

# City Council & Planning Commission Joint Meeting Staff Report



**Author:** Thomas Eddington, Planning Director  
Katie Cattan, Senior Planner  
**Subject:** Bonanza Park Area Plan  
**Date:** January 12, 2012  
**Type of Item:** Legislative – Discussion

## **SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS**


Staff is requesting City Council and Planning Commission direction regarding the Bonanza Park Area Plan, future implementation, and the General Plan. Staff would like feedback on the Bonanza Park Area Plan and direction on whether or not Staff should move forward and begin to implement the Area Plan. Areas of concern should be identified during the meeting for staff to further research and revise the Area Plan.

## **BACKGROUND**

The Planning Commission and City Council met during a Joint Work Session meeting on September 29, 2011 (Exhibit A – Minutes from the meeting). A summary of outcomes includes:

1. Council and Planning Commission agreed that Park City needs a Bonanza Park Area Plan that:
  - Incorporates The Rocky Mountain Power sub-station needs;
  - Focuses efforts to create a vibrant, affordable, mixed-used, locally serving area within Bonanza Park;
  - Balances height, density, and financial incentives as tools to effect development.
2. Both Council and Commission agreed to give additional height in BoPa to obtain:
  - Open space, a smaller building footprint, view corridor protection, affordable housing, and a resulting area built within a set of Design Guidelines.
3. Both Council and Commission agreed to give additional density in BoPa to obtain;
  - Protection of historic structures, increased connectivity, and realization of housing affordability.
4. A draft BoPa plan incorporating the agreed “gives and gets” will be delivered to the Joint Council-Commission by 12-31-11.

The City Council and Planning Commission met in a series of joint meetings in late 2011 to address a number of planning and development issues. Bonanza Park was specifically discussed in detail and the following illustrates the results of a survey the City Council and Planning Commission completed:



### Encourage

1. Locally-owned Commercial
2. Affordable Housing
3. Small Business Incubator
4. Apartments
5. Medium Sized Commercial
6. Multi-use facility/Expo
7. Parks
8. Campus

### Discourage

1. Museum
2. Single-Family Homes
3. Big Box
4. Nightly Rental

### No where

1. Big Box

2. National Franchise
3. Multi-Use Facility/Expo

The draft Plan was completed and distributed on December 30<sup>th</sup> and distributed to the Planning Commission and City Council. The Area Plan is available on line at [www.parkcity.org](http://www.parkcity.org)  
⇒Government ⇒Document Central ⇒Planning.

### **BONANZA PARK AREA PLAN**

The Bonanza Park Area Plan is a blue-print for future development within Bonanza Park. It creates ten (10) Planning Principles which implement a balanced approach to achieve the environmental, social, and economic goals of the City. The ten (10) Principles lay the foundation for the design of a new grid system, building pads, setbacks, height and a design framework found within the “Base Plan.” It also gives developers the option to attain greater density, beyond the Base Plan via the “Incentivized Plan” in return for community benefits. The Incentivized Plan creates options for additional height and decreased setbacks in exchange for community benefits, such as attainable housing, business incubator space, a community center, etc.

*Staff would like feedback on the Bonanza Park Area Plan and direction on whether or not Staff should move forward and begin to implement the Area Plan. Areas of concern should be identified during the meeting for staff to further research and revise the Area Plan.*

### **Next Steps**

#### Bonanza Park Area Plan Implementation

If the Planning Commission and City Council are in support of the general direction of the Bonanza Park Area Plan, the Plan should be adopted as a supplement to the General Plan. Once the Area Plan is adopted, staff may move forward with implementation. There are several steps to implementation, including:

1. Land Management Code (LMC) Amendments
  - a. Master Planned Development (MPD) amendments for Bonanza Park Overlay District
  - b. Creation of Form Based Code (including design guidelines) for Bonanza Park Overlay District.
2. Zoning Map Amendments
  - a. Create a Bonanza Park Overlay Zone

Staff estimates that the LMC and zoning map amendments and will take between 3 to 6 months to complete, depending on the amount of revisions during the review process. Depending on the desired timelines for future deliverables, the Planning Department may recommend hiring an outside firm to complete a Form Based Code with Design Guidelines.

*Would the PC/CC support hiring an outside firm for the creation of a Form-Based Code (including Design Guidelines) for the Bonanza Park district?*

#### General Plan

Prior to the September 29th Joint Meeting, the Planning Department had committed to rewriting the General Plan by April 15th, 2012. At the meeting the Planning Department agreed to finish a draft of the Bonanza Park Plan by December 30th, 2011, pushing the General Plan back three (3) months (July 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011

Staff estimates that the General Plan will be complete by July 31<sup>st</sup>, however given the implementation documents necessary for the Bonanza Park Area Plan, if we are going to move forward with implementation now, staff may need until October 31<sup>st</sup> to complete the rewrite of the General Plan. Staff learned through the Bonanza Park Area Planning process – there is a significant amount of time involved in the final preparation of the document; formatting, graphics, organization, colors, etc.

*Staff would like direction on deadlines:*

*Would the PC/CC support extending the General Plan deadline to October 31st, 2012, in order to begin immediate implementation of the Bonanza Park Area Plan?*

#### Transportation Study.

The Bonanza Park area is surrounded on three (3) sides by State Roads (SR-248 to the north, SR-224 to the south and west). All access to these roads (i.e., driveways or streets) fall under the jurisdiction of the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT). Access to SR-248 is currently managed under a Corridor Preservation Agreement that UDOT, Summit County and the City executed in February of 2007 (Exhibit B).

Any modification to existing access or the development of new access to these State roads will require prior UDOT approval and renegotiation of existing corridor preservation agreements. Should Council determine to move forward with the grid street pattern Staff will need to begin working with UDOT to obtain the required access approvals. The grid street pattern as presented has yet to be subjected to a comprehensive transportation analysis. UDOT's access approval process (set forth in Administrative Rule R930-6) will require the completion of a traffic impact study and renegotiation of existing corridor preservation agreements.

Staff is currently working with UDOT on the development of a corridor plan for SR-224 (between Snow Creek Drive and Bonanza Drive) and recommends rolling the required transportation impact study into the work currently being done. This process would allow for solid integration of the BOPA grid street plan with pedestrian, bicycle and vehicular plans for adjacent SR-248 and SR-224.

The City's transportation Staff estimates that the required transportation engineering work will cost approximately \$50,000 and this work will require three months to complete. UDOT's access approval process will add to this timeline (the specifics regarding time required for approval are not clear at this time). Should Council provide direction to move forward with the BOPA street grid, Staff would return to Council at a later date with a request to contract for the required work and a clearly defined timeline for the traffic impact study and the UDOT approval process.

It is important for Council and the public to understand that the findings of the required transportation impact study and/or UDOT's approval process may require some modification of the grid street pattern as presented.

*Staff requests direction from the Planning Commission and City Council regarding 1) do both entities support the proposed grid, and 2) if so, would City Council like staff to broaden the scope of the existing study to for the proposed grid system to be studied within this Plan to make sure the grid and the corridor work together seamlessly.*

### Soils Repository

The Area Plan notes that the Bonanza Park district sits fully within the Soils Ordinances Boundary. Accordingly, any soil removed from this site for redevelopment must follow the state and federal standards for contaminated soils disposal. Currently, the City no longer has access to the Richardsons Flat repository. Therefore, Tooele is the closest option, yet more expensive (due to hauling distance). Council will be asked to make further decisions regarding soils management in the near future that impact the redevelopment of Bonanza Park.

