

**SPECIAL JOINT CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
PARK CITY, UTAH
SEPTEMBER 4, 2013**

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of Park City, Utah and the Planning Commission of Park City, Utah will meet in a Special Joint Session in the City Council Chambers of City Hall, 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah for the purposes and at the times as described below on Wednesday, September 4, 2013.

5:00 p.m.

I ROLL CALL

II General Plan Discussion

III ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the City Recorder at 435-615-5007 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

Posted: 08/30/13

Joint Meeting Staff Report City Council and Planning Commission



Subject: General Plan - Schedule and Policy Issues Kick-Off
Author: Mark Harrington, City Attorney
Thomas Eddington, Planning Director
Department: Legal/Planning
Date: September 4, 2013
Type of Item: Joint Work Session - Direction

Summary Recommendations:

Confirm the remaining schedule for completing the General Plan by the end of the 2013 calendar year, and review highlighted policy questions identified during the task force edit process for initial direction/clarification. While not a formal public hearing, staff recommends public input as time permits.

Topic/Description:

The draft General Plan was completed in March 2013. All Planning Commission (PC) and City Council (CC) members rotated participation on a task force which met eight times between June and August to complete a first edit of the draft and identify policy issues for further discussion.

Background:

When the draft General Plan was completed, the Council and Planning Commission initially agreed to prioritize review of the BOPA plan and Form Based Code Land Management Code revision in order to timely respond to the Rocky Mountain Power timeframe for a final decision on the location of substation. The result was no formal review of the General Plan was scheduled to begin until August 13th.

At a joint City Council and Planning Commission work session on May 16, 2013, the Planning Director provided an alternative to adopt the draft "as is" now, to enable immediate use with a commitment to still have final review within the designated schedule above. There was no consensus to move forward with that alternative or push final adoption all the way back another year to late Spring 2014. The Planning Director indicated a shorter timeframe was unachievable given: the expedited Bonanza Park schedule, completion of the Form Based Code, and the existing and growing application workload of the Planning Department with the other priorities and staff vacancies.

At this point, the City Attorney suggested a hybrid approach, parallel to the existing calendars which could focus on compiling edits for the full review (which could be expedited since so much leg work would already be done). The goal would be to have the whole General Plan and perhaps an Executive Summary adopted by City Council before the end of the year.

Council requested that the City Attorney and Planning Director meet/email with the Planning Commission or designees and propose a schedule of the hybrid approach for their consideration at the May 30th City Council meeting. The Planning Commission discussed the proposal briefly at their May 22nd meeting and designated two members to work with staff. Staff, the two PC members and Council member Andy Beerman met on May 23rd. Several approaches were proposed at the Council meeting on May 30th and a hybrid approach for a task force was chosen.

Task Force: Planning Director/Staff, City Attorney, 2 rotating PC members, and one rotating CC member. Each assigned task force member collected input from other PC and CC members prior to the designated meetings so they were not representing personal viewpoints.

Scope: Prepare suggested redlines/issues list of the General Plan. While a list of redlines and substantive issues would be collated for review by the PC, the Task Force would not spend its primary time on substantive matters or policy recommendations. The decision to prepare an Executive Summary would be considered after the final draft was prepared. The goal was to focus on re-formatting the existing draft to consolidate substantive goals and action statements to expedite the full review by the whole PC and CC on a shortened schedule in the fall to enable action before year's end. Supporting text, citations, and graphs were to be moved to the rear of the document as appendixes or eliminated.

The task force met weekly between June and the end of July completing its review on schedule. Updates were given at regular Planning Commission and Council meetings. While the initial schedule had a full review and public hearing process kicking off 8/13, several Council members expressed interest in having a joint meeting to start the policy review. This joint meeting was scheduled as soon as possible due to limited summer meeting alternatives.

Analysis:

A. Schedule.

Staff revised the proposed full review and public hearing schedule. The CC and PC should confirm the schedule or provide consensus direction regarding alternative direction:

Revised General Plan PC and CC Schedule to Achieved GP Adoption by 12/13:

Proposed General Plan Schedule			
Joint PC/CC Meeting	Policy Issues	9/4/2013	
PC Public Hearing	Kick Off - Exec Summary & Small Town	9/11/2013	
PC Public Hearing	Sense of Community	9/25/2013	
PC Public Hearing	Natural Setting	10/9/2013	
PC Public Hearing	Historic Character	10/23/2013	
PC Public Hearing	Neighborhoods & Recommendation to CC	11/6/2013	
CC Work session	Introduction - Executive Summary	11/14/2013	
CC Public Hearing	Values, Goals, Strategies	11/21/2013	
CC Public Hearing	Final Draft Distribution	12/5/2013	
CC Public Hearing	Action - Vote on GP	12/12/2013	
			Dated 8/26/13

Policy Matters:

B. Policy Matters

Staff recommends several policy matters for initial review. The topics were chosen due to their high level impact on other policies, actions and the implementation of major strategies. Also, staff tried to delineate policy matters where it was evident from task force comments there may be a strong desire to address the matter early in the process so that the staff, PC and CC were not approaching core matters without a compatible vision right from the start.

