

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES – **Approved**
SPECIAL GENERAL PLAN MEETING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
JANUARY 22, 2014

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Nann Worel, Preston Campbell, Stewart Gross, John Phillips

EX OFFICIO:

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington; John Boehm, Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

=====

ROLL CALL

Chair Worel called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present except Commissioners Strachan and Joyce who were excused.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 8, 2014

Chair Worel noted that the minutes reflect that Commissioner Phillips recused himself and left the room, but it did not show that he came back to the meeting for the next matter. She requested that page 8 be amended to reflect that Commissioner Phillips rejoined the meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Gross moved to APPROVE the minutes of January 8, 2014 as amended. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Jim Tedford stated that he had been reviewing the drawings for the addition to the Public Library. He had also been reading through the proposed General Plan to try and understand the terms and integrity. In looking at the pictures of the library addition, it occurred to him that some aspects of the additions were not compatible with the overall building. Mr. Tedford had comments to he wanted to submit regarding his ideas for compatibility and other issues but he was unsure where to submit it.

Director Eddington stated that if Mr. Tedford had specific concerns relative to the design of a historic preservation element and/or compatibility of the design, he should convey his concerns to the Planning Department so they could be considered when the project goes through the design review process. Director Eddington suggested that Mr. Tedford make an appointment to meet with either him or Planner Grahn.

City Attorney Mark Harrington asked Director Eddington to inform Mr. Tedford on what has already been approved and what could still be changed. Director Eddington stated that the Library project had already been reviewed by the Planning Commission. The Staff was currently in the process of finalizing the HDDR review, which he believed was the area of Mr. Tedford's concerns. He again encouraged Mr. Tedford to contact the Planning Department.

Mr. Tedford stated that he spent a considerable amount of time going through the General Plan and he had issues relative to policy items. He asked if he should pursue the same avenue with the Staff regarding those items.

Chair Worel informed Mr. Tedford that the Planning Commission would take public comment on the General Plan following their discussion this evening. He could either comment during the public hearing or make an appointment to meet with the Staff.

STAFF OR BOARD COMMUNICATIONS/DISCLOSURES

Director Eddington reported that the date for the Joint Meeting with the City Council was finalized and the meeting would be held on Wednesday, February 5th.

Director Eddington stated that the second public open house on the General Plan was originally scheduled for February 18th; however, they realized it was the day after President's Day and UEA work. Since many people could be away on vacation, the date was changed to February 25th. Director Eddington clarified that it was a public outreach meeting only.

Chair Worel stated that when she checked the website calendar yesterday the Planning Commission meetings on January 29th February 26th were not listed. Director Eddington offered to follow up to make sure those dates were on the calendar.

WORK SESSION – GENERAL PLAN (Discussion and Public Hearing)

Planner Boehm passed out copies of public input that was received today.

Director Eddington clarified that the information and direction given at the last General Plan meeting were incorporated into the General Plan document as redlines. He noted that the redlined version was not put on the website because the Staff was concerned that it might confuse the public. Following the final General Plan meeting, the updated document would be posted on the website reflecting the recent redlines. It would also be identified as the document discussed at the Joint Meeting.

Planner Boehm stated that at the last meeting they talked about changing the document format and there was consensus to have Volume I and Volume II. The Staff intended to have the document split into two volumes for this meeting, but due to technical problems that was not possible. The goal was to have it posted on the website the next day.

Planner Boehm recalled that another request from the Planning Commission was to insert a "How to Use Section" in the General Plan. He presented a slide showing the proposed language that describes Volume I and Volume II. He clarified that Volume I would have the goals, objectives and strategies of the core values. Volume II would contain the methodology recommended for accomplishing the strategies, the section on neighborhoods and the trends section.

Chair Worel read the last sentence from Strategies in Exhibit A, "The second set of strategies is designed to hold the City accountable in terms of implementing the projects necessary to accomplish this task at the ground level." She asked if there would be a set of benchmarks or an evaluation schedule to monitor how well the City accomplishes these strategies. Director Eddington stated that once the General Plan is finalized the Planning Department would create a set of indicators that the Staff could benchmark themselves against. He noted that the hope is to examine the General Plan on an annual or bi-annual basis, and the Planning Commission could look at the indicators to see how well they were implementing the strategies.

Commissioner Gross suggested that they move the mission to "Keep Park City Park City" at the top to emphasize its importance.

Planner Boehm commented on density. At the last meeting the Planning Commission determined that there were places in the City appropriate for additional density and other places that were not appropriate. The areas identified as appropriate were Bonanza Park, the commercial/mixed use portion of Prospector, Lower Park Avenue and the Resort areas of PCMR and Deer Valley Resort. It was also recommended that they remove any language in the individual neighborhoods that encourage additional density in the primary residential neighborhoods of Thaynes, Park Meadows, Masonic Hill and the portion of Prospector that is currently single family homes. Planner Boehm presented a slide showing that all the language was deleted in the Thaynes neighborhood that referenced

accessory dwelling units, detached units and multi-family because it encouraged possible density in those areas.

Planner Boehm noted that some of the language had previously been removed from the Park City neighborhood section. New language was not added because there was already wording indicating that the character of that community should remain the same.

Planner Boehm stated that language was added to the Prospector neighborhood section to clarify where in that neighborhood density would be appropriate and where it should not occur. Director Eddington clarified that the Planning Commission indicated at their last meeting that density would not be appropriate in the single-family residential section of Prospector, but it would be acceptable in the higher density and commercial sections. He felt the easiest way to follow that direction was to follow the General Commercial zone. Planner Boehm noted that language in the Prospector section also states that any mixed-use development would be appropriate in the areas of General Commercial, to emphasize that it was the only area where density would be appropriate in that neighborhood.