### **Significant Impacts**

Adopting the Bonanza Park Area Plan supplement will put into place the guiding document for implementation. If the Planning Commission supports the Area Plan and the City Council adopts the Plan, Staff must begin revisions to the existing code to implement the plan. Clear direction to Staff regarding the questions noted in this report should be provided to staff.

### **Recommendation**

Staff is requesting City Council and Planning Commission direction on four items:

- (1) Do City Council and Planning Commission support the direction of the Bonanza Park Area Plan? If so;
  - a. Do City Council and Planning Commission support the hiring an outside consultant to create a Form Based Code for the area?
  - b. Do City Council and Planning Commission support extending the General Plan deadline to October 31<sup>st</sup>, 2012?
  - c. Would you like Staff to broaden the scope of the existing 224 Corridor Study to include the proposed grid system (SR224 Corridor Study)?

**Exhibit A** – Minutes from the Joint Meeting (29 September 2011)

**Exhibit B** – UDOT Corridor Preservation Agreement

**CITY COUNCIL/ PLANNING COMMISSION  
JOINT WORK SESSION  
SEPTEMBER 29, 2011**

**City Council Members:** Dana Williams, Cindy Matsumoto, Alex Butwinski, Dick Peek, Liza Simpson, Joe Kernan

**Planning Commission:** Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Julia Pettit, Jack Thomas, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Nann Worel

**Ex Officio:** Mark Harrington, Francisco Astorga, Katie Cattan, Kayla Sintz, Matthew Evans, Michael Kovacs, Phyllis Robinson, Jonathan Weidenhamer, Tom Bakaly

Mayor Dana Williams opened the joint work session at 6:20 p.m.

Mayor Williams noted that this was the fourth joint work session. If the entire meeting was devoted to Bonanza Park, another work session would be scheduled for Lower Park Avenue RDA.

Charles Buki, a consultant from Alexandria, Virginia, remarked that the objective this evening was to focus exclusively on Bonanza Park to address the main issues. Mr. Buki spent the week meeting individually with each City Council Member and Planning Commissioner. As the facilitator for visioning, he was able to experience the issues that were ratified on paper through one-on-one conversations with each of them. Mr. Buki intended to summarize the main points, but because they were private conversations he would not violate confidentiality. He stated that across the Board there was unbelievable love and dedication for Park City, which validated and strengthened the conclusions from visioning.

Mr. Buki remarked that what he learned from the one-on-one conversations was how far they had come in three meetings. A use of vocabulary surfaced in these meetings that reflected the essence of re-development, the essence of the market, and the challenges. They were still meeting because they had not found all the answers, but they were very close. Mr. Buki believed there was a lot of consensus among the group and he wanted to build on that consensus. They have begun to move from what Bonanza Park is all about to how to get there. They were not there yet, but the conversations and migration was showing progress.

Mr. Buki shared a few of the categories from the one-on-one conversations. One that he heard loud and clear was to emphasize the importance of process, logic, decisiveness and fairness. Mr. Buki stated that everyone was saying the same thing; however, certain things rose to the top. For some, it was the importance of remaining great and not resting at all. Another top priority was the importance of beauty and delight. For others, they recognized the importance of giving things such as height, density and money, but the result should be to get something of importance. Therefore, it is not a matter of trade for its own sake.

Mr. Buki reviewed a series of slides. He wanted to make sure they were in agreement on key pieces before moving forward in Session Four. He recalled from Session One that there was agreement that 1) development must be guided by the City's core values; 2) that redevelopment is essential for economic liability; 3) the portfolio approach.

The group concurred with the three pieces Mr. Buki outlined.

Mr. Buki remarked that TZO's were discussed in Session Two and the group agreed that, 1) partnership is necessary to stay ahead of the market; 2) individual neighborhoods have specific identifies; 3) redevelopment prioritization on a regular basis is necessary.

The Group concurred with the key points outlined.

Mr. Buki noted that the Third Session was a conversation on trade-offs and the beginning of the discussion on Bonanza Park. He concluded from the third session that there was a gap between what is allowed and what they want, particularly in Bonanza Park. Through a survey they identified all the things that could be done, what they did not like, the current function, where they want to be, and the fact that there is a gap.

Commissioner Savage asked Mr. Buki to expand on what they might want to do in Bonanza Park that is not currently permitted. Council Member Simpson believed it was more an issue of what is permitted might not be their highest desire. Commissioner Savage asked if more was permitted than what they would want to do. He was trying to reconcile the meaning of Mr. Buki's statement. Council Member Kernan believed that currently there were barriers to what they could do and what they are likely to do. He did not believe the infrastructure was in place to create what they want. There were several obstacles that needed to be cleared.

Mayor Williams believed that many in the group were shocked when they realized what would be allowed because much of it is not appropriate. The question was what that means in terms of moving forward. Commissioner Savage asked if they were in a position of having to expand what is allowed in Bonanza Park in order to get what they want. He thought that they were starting under the premise that there was already a definition.

Mr. Buki stated that his statements were more literal. While there were disagreements on the survey, there was a lot of agreement against big box retail. Big box retail could occur in Bonanza Park. Therefore, if they do not want it, they need to go back to the framework pieces from Sessions One and Two, which is how to prevent that from happening. Mr. Buki remarked that some communities accept it as allowed and other communities will attempt to go back and revisit the Codes that have a large enough gap for something to get through.

Commissioner Savage understood that there were more options for what could be allowed than what they would like. Planner Cattan used open space as an example. Currently, open space is within setbacks on large lots. However, they could create better utilized open space for community gathering spots. Council Member Simpson thought open space was a great example. The issue is not that it is permitted, but it may not be in the form they want. City Attorney, Mark Harrington, stated that is it not limited to the regulatory pyridine and it could go either way. There is an additional element in terms of the City partnership whether it be through RDA, infrastructure, or whether trade in a project would increase development opportunity for additional open space. Mr. Harrington stated that it might go beyond what you could get with a regulatory application.

Mr. Buki noted that from the survey it was very important to achieve a sense of community. From the conversations there was a strong sentiment that it is not there now. What is allowed now is

more of the same. Mr. Buki pointed out that if they do not want more of the same, they would have to make changes.

Mr. Buki stated that desirable results hinge on trading off gives and gets. Mr. Buki asked the group for examples of gives. Commissioner Hontz answered height. Commissioner Thomas pointed out that giving height would result in getting significant open space. Mr. Buki commented on their discussions regarding districting in earlier sessions and the fact that trade-offs, gives and gets, and how you deal with it in one district should not dictate how you deal with it in another district. There needs to be connectivity because of the portfolio approach, but they do have local distinction.

Mr. Buki remarked that the survey identified specific desired results in Bonanza Park, Lower Park and Old Town and what to encourage and what to discourage. He stated that two other pieces that came out of the previous meetings were 1) there will never be perfect information; 2) development will not wait.