1. “While Park City could choose to encourage growth to occur outward, into the undeveloped lands surrounding the City, we support higher densities in town, so that we can preserve open space and the natural setting in and around Park City. Small Town, Goal 1, page 95 (as edited). See also Sense of Community 7.1, page 135.

Why Planning staff recommends the position: A series of joint meetings last summer demonstrated consultants’ findings that open space acquisition and traditional annexation policies would be insufficient to guide growth in a proactive manner; the City and both Counties will need to identify common goals while retaining their distinct policy and political objectives; minimize traffic impacts and unsustainable building patterns.

What it means moving forward: Interlocal cooperation; a TDR system that allows density to be transferred from annexation areas and the counties into the City; further subdivision of existing neighborhoods such as Park Meadows and Thaynes possibly for affordable or mid-range attainable units; revised minimum lot size requirements; defined areas and transition zones where redevelopment is encouraged; allowance of accessory structure for possible affordable/attainable housing; and possible TDR multipliers.

CC/PC direction: Agree Reject Modify

2. “Increase opportunities for local food production within City limits.” Small Town, Principle 1D, page 96.

Why Planning staff recommends the position: A relatively small issue but presents an opportunity to increase sustainability and farm-to-table households and programs; demonstrates commitment to long term sustainability and willingness to revisit traditional zoning paradigms which typically separate such uses from denser, residential neighborhoods; opportunity for community gardens.

What it means moving forward: LMC amendments and targeting available lands separate from existing open space; likely conflicts with existing zoning and conservation easements which focus on undeveloped and natural state of open spaces; needs to be implemented with high efficiency water systems.

CC/PC direction: Agree Reject Modify

3. “Continue to provide necessary commercial and light industrial services within the City limits by allowing a range of commercial uses within city limits, including industrial uses in appropriate areas. Small Town, Strategies page 97.

Why Planning staff recommends the position: Complete communities; traffic mitigation; economic diversity.

What it means moving forward: Evaluating existing zoning and adjusting as necessary to confirm uses allowed in compatible areas; answering the question whether the current LI zone is appropriate or not; and if not, where? Do we want to be proactive or reactive in dealing with potential, new commercial and light industrial uses?

CC/PC direction: Agree Reject Modify

4. Parking and reduced single vehicle policies. Small Town, Strategies 3.1-3.4, page 111.

Why Planning staff recommends the position: Complete and walkable communities; traffic mitigation; reduced impervious surface and reduced stormwater runoff; reduced carbon footprint.

What it means moving forward: Evaluating existing zoning and adjusting as necessary to encourage public transportation; risk impacts on adjacent neighborhoods or implementing strict parking enforcement in residential areas; reduces non-resort peak day use economic flexibility/events; lower building costs for existing, vested density.

CC/PC direction: Agree Reject Modify

5. Expand the Park City Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) to include historic resources that were built during the onset of the ski industry in Park City in an effort to preserve the unique built structures representative of this era. Historic Character, Strategy 15.5; page 169.

Why Planning staff recommends the position: The Historic Preservation Board (HPB), at a General Plan work session update, indicated a unanimous desire to preserve the ski/recreation era structures. The ski/recreation era structures are unique to the City and represent a snapshot of the City's early transition to a resort economy.

What it means moving forward: Expansion of the HSI would protect these resources from demolition and demonstrate the City's commitment to the evolution of the community's architecture.

CC/PC direction: Agree Reject Modify

Scope/Alternative Options:

Option 1: Confirm the schedule as proposed and provide policy direction as requested.

Option 2: Provide direction regarding schedule modifications.

Option 3: Abandon the schedule and let the process unfold as necessary with no schedule prioritization.

Next Steps:

Meetings will be noticed and held in accordance with the proposed schedule.

Summary Recommendations:

Confirm the remaining schedule for completing the General Plan by the end of the 2013 calendar year, and review highlighted policy questions identified during the task force edit process for initial direction/clarification. While not a formal public hearing, staff recommends public input as time permits.