Planner Boehm remarked that Masonic Hill, another primary residential neighborhood, already contained language stating that it was not an appropriate area for additional density. Director Eddington noted that the Old Town section did not address an increase or decrease in density and that language was left as written.

The Commissioners were comfortable with the revisions as presented.

Director Eddington commented on a discussion at the last meeting with regard to the TDR zones, and a recommendation to remove the Huntsman property. The Planning Commission also preferred that the City not get involved with identifying locations in the County where density might be appropriate. The Staff recommended removing the County references from the General Plan and adding language indicating that it would be done as part of regional collaboration. Director Eddington noted that arrows showed that some density could be sent to the County. However, he suggested removing the arrows and enlarging the image to only show three primary nodes of PCMR, Lower Deer Valley and the Bonanza Park area.

Director Eddington asked if the Commissioners would be comfortable exploring other TDR receiving zones in the future. As they do more analysis, and since this General Plan could be a 20 year document, he wanted to know if it was acceptable to add a Principle to the bottom of page 210 that notes TDR opportunities in the future based on a thorough analysis as they look at potentially expanding the current TDR zone. The Commissioners were comfortable adding the Principle.

Planner Boehm stated that at the last meeting the Planning Commission discussed the Salt Lake City/Park City connectivity. At that time there was a difference of opinion among the Commissioners on the viability of some nodes of transportation. At the end of the discussion, the Commissioners agreed that it was worth investigating all options and alternatives.

Director Eddington provided a review on annexation to address some of the questions raised regarding the benefits of expanding the annexation area. Director Eddington summarized the reason to consider annexation as outlined in the Staff report. The considerations included expanded infrastructure, opportunities to control development, and opportunities to provide agricultural land, forests, recreational areas, wildlife management areas within the municipality. If an area is within the annexation expansion area, the surrounding County would be required to notify the City of a proposed development. Chair Worel found the benefits outlined in the Staff report to be very helpful.

In terms of more geographic specificity, Director Eddington reviewed a map of the annexation expansion area to help the Commissioners better understand the areas. He noted that the annexation expansion area to the northeast of the City includes property north of Round Valley and a lot of the land that the City purchased as open space. Moving further north and east of that, the Staff recommended crossing over SR40, including the triangle piece, and the gateway coming in from I-80 down SR40 to 248. The Staff believed that including that area in the annexation expansion boundary would give the City an opportunity to protect the wildlife corridors and the gateways.

Commissioner Gross stated that because the proposed areas were critical to wildlife and open space, it was important to look at moving the line presently shown on the east of SR40 out to the Eastern Summit County line, where Snyderville meets Eastern County. With all the densities immediately adjacent to Wasatch, it would give the City the option to be part of the conversation.

Commissioner Campbell concurred with Commissioner Gross. He also noted that if they did not include that piece to the east, it would become undevelopable or the City would lose control of what could connect on either side. Commissioner Gross gave Director Eddington a tax map to show the area he was talking about.

Commissioner Gross thought it was important to continue to have planning discussions with the adjacent counties; however, at the same expanding the annexation boundary assures the City the opportunity to be at the table when development occurs.

Director Eddington clarified that the Planning Commission was comfortable expanding the boundary to include the areas to the north and east to the Wasatch County line. The Commissioners concurred.

Director Eddington reported that the second area considered as the expansion area was the southeast section of the community and crossing over the County line into the Wasatch area, taking into account the area north of Deer Crest as a gateway coming into the south. As Jordanelle, Heber and Wasatch County continue to grow and develop, it is important to protect that gateway to Park City.

Commissioner Gross asked about the school district. Director Eddington stated that areas that are annexed would likely be within the Park City School District. He explained that typically an interlocal agreement is established when they cross over the County line and those decisions are made at that time. City Attorney Harrington clarified that an interlocal agreement between the City and the County would not address the school issue. That would be handled as a separate issue.

Commissioner Campbell understood that if the Planning Commission agreed to expanding the ADA boundary it would not mean they would absolutely annex. It would only put other jurisdictions on notice that the City could consider it in the future. Director Eddington replied that this was correct.

The Commissioners concurred with expanding the southwest section as suggested.

Director Eddington stated that the third expansion area was at the very southern end of Park City over the Wasatch County line in an area known as Brighton Estates and Bonanza Flat. He pointed out that there was entitled development in this area that has been entitled for a number of years. A lot of the area is open space and undeveloped, however, there are a number of lots for future development, as well as a number of existing cabins in that area. Director Eddington explained that the primary reason to consider this area is that it would have an impact on transportation and Guardsman Pass coming into Park City if that area were to develop. It is also an area that could impact resort development and what occurs in the resorts. Given its entitled development, the Staff felt it was appropriate to bring into the annexation expansion area. It would ensure that proposed development would be appropriate for that area and it could be a potential sending zone for TDRs to protect that area as open space and natural amenities.

The Commissioners concurred with including the southern area into the expansion boundary as proposed.

Director Eddington stated that the fourth and final area proposed was to the west of the current City boundary. This would clean up where the annexation expansion was and where it should be based on property lines. The previous ADA bifurcated properties and the Staff was recommending that it be cleaned up to follow property lines. The Commissioners concurred.

Director Eddington recalled previous concerns with regards to how the old General Plan relates to the proposed General Plan. He stated that from a fundamental standpoint the general plan provides goals, policy direction, strategies, and actions that were open to being utilized over the next 20 years. A number of the strategies are recommendations for overall planning strategies. Director Eddington noted that it was where the General Plan serves the most effectively. He remarked that this community tends to use the General Plan also as a barometer for compliance when they look at master planned developments and larger applications that come before the Planning Commission.

Director Eddington presented the Silver Star project that was a master planned development in 2003-2004, and explained how they used the old General Plan when reviewing this project and how the review would relate to the new General Plan format. Director Eddington pointed out that the new General Plan provided more direction and guidance in terms of development and it was a more finite review.