Mr. Buki noted that at the last meeting the group discussed the survey results. They collected the core values from the entire community, and the group had an opportunity to rank them for Bonanza Park. The core values were sense of community and small town feel, and they wanted that to drive the decision making. When they ranked the levers, economy and equity were the most important. They would want to see economic gains and gains in equity. Mr. Buki stated that based on the survey, they perceive the current character and function as being under-utilized, run down, small business, and mixed use. The stated goal was to make it vibrant, affordable, mixed-use and local. Mr. Buki remarked that the survey asked what they would be willing to give in order to get, what they want to encourage and discourage, and what tools they could use to achieve it. Mr. Buki stated that in the third session they went through very specifically what the survey gave as handrails. The top priority was to encourage locally owned commercial. They also wanted affordable housing, small business incubator, apartments, and medium size commercial. He noted that multi-use facility was on the list; but it in another area of the survey it was also ranked as being nowhere in the City. Mr. Buki stated that parks and campus rose to the top as something that should be encouraged. He stated that the planning implication is whether they can achieve these things now and whether they would happen on their own. If not, the question is what they could do.

Mr. Buki stated that the group was clear on what to discourage. They did not want single-family homes, a museum, big box retail, or nightly rentals. In individual conversations, he perceived that they did not want a suburban subdivision and a strip mall. Nowhere in Park City would they want big boxes, national franchises and a multi-use facility.

Mr. Buki noted that height and density were two primary tools for Bonanza Park. They also have financing tools. Mr. Buki clarified that the group was willing to consider height if they could be assured of getting something within a design framework, such as open space, a smaller building footprint, something green, local, protected view corridors, and affordable housing. Mr. Buki remarked that the group was not unwilling to use density as a tool to get what they want as long as it protects historic structures city-wide. As it relates to Bonanza Park, they would want connectivity, affordability, green, and within a design parameter.



Mr. Buki emphasized that their decisions would only get harder going forward because that is the nature of an advanced urban place. It gets harder primarily due to competing goals and more people. More of their values are in competition with each other. The choices are harder and you cannot have it all. The political implication is that not everyone will be happy. Council Member Simpson disagreed that it was a political implication. She believed it was a community implication. Mr. Buki estimated that no less than 40% of the community would be unhappy. He was unsure how many would voice their opinion, but they would be angry. Mr. Buki stated that the nature of 25 years of success has put them in a position of pitting gets against gets and gives against gives, and not everybody wins on every decision.

Mayor Williams pointed out that this was fundamentally different than how they have looked at things for the last 30 years. They are not being reactive because they have a landowner who is very open-minded to the parameters being set. Mayor Williams stated that they were trying to create the vision rather than just mandate the LMC. Unlike the past, they are trying to set up criteria. The challenge is the lack of experience in looking at this type of development. Mr. Buki stated that the group as a whole must find common language and common ground.

Mr. Buki outlined three issues he believed needed to be addressed this evening. The first issue was that the current General Plan and LMC are not the best tools to articulate what should occur in Bonanza Park to achieve a built environment consistent with what they want. The current tools leave large gaps between what is allowed and what they want. In his view, the net of those current tools create a "gotcha" environment for property owners and developers.

Mr. Buki remarked that there were several ways to think about the "gotcha" environment. One is that the status quo perpetuates an "it depends" posture. They recognize the gives and gets, but they still lack clarity and definition. It makes the resulting environment inherently regulatory instead of partnership oriented. Mr. Buki stated that in his personal opinion, it puts them at risk of getting what they do not want both locally and city-wide.

The second is to get a built environment consistent with the core values, which would require a Bonanza Park Plan that is not found in the LMC or the General Plan. The Bonanza Park Plan should include specificity in height, density and financing. The plan should also include a tool for addressing the power station. Mr. Buki stated that an additional advantage is that they would be prototyping a tool that could be used in other areas.

Mr. Buki perceived that there was emerging consensus on what they do or do not want, but there was also resistance. For some, redevelopment is scary and there is a tendency to regulate development to keep it from happening. Others do not want things to change and doing nothing feels safe. Mr. Buki remarked that in reality, doing nothing may be the least safe thing to do because the community is likely to grow haphazardly if they play it safe. Most importantly, they would miss the opportunity to get what they want and possibly end up with everything they did not want.

City Attorney Harrington advised the Planning Commissioners and Council Members to make necessary disclosures before continuing with the discussion. Commissioner Wintzer disclosed that

he owns property in the Bonanza Park area. Council Member Matsumoto disclosed that she rents property in the Bonanza Park area. Commissioner Worel disclosed that she is with the People's Health Clinic and Mark Fischer sits on their Board. Council Member Simpson disclosed that she sits on the Board of the People's Health Clinic and she rents a storage unit in Bonanza Park. Council Member Kernan disclosed that he uses the recycling center with his recycling business and he rents space in Bonanza Park.

Mr. Buki asked the group for their comments on the best way to address development in Bonanza Park. Council Member Kernan would like to eliminate or reduce visible parking lots with either street parking or having parking lots behind or under buildings.

Commissioner Wintzer asked Mr. Buki to re-review the core values to make sure there was agreement on the core values. Mr. Buki stated that when they talked about Bonanza Park at a previous last meeting they used the terms from visioning 2008 and 2009. The group prioritized sense of community and small town feel as top priorities. When they were finished with planning and there was full build-out, they would be able to feel confident that together they shaped development that provided a sense of community and small town feel.

Council Member Simpson remarked that Park City is an interesting town with very dense urban areas. In her opinion, sense of community and small town are almost one in the same. She does not define small town as a small rural town. In Park City you get a sense of community because you walk places and you see continually see familiar faces. It has nothing to do with the number of stories in a building or the architecture. Council Member Simpson believed sense of community and small town was defined by the feel that is generated by the built environment.

Council Member Butwinski stated that for him personally, it goes back to the presentation about form based code and where that would lead. He thought a sense of community was built by having neighborhoods within blocks where it would work as multi-use in the sense of retail/commercial/residential, with a goal of creating an environment where the retail can be successful because the residential is a part of the development and community in the neighborhood. Council Member Butwinski would encourage development to be contiguous and to be built at a pace that could be absorbed by the free market system, and dovetailing that into the overall development scenario.

Council Member Matsumoto agreed with comments by Council Members Simpson and Butwinski regarding small town, and added that development should also appear real and not fake. She believed there needed to be another way to make it feel real aside from commercial and residential.

Commissioner Peek stated that neighborhood is important, but it should also be welcoming to non-residents of the neighborhood. It should create a comfortable feeling for those just passing through.

Mayor Williams commented on the City Tour to Estes Park in Colorado, which he believed had a definite small town feel. Mayor Williams pointed out that the predominant feature of Estes Park was

the Old Stanley Hotel and one of the largest power grid stations in the middle of town which dominates the whole landscape of the City. Everything else was timeless. The rest of the town was mostly motel lodging and drive-ins. Mayor Williams stated that Estes Park had a small town feel, but it was definitely not what they would want for Park City. He was wary of small town feel because it is different depending on where it is. Mayor Williams believed the vision of small town feel for Park City should be focused on what they consider to be the small town feel of Park City.

Council Member Butwinski suggested that for vocabulary purposes they could use “neighborhood feel” rather than “small town feel”.

Commissioner Thomas thought they needed to add meaning to “sense of community” by determining what it is that creates sense of community. He believed it was gathering places, intersections for pedestrians, or a small market with related open space. If they want to build upon a sense of community, it is important to have a place where people could meet and interact.

Commissioner Savage asked if the vision was for a place where people live or where people go. Commissioner Thomas replied that it would be both. Commissioner Savage stated that Main Street is a place where people go. He wanted to know if Bonanza Park would be made vibrant because of the people who live there or the people who go there. Commissioner Peek replied that it could be vibrant because of the shared experience.

