

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES
Bonanza Park Area and Form Based Code
May 8, 2013**

PRESENT: Nann Worel, Brooke Hontz, Stewart Gross, Jack Thomas, Thomas Eddington, Katie Cattan, Polly Samuels McLean

Commissioners Strachan and Savage were excused.

Commissioner Wintzer was recused.

WORK SESSION ITEMS

Discussion on Bonanza Park Area Plan and Form Based Code.

Planner Cattan reported that the objective this evening was to discuss the Bonanza Park District and the Bonanza Park Area Plan from January 2012. The Planning Commission would also be discussing Form Based Code. Planner Cattan noted that the Staff report contained a draft Form Based Code for the Commissioners to review prior to meeting with Gateway Planners at the next meeting.

Planner Cattan stated that Form Based Code is an implementation tool for the area plan, and they need to have policy discussions in order to get it right. Rather than address the 5-foot setback for snow storage that was proposed and the amendments to the Code, Planner Cattan preferred to have a high-level conversation about things that were mentioned in the Bonanza Park Area Plan and the layout of the Regulating Plan so the Staff could begin tweaking the plan based on Planning Commission input on policy.

Planner Cattan started with the Policy Discussion on page 396 of the Staff report. The first item was Local Businesses. She noted that originally they used the height incentive for deed restricting local businesses, such as an incubator space, and allowed one for one square footage bonuses. When the Planning Commission discussed Form Based Code on October 24, 2012, the Staff had second thoughts about deed restricting uses other than affordable housing, because if they fail, they could have a failed space for a long period of time. The Staff was asked to come back for further discussion on that matter.

Planner Cattan stated that another piece was limiting the amount of National retail in the District to keep it a locals place and support local businesses. She commented on a number of regulatory tools that could be utilized to accomplish that goal. The Staff report listed a number of tenant sizes currently in Bonanza Park. Planner Cattan remarked that within the Code they have required multiple tenants along street frontages. Within different zones they have limited the maximum square footage a business is allowed. A conditional use permit is required for any business beyond 20,000 square feet in certain districts, and it would have to come before the Planning Commission. Planner Cattan noted that a "no district" is a single tenant allowed to be greater than 40,000 square feet. She clarified that those were two tools implemented within the current Form Based Code.

The third tool to utilize is the Community Development Area. Director Eddington explained that the CDA is a modern day equivalent of the old RDA Redevelopment Area. The City is looking to

implement a CDA in Bonanza Park and to utilize in helping to move the Rocky Mountain substation, as well as other work in the area. There are opportunities to use the CDA to provide incentives. It can be used to provide infrastructure and/or other improvements, and it can be looked at in terms of commercial development opportunities. Director Eddington stated that the City Council would be looking at incentive opportunities in July and August.

Director Eddington noted that the Planning Commission has always talked about the gives and the gets when looking at development. He suggested that they could think of a CDA as opportunities to buy-down density or incentivize what they want to get. As they look at Bonanza Park, they should look at the opportunities. If something is not right or they do not want buildings going four or five stories tall, there are opportunities to buy that away if needed. Director Eddington pointed out that it was a policy discussion for the City Council and obviously there would need to be available funding. The Staff was unsure what the CDA would produce in Bonanza Park. They were having that analyzed and would probably not have an answer for a week or two.

Planner Cattan requested discussion on the direction they were heading in terms of limiting tenant size. For a large tenant, there would be a requirement for linear shops that wrap the tenant with a minimum depth of 50 feet. For example, a Target might be acceptable if other shops can be experienced on the way to the Target.

Director Eddington asked if the Planning Commission was comfortable with larger buildings. Planner Cattan clarified that any building over 20,000 square feet would require a conditional use permit. The maximum building size would be 40,000 square feet. She asked if they would also favor liner shops in front of large buildings.

Commissioner Thomas suggested that the Staff finish their presentation and allow time for public input before the Planning Commission made their comments.

Planner Cattan noted that two people with an interest in Bonanza Park had presentations regarding changes to the regulatory plan. She noted that the Staff report contained a submittal from Mark Fischer and Powdr Corp., and a submittal from Wintzer-Wolfe Properties. Mark Fischer's representative would speak first followed by Wintzer-Wolfe.