Director Eddington reviewed five major differences between the old General Plan and the new General Plan as outlined in the Staff report. He remarked that that neighborhood focus was one of the biggest differences from the old to the new. It was based on a strong commitment by the Planning Commission to focus on that sense of geography. He believed the ten neighborhoods that were identified as a result of the process was good and it helped to create mini area plans for each neighborhood.

Director Eddington stated that a second goal for the new General Plan was to make it an image driven document, as well as text. There was a strong push by the Planning Commission to make sure the new General Plan had a design focus. While being quantitative, the General Plan should also give a sense of character, community and a sense of place and design. Director Eddington believed that the images included in the new General Plan represented what the community wanted.

Director Eddington stated that inclusionary housing was an element that was strengthened in the new General Plan. It talks about opportunities to expand on affordable housing and middle income housing. It also looks at the complexity of aging in place in a single community.

The fourth major difference between the old and the new Plans was alternate modes of transportation. Director Eddington stated that currently Park City does not experience the same problems as Salt Lake, but as the Wasatch Front continues to grow he believed they would be more impacted and challenged by the issues. The new General Plan looks at transportation from a State level. It also looks at alternative modes from the standpoint of getting around locally and how to link transportation with the Snyderville Basin and Wasatch County in the future. Director Eddington believed that it would eventually be an issue and the City should commit to exploring it. Exploration was identified in the new General Plan.

The final item was the environmental and sustainable components of the new General Plan. He pointed out that the world has changed since the current General Plan was adopted in the 1990's in terms of how they view sustainability and the environment. There are more opportunities to address the environment and those issues were incorporated into the new General Plan.

Director Eddington stated that aside from the five major differences outlined, he did not think the two General Plans were that different. He clarified that the intent was not to take the General Plan into a completely new direction. The goal was to update the old General Plan to be more directional in meeting the current and future needs.

Chair Worel commended the Staff on doing a phenomenal job with the General Plan. However, one gap that she sees is the lack of discussion regarding the services associated with affordable housing and inclusionary house. No matter how much affordable housing they provide, it will mean nothing if they do not have affordable child care, affordable food sources and affordable transportation. Chair Worel thought they should do whatever they could to strengthen that part of the General Plan. She believed the City would be challenged to fill inclusionary housing with middle income families without the support services necessary to live there.

Director Eddington recalled that Chair Worel previously raised the same issue and in response the Staff incorporated opportunities into the General Plan to address those concerns. He agreed that affordable housing would be a challenge without those services.

Chair Worel had a received an email from Commissioner Joyce with his suggestions about trends. Director Eddington had received the same email. He noted that Commissioner Joyce had specific concerns with regard to case studies, and he requested input from the rest of the Commissioners on whether to leave them in or take them out of the appendices trends sections.

Chair Worel stated that Commissioner Joyce suggested removing all the case studies starting on page 24 that did not have relevance to the General Plan. Director Eddington remarked that four pages talk about case studies from cities in other states. He explained that the case studies were included because each one contained a development that was important to future planning trends. The Staff thought it was important to look at whether or not there were similar opportunities for Park City as either a city and/or region moving forward. Director Eddington explained why the Staff felt each case study was important or relevant.

Chair Worel clarified that Commissioner Joyce thought the case studies read as a tidbit without any relevance and no way to tie it back to Park City. If the case studies are important they need to be connected better.

Commissioner Gross suggested adding a narrative at the beginning of each one explaining the purpose for why it was included. Commissioner Phillips agreed that adding an explanation would help clarify why it was included. He did not disagree with the concept of trying to learn from the case studies, but the idea of comparing Park City to a large city scares people. Commissioner Gross thought it might be sufficient to add a narrative at the very beginning with an explanation of why the "following case studies" were included as examples. Commissioner Gross was not opposed to removing the case studies as suggested by Commissioner Joyce.

Commissioner Campbell thought one sentence before each case study example would be sufficient clarification. He requested that Director Eddington draft language this evening so the Planning Commission could approve it.

Director Eddington drafted the following language: 1) The Portland, Oregon benefits are looking at opportunities for growth boundaries to protect those areas that are developed versus those areas that should be utilized for open space and/or agricultural producing opportunities. 2) Pineland, New Jersey was looking at the opportunity to protect and preserve environmental resources for future generations and utilizing land use principles and protections. 3) King County, Washington is a good example in terms of measuring their carbon footprint and how to utilize additional partnership to not only measure carbon footprint but to actually reduce it, and to look at opportunities to improve produced and/or expanded carbon footprint. 4) The Sarasota, Florida plan was a good resource in terms of protecting open space and wildlife corridors via the incorporation of development. 5) The Atlanta and the Belt Line planning area was looking at opportunities to utilize historic rail lines, historic trails and road and other opportunities for trails and how to expand on them. It also looks at cultural tourism.

The Commissioners were comfortable with the language drafted by Director Eddington.

Chair Worel noted that Commissioner Joyce also had concerns in the Trend Section regarding formatting. Director Eddington was aware of the formatting issues and those could be easily addressed.

Chair Worel read from Commissioner Joyce's email, "The massing software used to generate a lot of the pictures uses a satellite view of streets overlay, and then whatever you're showing overlaid on top of that. I can't tell much about any of them. The charts are important. Could they be a page instead of half a page? Is there a way to do it with a street view instead of a satellite view? It would result in a lot less clutter on the pictures. I found that even with a nice color version I got very little from almost 100% of the maps and photos; too detailed, too cluttered and too small." Chair Worel thought it would be best if Commissioner Joyce worked directly with the Planning Department on those concerns.