Mr. Buki remarked that sense of community could be created in various ways, however, a gathering space is critical and the capacity for people to gather is essential. Council Member Kernan thought the ability to provide ways for people to interact was also important. Council Member Simpson pointed out that gathering spaces do not always have to be large.

Commissioner Thomas stated that in looking at the map, you realize that Bonanza Park is the heart of the community in terms of circulation for pedestrian and vehicle traffic that comes to Park City. He believed this was an opportunity to create networks of connectivity for pedestrian pathways and creating places and passageways. People currently shop at Redstone and other places outside of the community. This was an opportunity to create the heart of their enterprise within their own community. Commissioner Thomas stated that it was bound to succeed if they would create a land use pattern that knits the rest of the community together.

Mr. Buki summarized that gathering space and connectivity were two building blocks to be considered.

Mayor Williams felt another issue related to the children who were raised in Park City and want to come back when they finish college, but there are no job opportunities. He noted that Fort Collins created an innovative center for incubating business. He believed Park City was a great area for facilitating new ideas for businesses. Council Member Simpson remarked that it would be a get. If they want to see it built in the District, they would have to give something to get it.

Commissioner Thomas believed that height and density were the given tools if they want to achieve more open space within the District. He remarked that the difficulty was that they were talking

about qualities they want in the community, but they needed a plan. Commissioner Thomas stated that eight years ago he suggested that the City hire someone to develop a master plan for this part of the community.

Commissioner Savage asked if it was possible to get a software model that talks about the economic impacts of making specific changes and the gives and gets. Mr. Buki replied that those types of models do exist. There are tools that would help them understand shade, sunlight, facades, and cost. Commissioner Savage felt they were at the point with Bonanza Park where there was agreement on the concepts, and it was time to find a way to begin substantiating that in the form of a model. With the right tools they could have a more progressive discussion. Council Member Kernan stated that in the model he would like to see better roads for connectivity to stay within the District.

Commissioner Wintzer struggled with the fact that in talking about sense of community and small town feel, they were actually talking about the sense of community and small town feel of a mountain ski resort. He wanted to know how they could create something that would not detract from what they love and depend on. Commissioner Wintzer noted that the City spent a lot of money to purchase open space to create a separation between Park City and Redstone. Mr. Buki stated that Council Member Matsumoto had expressed that same concern about being careful not to allow what they had walled off.

Council Member Simpson agreed that they needed a plan. She thought the objective this evening should be to define the goals for that plan and the tools needed to achieve those goals. Council Member Simpson did not believe they should be afraid to use height as a tool to get what they want, as long as it is done well. She noted that in discussions with Commissioner Thomas regarding view corridors and view sheds, Commissioner Thomas stated that some of his favorite views were between buildings. Council Member Simpson pointed out that everyone thinks of view sheds as being the mountain. However, Commissioner Thomas was integrating the built environment and she thought was valid.

Mayor Williams commented on the sculpture at Kearns and Bonanza and his shock at having his normal view blocked. It was not a question of good or bad, but it was different. Mayor Williams remarked that one of the gives is realizing that in order to get some of what they want, they will need to give up some of what they have.

Commissioner Thomas commented on the importance of documenting key view corridors when defining a plan. Mayor Williams thought they needed to define starting points. Typically, larger buildings were always at the base of mountains because the mountains dwarfed their size. Traditionally Park City has never gone higher than two or three stories. They are now beginning to look beyond those models. In his opinion, being willing to go over what traditionally exists is where they begin to gain a large number of gets.

Commissioner Savage asked what the Planning Staff needed from this group to come forward with a proposal for discussion. Mayor Williams thought they should first create a document that identifies the guidelines for development. Commissioner Savage stated that if they started with a

design, it would give this group something to critique that could turn into guidelines that could then be utilized.

Commissioner Thomas suggested that they approach this in the same way they would approach any design problem, which is to create a design program for the components they want to see in the community. They could then hire someone outside of this group to create a conceptual schematic diagram and begin to show options. Commissioner Thomas was concerned about trying to write a document to convey aesthetics. He thought they needed to start with an expert study of what works and where it should work. Commissioner Wintzer believed they could walk around Park City to see what worked and what didn't. He concurred with Commissioner Thomas about having someone do a conceptual design and something they could visualize.

Mr. Buki asked if there was consensus for a document to tell them what could be done. Council Member Kernan stated that the document would not have to be what they could do if they could control the whole area and build it. It could be broken apart into the characteristics they want. They do not need to know where the roads would be exactly, but they do need to know that there would be connectivity and find the right tools to get there.

Council Member Simpson stated that a Bonanza Park supplement was done in 2007, and she has heard from various people that they could accomplish what they want with the 2007 supplement. Council Member Simpson asked Director Eddington if he had a rebuttal to that way of thinking. She believed that the Planning Commission and City Council should prioritize what they want to see and what they are willing to give up, and then write a new plan if they determine that one is needed. Council Member Simpson respected everyone around the table, and she had heard dissenting opinions. She asked Director Eddington for his opinion on what was missing from the current Bonanza Park supplement that would achieve the flexibility of design and desire they were looking for.

Director Eddington stated that the existing Bonanza Park Supplement provides parameters and constraints; however it does not provide direction or a pro-active opportunity to shape that environment, or a visual sense of what was intended to go there. Taking out all the LMC aspects, Director Eddington did not believe the supplement provided a plan revision. It is more historic and code driven. Commissioner Wintzer concurred. His biggest argument when the 2007 Supplement was written was that they never started at the beginning to determine what they wanted and how to get there. Commissioner Wintzer asked Director Eddington what he would do different that could not be achieved with the current supplement. He noted that the plan is a guideline, but it is not binding.

Director Eddington replied that the existing plan allows a lot of things, but it is mostly things that could be done now by right of the general commercial zone. As an example, the supplement does not give direction relative to the street fabric within that area. It does not give focus to local business or other elements discussed relative to establishing, buying down and trading open space opportunities to create central open space.

Commissioner Savage wanted to know what the City's contribution would be as a partner to

encourage redevelopment in the long-term best interest of the City. Mr. Buki replied that if they do not want specific things, they should stop making it possible for those things to occur.

Commissioner Strachan thought the 2007 Bonanza Park supplement already encompassed everything they want. It is open-ended and says that height, zoning, setback and other items could be considered. It encourages open space and connectivity, and discourages big box and strip malls. Commissioner Strachan stated that if they intend to proscribe things that they do not want in the area and encourage other things, that should be addressed in the LMC.

Council Member Kernan asked how they turn into a form based code. Director Eddington replied that it is through an overlay zone. Director Eddington stated that before they get to the LMC, they have to exercise that vision and recommend the overlay zone if it is form based code.

Council Member Butwinski stated that as the liaison to the Planning Commission meetings, there is an ongoing conversation about specificity and lack of clarity in the General Plan. He noted that the purpose statement talks about community and all the components they have discussed as core values. It talks about what you can get, but it does not say what you have to give. Council Member Butwinski believed that was the disconnect in the current General Plan. Hearing the conversation at many Planning Commission meetings, the general consensus is that there needs to be more cohesiveness for what they want. Council Member Butwinski thought they should be more specific and identify exactly what they do or do not want, because that would help make the planning decisions.