Planner Cattan noted that the purpose of the presentations was to discuss the regulating plan to be adopted as a zoning change. When they were creating the regulating the plan the focus was at the community scale and making improvements for connectivity, circulation and the experience within the public realm. As they hear comments from individual property owners, Planner Cattan asked the Planning Commission to focus on the bigger picture of the entire Bonanza Park District and how it works together.

Commissioner Thomas understood that the Staff was asking the Planning Commission to consider this with an eye on the General Plan. That would mean that applications need to be looked at under the current General Plan because the updated General Plan was still unfinished. Planner Cattan stated that currently there is a supplement to the General Plan that was adopted for the Bonanza Park area. In addition, there is a draft Bonanza Park Area Plan. She explained that once the Bonanza Park Area Plan is adopted, it would replace the supplement to the General Plan as the guiding document. Planner Cattan remarked that the Bonanza Park Area Plan would need to be

adopted first prior to adopting a Form Based Code. The Regulating Plan, which is a map, would be adopted as a zone change with the Form Based Code. Therefore, future applications would have to comply with the zone change. Planner Cattan noted that the Regulatory Plan was reflective of the ten principles in the Bonanza Park Area Plan. She encouraged the Planning Commission to think about the ten principles within the Area Plan as a bigger picture of how the neighborhood works together.

Commissioner Thomas thought an even bigger picture was the General Plan because it is the guiding principle in the spirit of the direction taken. He asked if the Commissioner should look at this through the current General Plan or the contemplated General Plan. Director Eddington thought it was better to look at it in terms of the contemplated General Plan. However, he suggested that they focus more on the Bonanza Park Plan because it reflects the elements of the new General Plan.

Director Eddington believed the two presentations this evening look towards the future with regard to the new Bonanza Park and Form Based Code.

Craig Elliott with Elliott Work Group, representing the Fischer/Dejoria parcels, stated that he had been working with the Powdr Corp. design representatives on a conceptual plan for Bonanza Park. Over the past few weeks they have had several internal reviews and meetings with four different design groups to discuss the implementation of this particular part of the Plan. Mr. Elliott noted that they primarily addressed the roadway in the district that Fischer, Dejoria and Powdr Corp. owns or surrounds, and tried to relate the connections back to the original regulating plan.

Mr. Elliott stated that the owners have had concerns with the triangular shape of the park, as well as the traffic circulation patterns for both pedestrians and vehicles with all the points of intersection. They were also concerned about how to develop the first phases of a project that is essentially street-front urban type space, and create interesting spaces in the early parts of a project where people want to go before the entire project builds out.

Mr. Elliott presented a color code conceptual site plan. Their intent is to maintain the Park as a large scale park that would benefit the community. As they looked at the different parcels they used the same color sequences that were used in the regulating plan. The orange color represented mixed-use. Mr. Elliott stated that they looked at the Yard parcel that faces Kearns Boulevard a little differently and suggested that it might be better used as a Resort Gateway component. It would travel down to the corner of the Yarrow in future pieces to create a corner from Park Avenue and Kearns as the Resort Gateway.

Mr. Elliott pointed to the west end of the common green space where they were showing the opportunity for some type of civic facility or structure. Mr. Elliott referred to the transit center pocket plaza at the bottom. He believed the corner across from the Claimjumper should be low scale and public oriented. It could be in the form of a park, a transfer station for bus/car loading, etc.

Mr. Elliott indicated the Powdr Corp. parcels that surround the mixed use areas in orange. They could see an opportunity to develop around the perimeter of the park area and to develop the park early in the project. That would set the tone for this District and allow it to spread out and grow organically from that area. It would allow open space, access, and views towards the mountains. The green areas showed pedestrian pathways and secondary connections. Different colors were

used on the roadways to show the types of roads being proposed in the Form Based Code. Mr. Elliott noted that the Plan shows a pathway that connects all the way through the Park. In some form the view from the Park would be through the Iron Horse District as a physical connection or visual connection to Bald Mountain.

Mr. Elliott believed this conceptual plan was a straightforward way to develop the area. It makes for a nice connection and it allows the opportunity to create a space people want to come to, and at the same time encourage the rest of development throughout the zone.

Mary Wintzer, representing Wintzer-Wolfe Properties, stated that they have always called the Iron Horse District the heart of Bonanza Park. It took over 25 years to create the District and they believe the vitality they created was recognized by Mark Fischer, John Paul and Rodman, and that was really the impetus for how the Bonanza Park idea came about.