Director Eddington stated that the Staff would be happy to speak with Commissioner Joyce. However, he asked Planner Boehm to show a particular map and he asked the Planning Commission for their opinion on how it could be more effective. He presented the nodal map that was shown at the last meeting, and outlined what he believed was Commissioner Joyce's concern. He asked the Commissioners if they thought it was too difficult to read and preferred to remove the satellite imagery. Director Eddington clarified that early in the process people requested more satellite imagery in the mapping because there was none in the old General Plan. The Staff incorporated satellite imagery where they could because some people find it difficult to identify roads and boundary lines and instead use landmarks on the ground to identify an area.

Commissioner Gross believed that once the electronic version is available, the mapping would be enlarged. He was comfortable with the satellite view, but he thought they needed to do a better job of labeling the main streets. Director Eddington noted that all of the maps would be hyperlinked on the website and people would have the ability to zoom in.

Director Eddington asked if there was general consensus to leave the maps as they were, but improve the labeling. The Commissioners concurred. Director Eddington would meet with Commissioner Joyce relative to his concerns.

Commissioner Campbell read from Goal 14, item 14.14 as listed in the Staff report, "Consider LEED certification on all new municipal buildings." "Consider it as a requirement for all future construction within the City." He agreed with LEED certification for municipal buildings, but he thought it was a hard bar for future construction and goes against what they were trying to accomplish for affordable housing. Commissioner Campbell recommended that they change the wording to "suggestion" rather than "requirement". If

they preferred to enforce it, he suggested the possibility of a tax break or reduced building permit fee and let the market dictate it, as opposed to forcing everyone to do it.

Commissioner Campbell also suggested that instead of using LEED, that they allow NAHB, which is a less expensive competing program. Commissioner Gross suggested "LEED or equivalent".

Chair Worel asked if the alternative was only for municipal buildings or all construction. Commissioner Campbell liked the idea of LEED for municipal buildings, but he thought it would be onerous to enforce it on every building within the City limits.

Director Eddington clarified that revising the language to read, "Consider LEED certification or equivalent for all municipal buildings", was acceptable to the Planning Commission. The Commissioners concurred. Director Eddington revised the second sentence to read, "Consider incentivizing LEED certification or equivalent for all future construction within the City." The Commissioners were comfortable with the revision as read.

Commissioner Campbell had the same concerns with 15.13 under Historic Character, regarding the requirement for licensed architects and landscape architects. It would affect the cost of building, which was opposite from what they were trying to accomplish. Director Eddington asked if the Planning Commission wanted to discuss it this evening or wait to have that discussion with the City Council during the joint meeting. Commissioner Campbell preferred to delete the requirement altogether.

Director Eddington stated that the issue was previously discussed by the City Council and the requirement was included. This discussion has occurred consistently over the past 15 months. It was not recommended initially, but more recently the requirement for licensed architects was recommended. Whether the Planning Commission decided to leave it in or take it out, he thought it was a worthwhile discussion for the joint meeting.

Commissioner Gross thought the Planning Commission should wait to have the discussion with the City Council. Commissioner Phillips agreed, particularly since it has been discussed several times and the most recent decision was to include it. Commissioner Campbell wanted to make sure it was on the agenda for the Joint Meeting.

Chair Worel opened the public hearing.

Mary Wintzer, a resident at 320 McHenry, stated that the public following the General Plan process had lobbied for slowing down the process. At that time, both City Council Members and the Planning Commission were willing to extend the time line until April if it meant doing it right. However, when the schedule was released she noticed that the time

line had again been condensed to speed up the process. She and many others have tried to read all the materials to keep up with the current discussions. Ms. Wintzer noted that changes were made to the neighborhood section as early as that afternoon, and the changes were not available to the public. Ms. Wintzer remarked that Director Eddington is a “can do” person and during the City Council meeting he thought he could get everything completed on time. Recognizing that the Planning Department has had an increased workload associated with Sundance, she expected that the public would have the opportunity to review the changes prior to the General Plan meetings.

Ms. Wintzer commented on the urgency that the schedule set for the Planning Commission to vote tonight. She noted that two Commissioners were absent and would not be able to vote. As others make their comments this evening, Ms. Wintzer asked the Planning Commission to consider that they had not had the opportunity to read the new changes and make comment.

Ms. Wintzer referred to the trends section and noted that during the City Council meeting Mayor Williams spoke to the fact that the entire 120 page Trends Section could be eliminated. He suggested that it might work better as a pamphlet if people were interested. If the ideas put forth in the Trends Section were pertinent and valuable, they should be incorporated into the main body of the General Plan.

Steve Swanson, a Park Meadows resident, passed out a handout of suggested changes to the General Plan. He stated that some of his suggestions were fairly general. He clarified that when he suggests revising a certain section, he understands what that would involve. Mr. Swanson commented on what he believed were the more important suggestions from his reading of the most current document available online.

Mr. Swanson clarified that the heading ICON Park City was an independent council of neighborhoods representing at least five neighborhoods in town. He was representing ICON this evening and while the ideas were his own, they had been vetted with ICON Park City council.

Mr. Swanson started with the Introduction Section and requested that they re-write the Overview. He felt there was a tone to this section that was informal to the point of being hard to take seriously. He was willing to talk with the Planning Department about his specific ideas. Mr. Swanson thought an important issue was the sidebar on page 13 of the Introduction Section. It states that the number reflects theoretical unit equivalents, in other words, potential build out. He did not believe they could say with complete certainty that this was the number or that Park City would be built out at some date certain in the future. Mr. Swanson thought it was impossible to know that or to craft a plan around it as a central thought. He understood why it was included, but he thought it needed better clarification.

Mr. Swanson had concerns with how the Green Section was written. The tenure was informal and the narrative was not informative.