Commissioner Strachan stated that in his opinion, the General Plan is not the document that provides specific direction to a developer. The General Plan gives the developer a general idea of what he might be able to do, but the developer looks to the LMC to know specifically what he can or cannot do. Commissioner Strachan reiterated that the gives and gets should be addressed in the Land Management Code because that is the document that allows them to enforce it.

Director Eddington remarked that they need to do the plan first and then incorporate that into the Land Management Code. Commissioner Strachan pointed out that they could amend the LMC based on the current General Plan. Commissioner Wintzer remarked that the current plan lacks pictures, drawings and vision. Aside from that, he agreed with Commissioner Strachan that the current plan was sufficient.

City Manager, Tom Bakaly, remarked that the dialogue was similar to what was discussed several years ago. At that time he asked whether they wanted a plan, or a "plan for the plan". They made a conscious decision to choose a "plan for the plan" and outline parameters. In response to Commissioner Savage's question as to what the Staff needed from the group to move forward, Mr. Bakaly clarified that the Staff was trying to implement their policy and vision, and they needed a document with specifics to do that. He did not believe the General Plan serves that purpose because the LMC is the regulatory tool. Mr. Bakaly stated that if the City is going to be a partner, there needs to be a commitment to a plan that has specificity and can move from this vision to reality in concert with a major landowner. When this group talks about the Land Management Code or the fact that the current General Plan is adequate, he was not hearing commitment and buy-in to

a plan. Mr. Bakaly stated that he needed that commitment before he could provide direction to the Staff. Hiring someone from the outside would not work because they have looked for that solution many times. Mr. Bakaly remarked that the primary issue was whether they willing to be a true partner with the developer and specifically develop a plan.

Commissioner Pettit stated that one issue the community struggles with relative to planning is that the General Plan should be a living, breathing document, and that has not been the case in the past. She thought they were too afraid to be specific and provide a plan because they want to be flexible. Commissioner Pettit believed they could be flexible if over time they re-visit the plan and adjust or make appropriate changes.

Mr. Buki summarized that the quality of a document should allow for some flexibility at some point. However, that flexibility cannot be so great that it becomes a regulatory component. Mr. Bakaly further added that it should not cross the "it depends" line. He believed they needed to get past "it depends" and actually commit if they want to be that partner. Committing means specificity and risk and expecting that a large number of the community will be unhappy. Another approach would be to create the best framework possible on which to evaluate proposals that come before them, which is a very different relationship.

Commissioner Strachan supported Mr. Bakaly, and asked which document should have that specificity. Mr. Bakaly thought it should be a separate plan for this particular area that has principles and components that could then be applied for the rest of the Bonanza Park District. Commissioner Wintzer stated that regardless of what they do, it is important to make sure that Bonanza Park is connected to the rest of the town. If they end up with separate documents, he wanted to know which document would provide that connection. He believed the easiest place in was the General Plan.

Mr. Buki stated that he and Commissioner Pettit had a similar discussion on that same issue. The need to make sure that what they pursue in Bonanza Park is not so isolated that they forget it shares customers and cars with Old Town. Bonanza Park's gain should not be Main Street's loss. The plan needs to specifically and intentionally address that issue. Therefore, if they authorize a document with those pieces, it needs to have explicit articulation.

Commissioner Pettit stated that her ongoing fear is not fully understanding what the impacts of creating a vibrant retail/commercial in Bonanza Park would have on Main Street. She hoped it would be complimentary and a different experience. Mr. Buki remarked that an important component was finding that complimentary from district to district.

Commissioner Savage clarified that this was the reason for his earlier question of whether this area is a place where people live or a place where people go. Being a place where people go increases the competition with Main Street. A place where people live is more self-contained. He believed this was an important consideration when they think about types of commercial space and uses to encourage.

Commissioner Peek thought the question was the type of commercial uses or the type of built

environment they wanted for that area. They need to decide if they want to just draw from the ski season or expand to something more diverse with more buildings.

Council Member Simpson reiterated her previous question of what was missing in the current Bonanza Park Supplemental. She noted that the City is obligated to consider a zone change anywhere. However, if they do not want to see specific things in that area it should not be mentioned in the document. Council Member Simpson believed the plan should intentional and clearly lay out priorities for the District, as well as what they would not want to see.

Commissioner Wintzer clarified that his comments regarding the current General Plan were not meant to imply that he did not think the document should be changed or updated. However, in terms of use, if something is allowed as a conditional use in the LMC, the General Plan would not be able to prohibit it. Council Member Simpson stated that the 2007 Bonanza Park Supplement lacks their intentions and goals for that neighborhood.

City Attorney Harrington stated that Utah law allows an option for the General Plan to either be mandatory or advisory. By ordinance, Park City chose to make their General Plan mandatory. Mr. Harrington remarked that the last consultant recognized the need for flexibility; and therefore, the mandatory document has flexible non-binding terms such as should, hopes, and wants. Flexibility was built in so the document would not have to dictate a result. Mr. Harrington stated that the General Plan cannot be amended without amending the Land Management Code. It is always a two-step process. They would never be able to codify what they want without laying out plans for what they want, which no one wants the government to do. If they want creativity and vision in development, the balance is predictability with the freedom to have the private sector dictate the result. Based on their comments, Mr. Harrington believed there was general agreement that the current plan does not provide those agreed upon benchmarks. For that reason, it must be a two-step process with more detail in the plan, followed by regulator adjustments in the LMC that gives the Planning Commission the tools to better say yes or no.

The group discussed gives and gets and how specific the trade-offs should be in the plan.

Mayor Williams recalled agreement in the first joint meeting that Park City has unique neighborhoods. He noted that the existing neighborhoods are easy to define because they are already built. Part of the General Plan would be defining the uniqueness of these neighborhoods. Mayor Williams believed they were trying to do the same thing for Bonanza Park, but the difference is that they have a clean slate which makes it harder to define. He commented on the line about "development won't wait. He suggested that they give the Staff a 60 day bye on the General Plan to allow them to focus on a supplement to achieve the gives and gets.

Mr. Bakaly was uncomfortable with the word "supplement", because it implies that it is a component of the General Plan, as opposed to a specific area of the plan. It caused him to ask the question of whether it was a specific plan for the area or a component of the General Plan. Mr. Bakaly stated that it would take less time if the Staff was given specific policy direction as to what the group wants. It would take longer if they want to remain general and be as flexible as possible. Mr. Bakaly believed that two months to develop a document would be a realistic time frame if they



obtained greater specificity on certain items.

Commissioner Wintzer wanted to know why there was a rush to produce this document. Mayor Williams replied that one reason was that applications were coming in. Mr. Bakaly believed the rush was the consensus that the area was under-utilized, rundown, lacked identity, boring, and uninviting.

Mr. Buki clarified that it was not a matter of “rush’ as in getting it done tomorrow. It was a rush in terms of having a purpose. The market will not wait and currently they were not capturing the income being spent outside of the City boundary. They can continue to drag their feet or they can push for a document that will put a face on Bonanza Park to begin competing and recapturing some of the revenue needed to achieve what they want.

Council Member Simpson remarked that regardless of what they title the document, it needs to include a map, a tool, a list of priorities and a list of things they do not want for that area. Commissioner Savage could support delaying the April 15<sup>th</sup> deadline for the General Plan with the understanding that they would receive a crisp, well-defined plan that the Planning Department could recommend moving forward on. He thought they should empower the Planning Staff to do their job.

