on the agenda were to discuss were building mass, parking layout and circulation, and East Parcel. But the conversation vectored into process concerns.

Process Discussion

We basically learned that the revised Specific Plan and its appendix B are “already outdated” and are “constantly” being revised. In ongoing meetings, the applicant (KSL aka SVSH) and the County are continually revising the design guidelines. Chevis and Alex suggested we would see the latest iteration of this “fluid” process soon after the unveiling of the dEIR (which might not be until much later in 2014). At that point the applicant will, once again, publish their latest iteration for the public to see, “and adjust it again”.

Although the DRC may make motions and take actions (perhaps in 2 months per Alex), their guidelines will only be recommendations which the County or the applicant may or may not adopt. Then the plans will go to the Planning Commission and ultimately Board of Supervisors.

Alex and Chevis acknowledged they have both received the FoSV guideline suggestions and have incorporated some. The process, however, has no public visibility. Chevis said they need to “hold the project static” for the moment (with the existing iteration being their plan at this point in time) while changes/revisions/inputs are being evaluated, and they perhaps will accommodate some.

General comments –

Some DRC members stated specific concerns with contents of Appendix B.

- Kevin agreed the “words” of Appendix B were good; he felt they were too vague; he disliked the image of a 12/12 roof when the text calls for 6/12 pitch.
- Judy said no “imitation” stone.
- From Dale Cox’s illustrations, they all agreed it should not be “heavily rustic” (“you can’t build a multi-story log cabin”) and they settled on “moving the needle” to a more “contemporary” design, “transitional”, not modern, but more “up to date”. (Whatever that means). Alex said he has requested photographs and “real world” examples to better visualize what the applicant is proposing.

Chevis spoke next. He said the FoSV have had some good suggestions but cannot accommodate all. Their re-design objectives are to develop some areas more intensely, and leave others alone. For example, for financial feasibility objectives, they went with a “high and tight” design, versus more building separation, as that reduces “sprawl”.

He said they are not ignoring the public; changes will be seen” after the dEIR.”

They have completely redrawn appendix B , which will have lot by lot planning, with each developable lot to have 50% open space.

They have received almost no input on Village Core – Neighborhood, except to say they have placated the OVI concerns. As a result, that area has changed from what is in Appendix B as well.

Regarding the fractional cabins on non-developed land, he said they are taking “what the mountain will give us”. (There was no mention of the maintenance center at the West end).

Regarding Village Core - Commercial, he acknowledged they have fully edited appendix B after FoSV and County input; it is under re-design but he again reiterated need for “critical mass”, are looking at “additional separation”, and have reached agreement with Red Wolf on separation from that building.

Regarding the East Parcel – Chevis said the architect has redesigned it with significant input by Alex (who admitted making the suggestions now in play). Here are the other key points mentioned:

- They have “pulled back” from their obligation of in-valley employee housing, reducing the number of beds from 360 to 250 beds (= heads), and will pay additional “in lieu fees” to the County for the balance. Judy Carini questioned how they have determined the number for employee housing; and Chevis said he is going on what the County says they need to do).
- They are pushing the “modular dormitories” to the north side of the parcel (nearer the creek). Judy Carini questioned that the current zoning does not allow employee housing; Alex disagreed.
- They have reduced the East Lot parking structure to 2 levels with 25 foot landscaping and berming. This requires moving some parking back to lots 11 & 12 which will have structures 20 feet above ground, and bermed and landscaped so you will only see 10 feet of parking structure.
- They plan a 5,000 sq.ft. market in the East Parcel. They moved the shipping and receiving facility to the west end of the lot (nearer Indian Trail).

The WSA is moving forward and will be seen in June.

Squaw Creek restoration plans have been reworked several times and now have agreement of all hydrologists (including Mike Liquori).

As announced before, their plan for a west end park has been withdrawn; they plan to meet their parks and rec obligation with a linear park along Squaw Creek, add pickle ball to the existing park, improve trail heads (and add parking for Granite Chief and Shirley Canyon sites), add trails on the 2600 acres that they control.

Question and Answer:

Peter VZ asked if their final (“preferred drawing”) illustrations and design are approved, would that be what is built? How “locked down” will the developer be? Not sure he got a straight answer.

Lisa Cardin suggested that roof tops be gardens both for aesthetics and going green.

Alex mentioned he got a letter of concern from the Tavern Inn with a list of concerns and recommendations about Lot 4 including comments about 50 foot set-backs from the road, staggered buildings, screening, move S&R building, and that employee housing should be consistent with neighbors.

Laurie O. suggested the DRC make “motions of intent” as they go along to highlight their recommendations at each meeting (and not rely on extracting some final recommendations from the minutes).