Mr. Swanson commented on his suggestions for the Small Town Section. He thought the phonetic definitions were “cute”, but he questioned whether they were really necessary. He thought the tenure of a document that would guide development and growth for the next 20 years should be more readable and useful. He understood the intent but he did not believe the definitions were effective. He requested that the City Council really look at the bold headings with phonetic definitions because they were very difficult to read. Mr. Swanson suggested that they replace the phonetic definitions with definitions that are useful and helpful the readers. Mr. Swanson commented on some of the images. He noted that trains coming through tunnels out of the mountains are ideas that have not been thoroughly vetted, and he did not think those should be included. One image includes the idea of putting a gondola terminal at the top of Main Street. It may or may not be a good idea but he did not think it belonged in the General Plan.

Mr. Swanson outlined his concerns and suggestions for the Natural Setting Section. He noted that on page 10, 5.2 mentions increased density and that should be removed. Mr. Swanson did not understand why carbon sequestration on page 15 was included in the General Plan. He was comfortable with carbon sequestration as a theory, but it is not a tested science and it was not germane to the General Plan. Mr. Swanson thought it should be removed. On page 28, he requested a commitment to preserve the Recycle Center. He noted that BoPa plan specifically talks about giving the Recycle Center to Mark Fischer. Mr. Swanson thought it was important for the people of Park City to know that the Recycle Center would not be taken away. Mr. Swanson referred to page 39 and asked about a real effort to get cars out of town. He suggested the possibility of charging a fee to bring in your car, separate from parking fees.

Mr. Swanson commented on the Sense of Community section. He thought the graph on page 22 was very telling and he wondered if they should say more about it. He thought the graph showed that Park City was over-built with nightly rental hot beds, but there was no indication to slow down on building more. Mr. Swanson suggested that it might be worth studying in the future to see if they are on the right or wrong track. He thought it should be front and center in their thinking.

Mr. Swanson commented on the Historic Character Section. He was concerned about projects such as the library expansion in terms of the lack of qualified historical professionals that should be involved and the public purview. Mr. Swanson thought there were actual layers of protection for historic resources in town and important public buildings that needed to be mentioned in the General Plan.

Mr. Swanson referred to the Neighborhoods Section. He noted that the BoPa plan was separate from the General Plan and he would like the Planning Commission to encourage the Staff to either incorporate the BoPa plan into the General Plan so people understand what could potentially be built in this area; or take out the graphics. He believed it was misleading for someone reading the plan when they see the overlay of new roads and the implications for this area, which is the focus of transferred development rights, etc. Mr. Swanson was dismayed in seeing that Bonanza Park was combined with Snow Creek, which is an important business area that services the needs of all Parkites, including visitors.

Mr. Swanson agreed with Ms. Wintzer regarding the Trends Section. He understood that the General Plan was split into two volumes and the trends would be included with neighborhoods. However, he thought the Trends Section could be eliminated or created as an appendix. If they keep the Trends Section, he would like an explanation of the graph on page 30. He wanted to know how they could build 2.5 million square feet of commercial and another 2500 residential unit equivalents without using additional water. Mr. Swanson referred to pages 42-43 and requested that they give proper credit to the founders of CARG if they were going to quote one of its members. He thought it could also be removed because it was anecdotal. Mr. Swanson thought the personal accounts included in the General Plan should be better vetted in order to give proper credit.

Jo Scott asked for a definition of primary neighborhood.

Director Eddington stated that primary neighborhoods are those with primarily year-round residents.

Ms. Scott clarified that Thaynes would be considered a primary neighborhood. Ms. Scott thanked the Commissioners for the changes that were made to the neighborhood sections and removing the language regarding increased density. However, she felt there were still inconsistencies in the language. Sense of Community, 7A in the Staff report, says, "increased diversity of housing stock to fill voids within housing inventory." In her opinion, increasing diversity for Thaynes, as an example, might mean more density. Further down in 7.3, it reads, "Explore new and emerging trends for non-traditional housing developments such as co-housing, congregate housing or limited equity co-ops within primary residential neighborhoods." Ms. Scott believed that language implies increased density in the neighborhoods where they wanted to discourage density. Ms. Scott asked if the Planning Commission found the statements to be contradictory.

Commissioner Gross answered no. He believed the Planning Commission and the public have discussed the Thaynes Canyon issue as much as they possibly could for the General Plan. He informed Ms. Scott that any remaining issues or concerns could be addressed

with the LMC, similar to the way they dealt with the Holiday Ranchettes. Commissioner Gross reiterated that the neighborhoods were sufficiently addressed and he thought it was time to move forward.

Ms. Scott respectfully disagreed because she preferred consistency in a General Plan that serves as a reference. Commissioner Gross pointed out that the General Plan is also an organic document that will be reviewed and scrutinized for the next 20 years. It would be unrealistic for the Planning Commission to include the level of detail that Ms. Scott was suggesting. Commissioner Gross stated that Ms. Scott was concentrating on Thaynes and missing the organic point of the General Plan.

Ms. Scott clarified that she lives in Thaynes but she was also concerned about the other neighborhoods as well. However, for the areas the Planning Commission identified as places to discourage density, she felt the language could be cleaned up to be more consistent.

Chair Worel thought that Ms. Scott's point was addressed in the last sentence of 7.3, "Create specific review standards to ensure compatibility and mitigation of impacts as necessary." Chair Worel thought that sentence made it clear that the Planning Commission would look closely at whatever review standards are applied in the LMC to ensure compatibility and that the impacts are mitigated.

Director Eddington explained that the language represented different uses and opportunities for housing, as opposed to increased density. Ms. Scott was not opposed to housing diversity as long as the language did not imply increased density in the neighborhoods that have already been identified for no additional density.

Commissioner Campbell felt there was a philosophical difference with some of the different neighborhoods. From his perspective it was like a three sided triangle with density on one point, sprawl on the second point and affordable housing on the third. People do not want density or sprawl but they want affordable housing and those are incompatible. In his opinion, there would have to be increased density somewhere. Commissioner Campbell stated that no one wants sprawl and everyone agrees with having some sort of a belt around it to identify when you have reached Park City. Everyone also agrees that a lot of property owners have the rights to build houses in Park City, and he personally preferred to have those clustered. Commissioner Campbell stated that he lives in Thaynes and there is not that much left to be built; therefore, clustering could not occur in Thaynes. He was confident that the Thaynes residents could stop worrying about having work force housing in their neighborhood, but it clearly needs to be somewhere.