Mayor Williams suggested that part of that was drilling down on the meaning of each parameter. He commented on the number of every day basic items that are not available in Park City, which leaves the residents no choice but to drive outside of the city limits to purchase them. If meeting those basic needs was something they wanted in Park City, he was unsure whether that would be a give or a get. Mayor Williams noted that in focusing on the tourist industry they have given up the things geared towards the local community. In his opinion, the April 15<sup>th</sup> deadline was not critical for the General Plan because it was more important to drill down on the individual parameters. Once the parameters are defined and established in a document, it would be easier to define the gives and gets as they move through the process with developers.

Mr. Buki summarized that there was a proposal on the table for a crisp and clean document that is policy driven and goal oriented, and describes what they want to see occur. The document can and will be prepared by Staff based on direction from this group. The document is a high priority that should be done sooner rather than later; and because it is a priority, the deadline for the General Plan re-write would be delayed.

Mr. Buki asked Commissioner Thomas to provide his ideas on the document from the standpoint of process and element. Commissioner Thomas believed they were looking for help from the Staff and should assign the Staff the responsibility of coming back with a specific plan for the Bonanza Park neighborhood by the end of the year. The plan should focus on gathering spaces, connectivity, authentic architecture, and the components and elements they all believe are necessary to turn Bonanza Park into a central place where people can shop and live. It should be done on the scale of a local town feel. Commissioner Thomas believed the Staff was capable of accomplishing that goal.

Mayor Williams added that the plan should have pictures. In addition, he felt there was enough

expertise in the room that going outside for help was not necessary. Mayor Williams suggested that they ask Commissioner Thomas to be their liaison and work with Staff. Commissioner Thomas was not opposed to working with the Staff on behalf of the Planning Commission and the City Council, but he felt it was important to rely on the professionalism of the Staff to generate the plan.

Commissioner Wintzer was still unclear as to what they would name the document. Director Eddington stated that it would be the Bonanza Park Plan or a Plan for Bonanza Park. The document would be incorporated into the full General Plan once the General Plan re-write is completed.

Commissioner Thomas pointed out that the plan needs to have a supported relationship with Main Street and with the resorts. It should also help resolve transportation issues and connectivity.

Mr. Buki asked if there was agreement for the General Plan re-write to take a back seat while they construct this document. Commissioner Wintzer added the caveat that part of the connectivity of this project to the rest of Park City would be worked on in the General Plan simultaneously. Commissioner Peek thought they should be able to use this experience as a template to create the rest of the General Plan.

Mayor Williams called for public input.

Mary Cook stated that in addition to a traffic analysis, she suggested that they think about the pedestrian traffic, bike traffic and skateboard traffic that comes up against that piece of land and stops. Ms. Cook offered two different ways to approach the problem. One was more visual and technical. They could build it first and then see what it suggests in terms of rules and regulations. The second approach was to come at it from technical knowledge about laws, regulations, what does and doesn't work and to write the plan. She suggested having two groups work from two different perspectives and then have them come back together at some point. Ms. Cook was certain there was a computer program on the market where they could build multiple perspectives of a land use project to see how they lay out.

Jon-Eric Greene commented on conversations regarding the economy and how to add to the economy as opposed to detracting from it. He believed a big elephant in the room was the office space at Kimball Junction. Park City has seen a lot of businesses, including his own, move out of Old Town due to the lack of functional office space. He agreed with Commissioner Thomas that this was their opportunity to create the center of the community from residential, and a large part of that is office space and jobs. As a community they need to talk about the types of jobs they want to attract in Park City and whether they compliment the resort/business and world resort lifestyle or take away from it. Mr. Greene remarked that they could talk about heights and what development should look like, but they also need to consider jobs and the economy in Park City, as well as the opportunities that the Bonanza Park area can contribute to the future of the economy.

Mayor Williams believed office space would come under mixed-use with an emphasis on local business. He reiterated his earlier comment about providing opportunities for college graduates

who want to return to Park City. Council Member Simpson stated that she met with the new Park City Young Professionals Group, who are young professionals who moved back to Park City and would like to start a business. She agreed that it was getting harder to find office space.

Commissioner Savage asked if the City had a development plan that speaks to those types of questions. He was told that the City did not have that type of plan. Commissioner Savage asked if that should be a separate issue or included as part of the General Plan. He was told that it could be addressed in the General Plan.

Kate Riggs thanked the group for their efforts. She commended their great discussions and how they came together on a recommendation to put long-term strategy ahead of Code. She believed that was for the betterment of the community. She agreed that there was great expertise on Staff and she commended their decision for using that resource. Ms. Riggs thought another great resource was Mr. Buki, the facilitator and consultant. She commented on words she heard such as connectivity, jobs, complimentary, economy, and economic development. She urged them to look at the community beyond the ski resorts because Park City is no longer just a ski resort community. The resorts have worked hard to become year-round resorts. Ms. Riggs stated that they need to look at economic development. She is one who would like the ability to buy basic items within the Park City limits. Park City should provide the services that are needed for a year-round community because that is what they are. They cannot diversify Old Town and Park City proper if they continue to look at themselves as a ski resort community. Through the Bonanza Park plan, Ms. Riggs hoped they would look to community resources within the resorts, the residential, and the realtors to provide data and the expertise needed to support the long-term plan.

Michael Barille encouraged them to allow avenues for the community to help with a number of tasks. Whether it is design examples or job growth and ideas, it is important for the community to be interactive in the planning process. Mr. Barille also encouraged them to trust the private section and use their experience to understand the issues.

Craig Elliott stated that Mark Fischer was out of town and asked him to comment this evening. Mr. Elliot disclosed that he works for Mark Fischer. Mr. Elliott believed that the decision to have a Bonanza Park plan was a good step and would make a big difference for what Mr. Fischer would like to accomplish. He stated that Mr. Fischer is one of Park City's philanthropic community members and they have an opportunity to move forward with him. Trust is an important word and something they have to work through. Mr. Elliott stated that he has the computer model software and available information they were talking about this evening. Mr. Fischer has suggested that he provide them with that information. Mr. Elliott pointed out that they do not need to hire someone outside of Park City because he was willing to give them the tools and the benefit of his expertise. Mr. Elliott believed there was an opportunity for a public/private partnership to evolve. He preferred that the document be a statement of great development and what they want versus everything they do not want. Mr. Elliott stated that he works with the Staff every day and he was confident in their ability to put together a great plan. He agreed with the request to have pictures and visuals in the document.

A member of the public suggested that they think about the movie Field of Dreams and the line, "if

you build it they will come”.

Mayor Williams thought it would be interesting to have a public meeting at some point on what eight words mean to people in town; everyday use, vibrant, etc. Getting the public involved would be an attempt to make a larger percentage of people accept the document.

Ruth Meintsma stated that she has been listening to the group talk about the manifestation of the Bonanza Park plan. She recalled that Director Eddington had said that the current plan had parameters but no direction. The General Plan has direction but it is not specific enough. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that in talking about what they need in this document, they were describing the Historic District Design Guidelines. Ms. Meintsma noted that the design guidelines are specifics, but always in the context of size, character, neighborhood and feel. She suggested that they use the same format for the Bonanza Park plan and call it the BPDG, Bonanza Park Design Guidelines. If they used the same format and followed the parameters of the HDDG, she believed the public would have a better understanding of what they were trying to accomplish and refer to that document first.