Ms. Wintzer believed the conceptual plan they were presenting creates a more livable area that is in tune with the values along the Iron Horse corridor.

John Newell, with Peters Newell Architects, reviewed the conceptual plan he had prepared on behalf of Wintzer-Wolfe Properties. He noted that Wintzer-Wolfe hired his firm to look at their property and try to create a vision for the future. He was struck by the fact that the way the property was built out related to what the City was trying to do with the BoPa Ordinance and Form Based Code. Buildings were already built or were being built to the street edge with parking behind.

Mr. Newell presented a conceptual plan showing the existing building footprints, which includes a mix of uses ranging from art galleries to cafes to storage, as well as offices and retail. Mr. Newell was struck by the linear nature of the top portion of the property north of Iron Horse Drive. He later realized that it was an old rail yard where the trains came in coming off of what is now the Rail Trail, he looked for opportunities to make a historical reference to the past.

Mr. Newell felt there was an opportunity to use the existing buildings and do an adaptive re-use project. Using the eclectic nature they could add on to the buildings, increase the density and increase the height to create a more active place. He noted that they started with the railway park running east to west coming off the Rail Trail and had the idea to make it a linear park connected to the Rail Trail. They would try to come through the building on the west to create a leaner connection all the way through the project. As an evolution of that idea, they saw the opportunity to connect the south and the north and create a T-shape to have two linear parks.

Mr. Newell presented a slide showing opportunities for additional first floor space to create more density and more vitality. Another slide showed additional second floor space because it would not be hard to build on top of the existing buildings and create a variety of heights to achieve different views.

Mr. Newell addressed the automobile by putting vehicles behind the buildings and in underground parking garages that would access via secondary streets. If they could find a way to configure buildings and streets to allow access to parking garages, he believed it would work well and keep the automobiles separate.

Mr. Newell commented on discussions in some of the area plans about having a road going through the Wintzer-Wolfe Properties connecting them to the properties to the north. They felt the railway park concept was a stronger concept and more of a community asset. A road passing through would actually be a detriment to the community and what they were trying to achieve.

Ms. Wintzer stated that she was told by Staff that the road was placed there to create more commercial. She believed that if they did an economic study, they would find that more commercial is not needed. Her strong suit was to add more residential. They have always oriented their projects towards the sun and views, and they have always had open space and gardens. Ms. Wintzer thought it would be a great benefit to the community to have a north/south pedestrian bike connection. It would make BoPa more walkable, which is the main reason for proposing it. They also like the concept of trying to be more sustainable versus scraping the land and starting over.

Ms. Wintzer referred to page 388 outlining comments and questions from the Planning Commission and City Council members during the meeting on October 24, 2012. Before they make any decision, she hoped the Planning Commission and the City Council would be given the study tools they requested at that meeting so they could make the best decision for Bonanza Park.

Planner Cattan presented a layout of the two plans together. She showed what the draft Regulating Plan was like at this point. She identified the existing conditions within Bonanza Park and she had outlined the existing buildings. Planner Cattan identified the existing roads as they would be in the Form Based Code. The red showed primary A-type roads; (B) was more oriented towards parking and the automobile. The lighter color identified roads that do not exist but what the plan was requesting. The lighter red color would be A-types roads and the lighter blue color would be B-type roads. She noted that (A) was more oriented towards pedestrians and storefronts. The solid lines marked primary roads and the dotted lines marked secondary roads. All the roads are essential to making a great place happen and for connectivity and circulation. The dotted roads could come in as pedestrian pathways by the Code. Building would not be allowed on these areas to cross through in an effort to maintain the right-of-way for the future. They could be pedestrian pathways and they are not in the give/gets of additional height.

Planner Cattan stated that the sections shown in gray were the City properties within this District; the recycling center and the Public Works areas.

Planner Cattan presented the site plan suggestions from Wintzer-Wolfe and the site plan suggestions from Fischer/Powdr Corp. She then presented a slide showing how the two fit together.

Planner Cattan reviewed additional slides showing how it could fit into the Code. She noted that the majority of the Park sits on the Recycling Center property so it would be a City-owned park. A smaller portion along the southern edge is not owned by the City. She stated that the gives and gets go away in the location with the additional square footage for height by using the already existing City property.