Brad Smith, stated that he was representing the Thaynes and Park Meadows HOAs. Mr. Smith explained why he his comments would be so detailed. In the neighborhoods that have HOA, the General Plan states that it is a legal contractual obligation with anyone who purchases a home in those neighborhoods. The HOA also has potential liability with future problems and that is why they were concerned with getting everything in order before the General Plan is adopted. Mr. Smith stated that the HOAs have been working with the City and have had productive meetings with Director Eddington and the progression has been approved by the City Attorney. He believed they were very close to agreement but a few items still needed to be satisfactorily addressed. He wanted the Planning Commission to understand that the organizations could be liable if they do not protect the existing HOAs. The goal has been to avoid future problems by eliminating potential conflicts in the General Plan. Mr. Smith noted that the Thaynes HOA revised their CC&Rs and architectural guidelines four years ago to make it as close to the City Code as possible. He believed there was commonality and the neighbors were not here to be repetitive or picky.

Mr. Smith commented on two items that were raised by two Commissioners during the January 15th meeting that the neighbors favored and thought might be incorporated into the General Plan. Mr. Smith remarked that the neighbors were asking for details in the document because they needed details to protect them from legal liability. At the last meeting it was suggested and agreed, to identify the areas appropriate for density and to remove the language for the other neighborhoods where density should be discouraged. Mr. Smith noted that one Commissioner did not think it was enough just to say density in other areas, and that the language should specifically state that increased density in those areas should not be encouraged. Mr. Smith requested that the language suggested at the last meeting be included in the General Plan document.

Mr. Smith stated that the second issue was raised by Commissioner Joyce on January 15th, and related to who was in charge. It was clearly stated and clearly understood that these neighborhoods have HOAs that have covenants and CC&Rs that will apply, and only HOAs can enforce the regulations, not the City. Mr. Smith indicated two places in the General Plan where that language could be inserted.

Director Eddington believed the issue of CC&Rs was addressed in the document with the language, "CC&Rs are enforced by their respective HOAs." Mr. Smith suggested that they also a sentence on the first page that lists the neighborhoods, which would read, "In this neighborhood there may be Homeowner Associations and they have CC&R that will apply and be enforced." That would alert people to check with their HOAs to before purchasing or developing a lot.

Mr. Smith believed they could meet the scheduled timeline; however, the Thaynes HOA needed the opportunity to have the document reviewed by their legal counsel to make sure

the HOA could not be sued for liability. Mr. Smith clarified that the neighbors did not want any conflict with the City.

Mary Wintzer stated that it was clear that Commissioners Campbell and Phillips have not had to endure the endless hours spent by the other Commissioners. She does not live in Thaynes; however, when all this came up and the Park Meadows and Holiday Ranch residents attended the public hearings regarding subdividing lots, Commissioner Gross understood their concerns and made the comment himself, "not in my backyard". Ms. Wintzer pointed out that the idea of subdividing lots in Park Meadows was quickly taken out and the Park Meadows residents never had a problem. She believed the Thaynes Canyon residents have had difficult time, not just with the Planning Commission but also at the City Council level. In equality and fairness to neighborhoods, Ms. Wintzer believed that if the concept of subdividing had not been addressed quickly and removed from the document, the Park Meadows neighbors would be here fighting as well. Ms. Wintzer clarified that no one was trying to be an obstructionist. Everyone was trying to do the homework and get up to speed. However, they did feel that the scheduled was fast-tracked from April 1st to the beginning of March.

Chari Worel closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Campbell did not want anyone to have the impression that someone had an evil plan of subdividing lots in Thaynes Canyon. He found nothing in the document that prepares the groundwork for that to occur.

Director Eddington clarified that there was some discussion at the last meeting to remove any language that encouraged density. They had discussed the possibility of accessory units in the Thaynes Canyon section and that was also eliminated. Director Eddington remarked that they also defined specific areas where the Planning Commission thought density would be appropriate, and further defined areas where mixed use and increased density could exist. Director Eddington believed the density issue had been resolved. Relative to the CC&Rs, he noted that the Hierarchy of Land Use documents were originally located in back of the document before the neighborhoods. However, to honor a request it was moved to the front. Director Eddington believed the front was a more appropriate place because it was applicable to the document. He noted that the last sentence was incorporated, stating that the CC&Rs are enforced by their respective HOAs.

Commissioner Phillips was comfortable that the issues had been sufficiently addressed.

Commissioner Gross remarked that it was difficult because they could not do exactly what the neighbors wanted and the best they could do was to provide the language that had been incorporated to address enforcement of the CC&Rs. Director Eddington stated that

because the City does not address CC&Rs or point out the geographic distribution of HOAs, the General Plan could not speak to that specifically. The only way to address the issue is note in the General Plan that there is a hierarchy of land use and that CC&Rs are a contract of homeowners with their neighbors and their land.

Chair Worel asked if there was any difference in having the Trends as a section in the General Plan versus an appendix. Director Eddington stated that due to the discussion regarding the length of the document, it was included as a section in Volume I. He believed the majority of people would primarily use Volume I - Goals and Strategies. He explained that the thought for keeping it in was to be transparent and open and to identify some of the best planning practices that contribute to ideas.

City Attorney Harrington stated that it would not matter whether the Trends were a section in the General Plan or an appendix, and they could define the volumes of the General Plan however they want. However, he thought it was better to focus on the functionality of the volumes and what they expect everyone to use.