Mayor Williams remarked that Old Town is a defined area and they were able to create the guidelines for something that already exists. That is very different from something that has a clean slate and needs a mission statement.

Ms. Meintsma noted that the geography of Bonanza Park is flat, which is much different than Old Town. She thought they should keep that in mind when they talk about neighborhood feel, because being flat offers many opportunities.

Mary Wintzer stated that in talking about the vibrancy of Bonanza Park, she wanted them to keep in mind what the 20 small business owners on Iron Horse have created through the years. The business owners contribute their own creativity and that has created vibrancy on Iron Horse. Ms. Wintzer suggested that they use that as a model and keep economics in mind. They cannot encourage people to build grandiose complexes with high rents, because it is unrealistic for a small business owner to make it in that setting. Ms. Wintzer encouraged them to keep the authenticity that the business owners have created.

Director Eddington summarized that the Staff would endeavor on a plan that deals with Bonanza Park, and look at it from a new comprehensive, holistic approach. A number of issues are comprehensive city-wide in terms of connectivity, transportation, and economic impacts. Issues specific to Bonanza Park include gathering spaces, connectivity, transportation, utilizing graphics, relationship to Main Street and the resorts. The intent for this plan is to use graphics and narrative to provide direction based upon the goals exhibited from the survey and the last four meetings. Director Eddington stated that the idea is to build upon the visioning statement from 2008-2009, as well as the comments from the survey and the discussions, to create a forward thinking plan and vision for that area. The plan should define parameters and recommend whether it is form-based code, design guidelines, or LMC changes and present the document to the group. The Staff would utilize this group and the public for input to carry the plan forward. Director Eddington believed the document could be completed by the end of the year. He recommended that it be presented at a joint meeting in January.

Mr. Buki requested final comments from each of the participants.

Council Member Butwinski noted that Director Eddington never mentioned gives in his summary. He believed it was important to have gives. Director Eddington thought they would be able to identify the gives and gets as they move through the process. The gives and gets listed in their discussion would be addressed in the plan.

Commissioner Savage thought it would be helpful to create a spreadsheet that correlates the relationship between the gives with the gets. He did not have a good idea of the expected demand for affordable housing or to what degree this type of environment could be used to substantially accomplish those objectives. Commissioner Savage also suggested an economic model associated with how revenues flow back into the City taxes and other sources to look at it more holistically. Density, height, economic model and relationship to other major goals as it relates to the equity question.

Council Member Kernan thought they were making a commitment to work more like partners. He hoped the new Bonanza Park Development Design Guidelines would help bridge what was missing and help them partner easier to accomplish some of what they like, such as the form based code. Council Member Kernan also hoped they could find the tools to better connect all the roads and accomplish other goals, and to find the gives needed to connect that area. He was excited to have a new tool to implement a vision they all like instead of reacting to things they do not like; and one that encourages developers to work together for common goals.

Council Member Peek suggested a give for uses that do not cycle with the winter and summer based economy. Other important elements were welcoming, comfortable, generates a shared experience, gathering space, connectivity, regional architecture, shop/live, local town feel.

Council Member Matsumoto was unsure if the new plan was the appropriate place to address phasing. In an earlier meeting someone had mentioned that phasing achieves a more authentic look than designing it all at one time. Council Member Matsumoto remarked that the elephants in the room were a convention center in this area of town and the power poles, and she had definite opinions on both issues.

Mayor Williams noted that the Power Company was looking at several options. The City requested that the Power Company look at Mark Fischer's property across the street as the main option. The Power Company realized that it is one of the most viable options on the table. Mr. Buki advised Director Eddington to account for the implications of different scenarios for power locations.

Commissioner Worel asked if studies have been done on the health implications related to the proximity of the power station. Mayor Williams did not believe the Power Company had conducted a study, but they deny any health factors. Mr. Buki requested that they table the power station discussion until after Director Eddington and Commissioner Thomas flush out all the implications.

Commissioner Strachan was willing to give anything in order to get proper traffic mitigation on Highway 248. He stated that unless the new document is more specific than the current General Plan supplement, he would consider the whole process a loss.

Commissioner Pettit supported gives and gets with respect to height and density. However, she would need to know more definitively and quantitatively what the give and the gets are to understand the correlation. Commissioner Pettit stated that another piece of the equation was the flow out of town to Redstone and other places outside of the City limits. She believed this area should be developed in a way that appeals to young people so they will want to ride their bikes to the Bonanza Park District instead of riding the bus to Redstone. They should think about uses in that area that would be attractive to the young people in the community.

Commissioner Hontz favored the idea of a new plan and thought it should be sophisticated and very specific. She hoped the Staff would do a good job of controlling the Planning Commission and the City Council when they start asking for additional studies and information that do not pertain to what they are trying to accomplish with this plan. The Staff could take time to provide the information, but everyone needs to realize that the trade-off would be not meeting the deadline. Commissioner Hontz could not see them continually pushing back deadlines. She encouraged the Staff to be firm with both the Commissioners and the Council Members to keep the process on track.

Commissioner Worel struggled with how to take the current plan and supplement from having so many depends to being too regulatory. She liked the concept of the gives and gets because it is an intermediary. She appreciated the comment about having the document being more of a guideline than a regulatory plan.

Mayor Williams thought they should utilize Craig Elliott if they wanted a public/private partnership to move forward. Mr. Elliott has worked with the City on other projects and he already has the tools they might need. Mayor Williams stated that in 35 years he has never seen anyone who owns so much ground ask the City to help decide what to do with his property. He believed Mr. Fischer and Mr. Elliott should be at the table for some of the discussions in some manner. It is a unique opportunity for the City to have a developer willing to work with them and they should take advantage of it. The process for Lower Park Avenue will be different because there will be so many people and many different properties.

Mayor Williams liked that this group tried to define the terms for Bonanza Park. This is an important document and he believed they would be able to complete it by the end of the year. Mayor Williams believed the four joint meetings were an example of how the City has evolved to the point of being able to sit down together for meaningful discussions.

Council Member Simpson concurred with Mayor Williams and most of the other comments. However, what she heard from Director Eddington were the words "we hope, we think, we will try, we plan to" and that was not definitive enough for her. She would be very angry if they do not produce a document by the end of the year. If there are problems or the Staff needs extra resources along the way, she would want to hear about it early rather than later. Council Member Simpson was willing to support a complete three month moratorium on requests from the Planning

Commission or the City Council for information that is not directly related to a packet. Completing this plan is important and they need to adhere to the deadline. Council Member Simpson wanted to be sure they use the word "equity" because it applies to both the community and the developer. When they start talking about the power station it will be a very hard part of the conversation. If the City makes the trade-off, and as a group they decide that it benefits the community to move the power station out of Bonanza Park but possibly near dense residential housing, they will have a very tough equity conversation on their hands. She wanted everyone to be clear on that issue.

Mr. Buki stated that when they did visioning, nothing permeated every conversation as much as equity. The issue of equity deserves time for its own conversation, but that time was not this evening.

Council Member Butwinski stated that the new plan should give the developer a clear sense of what they are applying for and an expectation of whether or not it would be approved. He agreed with Commissioner Hontz and Council Member Simpson about not letting requests for additional information interfere with the end of the year deadline to complete the plan. However, he was not willing to support a moratorium as suggested by Council Member Simpson.