Planner Cattan stated that if the Staff was given direction this evening to move forward with a regulating plan that plays off the two conceptual ideas, they would also want to enhance the pedestrian connectivity to the east and west throughout the District, as well as north and south, to bring back the idea of breaking up the mid-block for the pedestrian or an alleyway.

Chair Worel called for public input on the Regulatory Plan only. She noted that the full Form Based Code would be addressed in a public hearing on May 22nd.

Lee Whiting, and owner/occupant in the Claimjumper Condominiums, thought the aerial presented by the Elliott Work Group was great because they could actually see the livability of their neighborhood. Mr. Whiting stated that he lives with his two sons as do owners in 28 units in his development. Mr. Whiting clarified that his comments addressed some of the details that were put forth in print. He referred to table 7.4, Affordable Housing, and disagreed with the numbers based on the people who live there today. Mr. Whiting asked whether or not residential mixed-use makes sense at all or whether they already have a residential district with beautiful green space and established foliage. In terms of livability, traffic, parking, etc., Mr. Whiting stated that the neighborhood is currently unsafe for people to walk along the street on Homestake. Therefore, cutting roads through their property is not a great solution because it would take away from their already livable green space that they currently enjoy. Mr. Whiting noted that Claimjumper Condos are not deed-restricted. They enjoy square footages that range from 800 square foot to 1300 square feet. To convert them to affordable housing in its current model, does not make sense. When he was looking for affordable housing several years ago he found this non-deed restricted property that suited his personal needs for a family.

Mr. Whiting thought the commercial interests shown in both plans presented this evening make a lot of sense for overall commercial development, and it may make sense to expand in the westward direction. However, as they think about livability and the standards they enjoy in their community, the owners need to ask themselves what they are going to do when faced with increased traffic, noise, congestion, and more people walking through their yard. Mr. Whiting clarified that he is on the Board of the HOA, but he was representing himself and not speaking on behalf of the HOA this evening.

Doug Clyde stated that he was representing the Prospector Square Property Owners Association. Mr. Clyde had submitted a letter that was included in the Staff report. He noted that the Association has concerns with the relocation of the power stations. They were less concerned about the relocation, but if it is relocated, they want it to be the best looking power station in the Country. He hoped that platform would be adopted by the City Council as well as the Planning Commission. Mr. Clyde stated that the Owner Association was also concerned about the intersection of Bonanza Drive and Prospector Avenue because it is the entrance to Prospector Square. They understand that it is no longer a favored alternative, but they object to the potential impacts from having North Iron Horse re-routed through that intersection.

Mr. Clyde stated that relative to the BoPa Plan, the Prospector Square Property Owners Association sees an opportunity to be integrated into this plan. Prospector Square is already a built environment and it is a separate district with its own characteristics and its own entitlements. They are not incompatible with the BoPa Plan but they are different and they are significant and separate to the Square. Mr. Clyde stated that the Association has been talking with Staff about the possibility of a district for the Square that would be within the overall re-planning of the general BoPa Prospector Area. The General Plan talks about a BoPa and Prospector Square and all that area in the Region, and they believe this is a good opportunity to plan them both at the same.

Catterena Blais stated that she is also a Claimjumper owner. She has owned her property for 26

years and even though she has since moved, she has a direct interest. Ms. Blais supported Mr. Blais and his comments. She commented on the amount of tremendous work that has been done on the BoPa Plan and she commended everyone involved and their hours of consideration. Ms. Blais stated that from everything she had read and seen regarding the Bonanza Park Re-development Plan, it appears that residential is taking a back seat. She felt it was important to keep character based residential in the area. She was pleased to hear Mary Wintzer say that the commercial aspect was sufficient as it stands. Ms. Blais acknowledged that she does not have any experience in long range planning, but she knows when she sees empty commercial space all around Park City. However, trying to find affordable housing that is not deed restricted is a challenge. She encouraged the Planning Commission to consider what they can do to keep some type of residential character in the Bonanza Park area and not turn it into commercial/Light industrial, which is where it seems to be heading. Ms. Blais felt there was too much of a dysfunction between the upper end of Park City and the monetary base for real estate and affordable housing. There is very little in between. The Prospector area is about all they have at this point. She implored the Planning Commission to keep the middle class part of Park City viable.