MOTION: Commissioner Gross moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the General Plan with the amendments discussed tonight. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion.

Chair Worel called for discussion on a motion and a second to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council. She requested that the motion be amended to recommend that the City Council consider the public input that was provided this evening.

Commissioner Gross accepted the amendment to the motion.

Commissioner Campbell was uncomfortable with the amendment because it implied that the Planning Commission was approving all the discussion and comments heard this evening, when that was not the case. Chair Worel clarified that she would like the City Council to take into account the public input that was provided. Commissioner Campbell preferred to take the time tonight to be clear that they were not recommending the specific items that they requested to be on the agenda for the joint meeting with the City Council. Director Eddington noted that the items for the joint meeting were the redlines and the policy discussions that have come up over the past few meetings, as well as the items that were added this evening. Commissioner Campbell preferred to resolve the issues among the Commissioners before going to the City Council.

Commissioner Gross withdrew his motion to allow the Planning Commission the opportunity to discuss some of the topics.

Chair Worel stated that the Planning Commission would go point by point on the written remarks from Icon Park City. Director Eddington stated that with regard to the overview there was concern that the Overview was too informal. He noted that in the first draft the Overview was very formal; but the Staff reconsidered and decided to make it more informal for a better understanding of the direction that was taken from Visioning 2009, which was the foundation for the General Plan. The other concept was to make the Overview more lively and simple because the rest of the General Plan was technical and specific.

Commissioner Gross was comfortable with the Overview as written. Commissioner Campbell referred to page 13 and stated that he supported the idea of putting the word “potential” before the word “buildout” in the first paragraph, because it is potential. The Commissioners agreed with adding the word “potential”.

Chair Worel liked the informality. She thought they should whatever possible to make the document more readable and user friendly. The Commissioners concurred.

Director Eddington referred to page 9, Small Town, and noted that different definitions primarily from Webster’s were incorporated throughout the General Plan to help with formatting and for guidance. Some of the definitions were included in the draft Bonanza Park area plan and the concept was carried over to the General Plan to create connectivity between the documents.

Commissioner Gross found the font very hard to read. He thought the phonetic part was confusing. Director Eddington agreed that it was difficult to read and they would change the font.

Director Eddington referred to page 10, 1.2 which talks about transition zones. He noted that these were areas that could potentially received TDR credits. The Staff recommended that as they look at the opportunity to use TDRs or incorporate different types of housing, they would say that there should be specific review criteria that would need to be created before there was increased density in a transition zone. He asked if the Planning Commission was comfortable leaving it as written, or whether they wanted to change it.

Commissioner Campbell recommended that they leave it as written. Director Eddington clarified that before they would have increased density they would have to create specific criteria for Planning Commission and City Council review. The Commissioners concurred with leaving the language as written.

Director Eddington referred to page 50 of Small Town. He noted that in the early process of working on the General Plan people asked for renderings to give a visualization of some of the things mentioned in the narrative. They talk about alternative modes of

transportation moving forward into the future and various ideas have been discussed over the past years. He expected that there would be many new things over the next five to ten years. Therefore, they showed the graphic of alternative modes and how they could work.

Director Eddington clarified that it was not intended to be specific; however, the Staff thought the opportunity to start connecting different neighborhoods within a community is a great idea and they wanted to show it. He noted that including it in the General Plan only means that it may be considered or explored. It does not specifically mean that it would happen in a specific location.

Commissioner Campbell suggested changing “a conceptual layout” to “one possible layout”. Commissioner Gross liked the narrative, but he had concerns with the image. The Commissioners concurred with revising the language as suggested. Director Eddington revised the language to read, “A gondola from Main Street to Deer Valley has been discussed and **one possible layout** is depicted above.”

Director Eddington referred to page 10 of Natural Setting, 5.2 and read, “Identify locations where increased density and/or mixed-use are compatible, located within transit and would decrease trip generation.” Director Eddington clarified that this would only be looking at future opportunities. The Commissioners were comfortable with the language as written.

Director Eddington referred to the carbon sequestration graphic. He explained that some of the people on the General Plan task force were looking into carbon sequestration. It could be as simple as planting trees in a forest or more complex in terms of other biological opportunities. The idea is for Park City to do their part. The Commissioners were comfortable leaving it in.

Director Eddington referred to page 28, which specifically talks about greenhouse gas reduction and opportunities. He noted that language pertaining to the Recycle Center focused more on the building itself. He was unsure if the Recycle Center would always remain in the same location, but he believed the City was committed to a recycling center servicing the community. The Commissioners preferred to have language in the General Plan that talks about the City’s commitment, but they did not believe it was appropriate in the section regarding greenhouse gas reduction. Director Eddington stated that the Staff would add a strategy in the Natural Setting section addressing the City’s commitment to a recycling center servicing the citizens. Commissioner Campbell preferred that the language remain vague rather than making it sound like the Planning Commission supports a specific site. The Commissioners concurred.

Director Eddington referred to page 39 and the suggestion to incorporate a graph bar representing financial disincentives for vehicular use in Park City. Director Eddington stated that what was shown was developed with the Sustainability Department and the

environmental staff, and they were trying to show where they get the most “bang for the buck” in terms of different opportunities. He pointed out where they start to get into lower complexity and lower cost, which is where they want to be. Director Eddington was unsure what a graph to disincentive car and truck use would look like. He asked if it was something the Planning Commission wanted to explore.

Chair Worel asked if it was ever discussed at the City Council level. Director Eddington answered no, because they tried to focus more on the positive and how to incentive the other modes of transportation, including walking. He thought a disincentive would be something like a toll booth. If they wanted to consider something like that it would be better as a strategy because the City does not have a disincentive fee schedule.