Commissioner Wintzer wanted it clearly understood that the desire to create a viable project does not necessarily mean giving something away. He asked Director Eddington to first find a way to describe what is needed for a nice project, and then identify the gives and gets. Commissioner felt this had been a great process.

Commissioner Thomas found it exciting to be playing offense rather than defense. He was confident that the Staff would meet the deadline and he was willing to support that with his time and effort. Commissioner Thomas was pleased to be able to weave some things back into the community that have dwindled away. He felt it was important to find a way to tell their story and to pay tribute to the mining heritage and the Olympic heritage. Commissioner Thomas stated that aesthetics do not happen from an analytical or engineering approach. It is achieved by making it a priority to make sure what they get a better visual environment. He concurred with all previous comments.

Mr. Bakaly believed this would be a team effort at the Staff level. He agreed with the comments to involve Craig Elliott in some manner. Mr. Bakaly suggested another joint meeting in a few weeks to talk about Park City Mountain Resort and Lower Park Avenue.

The Work Session adjourned at 9:10.



State of Utah

JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR.  
Governor

GARY R. HERBERT  
Lieutenant Governor

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

JOHN R. NJORD, P.E.  
Executive Director

CARLOS M. BRACERAS, P.E.  
Deputy Director

March 9, 2007

Eric DeHaan, City Engineer  
Park City Corporation  
Marsac Municipal Building  
PO Box 1480  
Park City, Utah 84060

SUBJECT: Corridor Preservation on SR-248 in Summit County  
UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,  
SUMMIT COUNTY AND PARK CITY

Dear Mr. DeHaan:

Attached is an original fully executed copy of the Corridor Preservation Agreement between UDOT, Summit County and Park City.

Sincerely,  
*Vicki Townsend*  
Vicki Townsend  
UDOT Region Two Contract Specialist

CC: Kris Peterson, Traffic Operations Engineer



6536

COOPERATIVE  
CORRIDOR PRESERVATION AGREEMENT

THIS COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT, made and entered into this 1 day of FEBRUARY, 2007, by and between the UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, hereinafter referred to as "UDOT" and PARK CITY, ~~Municipal Corporation~~ *Political Subdivision* in the State of Utah, hereinafter referred to as the "City", and SUMMIT COUNTY, a ~~Municipal Corporation~~ in the State of Utah, hereinafter referred to as the "County".

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS, to facilitate traffic flow along the SR-248 corridor between S.R. 224 to US-40 Quinn's Jct., the parties hereto desire to designate specific access management and corridor preservation elements; and

WHEREAS, the parties hereto have determined by formal finding that regulation of intersection and access points for future highway improvements is not in violation of the laws of the State of Utah or any legal contract with the City or County.

THIS COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT is made to set out the terms and conditions whereunder said rights-of-way shall be preserved. This agreement is to replace the existing cooperative agreement for SR-248.

**NOW THEREFORE**, it is agreed by and between the parties hereto as follows:

(1). To facilitate traffic flow along the SR-248 corridor between S.R. 224 and US-40 Quinns Jct., the following locations are identified as locations for future traffic signal installation. Actual installation will be as determined by the criteria contained in enumerated paragraphs (2) and (6).

Homestake Rd.	Proposed
Bonanza Dr.	Existing
Park City High School (approximately midway between Bonanza and Comstock)	Proposed Pedestrian Signal
Comstock Dr.	Existing
Wyatt Earp Drive	Proposed
SR-248 at Old Dump Rd.	Proposed
SR-248 development signal (minimum ¼ mile west of US-40 SB offramp terminal)	Proposed

(2). The parties hereto agree that proposed traffic signals will only be installed at the locations specified in enumerated paragraph (1) in the herein described SR-248 corridor and only as they become warranted as defined by Chapter 4C of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (FHWA, current edition), except as noted in enumerated paragraph (6). As agreed upon by the parties hereto, it is further agreed that it may be necessary to not allow unsignalized accesses between Old Dump Rd. to US-40 Quinn's Jct. The **City** and **County** shall develop any master plan in this area around this concept and the parties hereto shall work towards the common goal identified in this agreement. The parties hereto agree that up to two additional access points may be constructed on S.R. 248 east of U.S. 40 to access a planned Park and Ride lot subject to normal permitting by UDOT.

(3). In order to promote safety and efficiency within the SR-248 corridor, unsignalized accesses between Old Dump Rd. to US-40 Quinn's Jct. will be closed upon development and future signal installation as noted in enumerated paragraph (1).

Corridor Preservation on SR-248 in Summit County  
UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,  
SUMMIT COUNTY AND PARK CITY

(4). In order to promote safety and efficiency within the SR-248 corridor, unsignalized accesses between Wyatt Earp Way to Old Dump Rd. will be administered as per **UDOT's** access management requirements (Administrative Rule R930-6).

(5). Upon completion of the south development in the area between Homestake Rd. and Bonanza Dr., the existing non-signalized accesses shall be consolidated to promote safety and efficiency within the SR-248 corridor.

(6). In order to promote safety and efficiency along the SR-248 corridor, all other access to the corridor will be administered as per **UDOT's** access management requirements (Administrative Rule R930-6).

(7). Regarding development located westside of US-40 Quinn's Jct.:

(a). The northside development will be serviced by the future development signalized intersection located minimum  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile from the US-40 SB offramp terminal. This future development signalized intersection will also serviced the southside development and road connection from Old Dump Rd. As agreed upon by the parties hereto, the signal may be warranted and built to coincide with the opening of this development. Any right-of-way acquisition, environmental clearance, design, and construction costs shall be paid by the developer.

(b). Upon completion of the northside development and the installation of the future development signalized intersection, the existing N.A.C. (National Ability Center) access will be closed.

(c). Upon completion of the southside development and the installation of the future development signalized intersection, existing non-signalized accesses will be closed.

(d). This agreement shall not be considered precedent-setting. It is not the general practice of the **UDOT** to warrant a signal before traffic volumes meet minimum thresholds as defined by Chapter 4C of the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (FHWA, current edition).


(8). Based upon future considerations and needs, this Cooperative Corridor Preservation Agreement may need to be amended from its original form and, therefore, any desires to amend this agreement shall require the concurrence of the parties hereto.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have caused these presents to be executed by their duly authorized officers as of the day and year first above written.

ATTEST:

PARK CITY, a Municipal Corporation  
of the State of Utah

*[Handwritten Signature]*



*[Handwritten Signature]*

Title CITY RECORDER

Title MAYOR

Date: 2/5/07


Date: 2/5/07

(IMPRESS SEAL)

ATTEST:  
Corporation

SUMMIT COUNTY, a <sup>Political Subdivision</sup> ~~Municipal~~

*[Handwritten Signature]*



of the State of Utah

By *[Handwritten Signature]*

Title Summit County Clerk

Title Commission Chair

Date: 2/21/07

Date: 2/21/07


(IMPRESS SEAL)

\*\*\*\*\*

Approved as to form  
Summit County Attorney  
By *[Handwritten Signature]*

Corridor Preservation on SR-248 in Summit County  
UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION,  
SUMMIT COUNTY AND PARK CITY

**RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL: UTAH DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

By   
Region Two Traffic Engineer


Date: 5-1-07

By   
Region Director

Date: 3/1/07

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

UDOT Comptroller Office  
The Utah State Attorney General's  
Office has previously approved all  
paragraphs in this Agreement as to  
form.

By   
Contract Administrator

Date: 3-6-07