Commissioner Campbell did not believe it should be specific but he thought it was worthwhile to explore. He suggested adding a sentence at the bottom of the graph to read, “Future Councils may consider...”. If this General Plan is intended to last 20 years, he believed there would be a cost to drive up Main Street in a car 20 years from now. Director Eddington added language stating that, “Future Councils may want to consider disincentiving the use of private vehicles within certain sections of the City limits.”

Commissioner Gross asked if that only pertained to cars. If they included delivery trucks, construction trucks, etc., he wanted to know where they would draw the line. Commissioners Campbell and Phillips emphasized that it should be left vague at this point.

Director Eddington revised the proposed language to read, “Future Councils may want to consider disincentiving the single occupancy vehicle in certain zones within the City limits.” The Commissioners were comfortable with the revised language.

Director Eddington referred to page 22, Sense of Community. He noted that the graph showed the ratio of lodging guests to year-around population and how Park City compares to other communities. They also talked about different community strategies on both Sense of Community and Small Town where they want to keep hotel and lodging opportunities focused into the resort neighborhoods. From a General Plan standpoint they want to talk about where to locate hotels. He believed the market would dictate the number of people who visit the community and how many rooms are viable. They would not want to negatively impact opportunities for the resorts and their development.

City Manager, Diane Foster, reported that the source was the Chamber Bureau. She clarified that the number shown was actually the number of beds for the greater Park City area, which includes Snyderville Basin.

Chair Worel asked if it was possible to break it down to reflect the number for Park City. Ms. Foster was unsure if the data was available but the Staff would check onto it. She noted that it was based on number of pillows rather than rooms.

Commissioner Campbell pointed out that they have three ski resorts and most of the competitors only have one resort. He did not believe the graph required any action on the part of the Planning Commission. Commissioner Gross suggested that they label the graph as Greater Park City rather than just Park City. The Commissioners concurred. Director Eddington asked if the Commissioners would be willing to leave it as just Park City if he finds that Aspen and Sun Valley were also greater areas, because it would be apples to apples comparison. The Commissioners agreed.

Director Eddington referred to page 7 of Historic Character, and asked Steve Swanson if he was referring to the Park City library specifically and that he wanted to make sure it was reviewed thoroughly.

Mr. Swanson stated that he had spoken on that issue in other forums, including the City Council. Whether it was germane to the General Plan was for the Planning Commission to decide. Mr. Swanson remarked that if they were going to walk the talk in terms of historic, they need to be very careful in how they approach their very limited inventory of public historic buildings. Since the HDC was dissolved and the Planning Staff has more and more responsibility for these projects, he did not want to see important buildings planned into existence in the future with the help of library boards, etc. He believed it should be done in the full light of day.

Director Eddington stated that a review of a design requested in the Historic District goes before the Staff and the historic preservation specialist, and it is reviewed at a Design Review Team meeting with the applicant. It is analyzed and compared to the 2009 guidelines. If that decision it is appealed, it would go before the Historic Preservation Board for a hearing. He believed the current process functions well. Director Eddington stated that there is a historic preservation planner on Staff and a historic preservation consultant that is utilized on a weekly basis. Director Eddington stated that there is full noticing of all HDDR applications, and it is noticed a second time when an approval is made.

Commissioner Campbell understood that the Staff decision could be appealed by the applicant or by the general public. Director Eddington replied that this was correct. The Commissioners could see no reason to change the current process.

Director Eddington referred to Neighborhoods, page 34. He noted that the Bonanza Park Plan should either be incorporated into the document or the graphics should be removed.

He explained that when they did the Bonanza Park draft plan it was in front of finalizing the General Plan. They were trying to expedite the process to address potential future development concerns to make sure they had the right design controls in place. However, it was determined that there was a sense of urgency to do the General Plan and the Bonanza Park Plan was put on hold. He believed it was a more appropriate order to do the General Plan first and then the area plan. Director Eddington stated that the Staff wanted to make sure that some of the elements of the Bonanza Park area plan from a conceptual level were incorporated into the General Plan so when completed it would relate to the future Bonanza Park plan. He remarked that showing possible future roads is an effort to indicate that they have a greater vision for Bonanza Park. The intent is to finalize the Bonanza Park area plan shortly after the General Plan is completed.

The Commissioners were comfortable leaving in the references to the Bonanza Park area plan.

Director Eddington referred to the graphic on page 30, which addressed residential equivalents. He noted that the Water Department measures water by Residential Equivalents. The graph shows the projected residential equivalents rather than the projected water usage. The graph showed that the populace would begin to taper off in 2030. Commissioner Gross noted that in addition to residential equivalents, it is also the City's capacity to deliver it. Commissioner Campbell suggested that the Staff add wording to the left side of the graph indicating that the numbers had nothing to do with gallons.

Chair Worel noted that one of Commissioner Joyce's suggestions was for the chart on page 31 regarding exterior gallons used to water landscape. Director Eddington clarified that the one above was per day and the two below were annual. The Staff would make that clarification. Commissioner Campbell suggested that they change the first line to be yearly so it matches up with the second line. Director Eddington stated that he would change everything to annual.

Director Eddington remarked that the final issue related to the write-up on pages 42-43. He stated that there were a couple of write-ups in the plan with regards to arts and culture and a few other items. This write-up was focused on Natural Setting and CARG and provides a background on where they have come from, where they are, and how things have occurred. He believed it was a natural write-up telling how citizens have a tremendous power to make changes in the community. There is no doubt that other members of CARG who were involved.

Commissioner Gross asked if there were charter members of the group that could be highlighted. Steve Swanson stated that it was only fair to recognize the founders of CARG. He knows these individuals personally and knows their story. He thought the founders

should be credited and he believed their names would be easy to find. Director Eddington offered to research the charter to find the names of the founding members.

MOTION: Commissioner Gross moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation for the General Plan to the City Council contingent on the various amendments and discussion points from this meeting and the January 15th meeting that have not yet been incorporated. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Park City Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: _____