Ms. Blais referred to the road plan and thought the section of suggested road that goes behind the Claimjumper property is detrimental. If they can increase pedestrian access and keep cars out of that section of the Bonanza Park Development area, they would be heading in the right direction. However, to carve it up with another road behind their property just to create a north-south access is denigrating to both the property and the general character of that area which has a lot of green and open space.

Michael Barille, a consultant to Powdr Corp., stated that if they list things that the CDA might potentially be used to encourage, he would like to add infrastructure as one of those items. Mr. Barille commented on the issue of buildings that would line bigger commercial spaces and wrap around the corner into secondary streets. He supported the concept of those kinds of spaces, but he was concerned about the viability of those spaces and how they could attract a tenant user that would want to occupy that space. Mr. Barille suggested they spend time discussing that issue with the consultants on May 22nd and that the Staff ask them to bring examples of places where Form Based Code has been applied and there is already an operating district to see how it functions and what makes it successful. He also remembered a City Tour where the City had allowed commercial frontage on the existing alleyways in order to add vibrancy and to create a more walkable district. They could look to other similar communities to see if there is an existing program in place that has been successful.

Amy Dixon, a Claimjumper owner/occupant, stated that there are many people who are interested in purely residential parts of this development. She specifically said purely residential because mixed-use ends up looking like commercial. She asked the Planning Commission to keep that in mind as they continue with the planning. Ms. Dixon stated that a vibrancy is added when people live somewhere and it not only contributes to reasonably priced housing and walkable neighborhoods, but it also looks good for tourists who come to see more than just stores. It is important to keep the personality of being a town where people live. Ms. Dixon encourage the Planning Commission to keep the residential areas. She could see no point in adding streets for no reason, particularly when they would like to see less traffic, pollution and noise. Another road is not needed, especially the one proposed behind the Claimjumper. She also cautioned against really large commercial buildings because they end up looking like Kimball Junction. Ms. Dixon thanked the

Commissioners and Staff for their work.

Chair Worel closed the public hearing.

Planner Cattan requested feedback on the regulating plan, particularly the north-south layout of the Park. She noted that the traffic study identified difficulties with the Spur Park. There are bonuses on the fact that it sits on City property so it is not a give/get in terms of additional height in the District.

Director Eddington noted that the Staff had not done a thorough analysis on the Plan. It was included in the Staff report for the Commissioners to review and the Staff was looking for ideas and direction from the Planning Commission. Director Eddington pointed out that this Plan was different from the original plan.

Commissioner Hontz stated that she thought the triangular shape of the Park was unique because it reflects the historic nature of the train tracks and how that pod was shaped and used at one time. However, it never seemed reasonable for a number of reasons. One was the intersections and how traffic related to pedestrian traffic. People would always be crossing the road in various places to get to the Park. The three corners of the Park would be less usable, and the usable space was far less than in a round or rectangular shaped park. Commissioner Hontz was comfortable reconsidering the shape of the Park.

Commissioner Hontz stated that in looking at the Elliott Work Group exhibit and the amount of existing green with the Claimjumper and Homestake residential area, as well as across the street, the spaces are significantly larger than any green shown on the map. What they need to look at in Form Based Code is whether those spaces are going to be meaningful green and more than pedestrian pathways. They need to be spaces where people want to go and spend time. Commissioner Hontz the rectangular shape was a better direction and they needed to have more of that throughout the entire District.

Commissioner Thomas thought it was interesting to see the different concepts, particularly with regards to this area of Bonanza Park. He also liked the breakdown of smaller neighborhoods within the larger neighborhood. Commissioner Thomas had no issues with moving away from the triangular shaped park. Making it more rectangular and drifting to City-owned properties was logical. Commissioner Thomas had no major issues with the plans, but he felt there was a possibility for these two concepts to co-exist. He believed another neighborhood to the right could be linked and tied in, in some pedestrian way that enhances the entire greenbelt core. Commissioner Thomas was nervous about cutting three roads through a concept that he thought was intriguing and interesting on the Wintzer property. He stated that cutting the roads would destroy their concept. He understood the need to be sustainable and green, but they do have ease of access to their frontages from Iron Horse.

Commissioner Thomas stated that these neighborhoods have different needs, different economics and different geometry, and they need to respect those. In addition, the applicants have different ideas and purposes that need to be respected as well. Commissioner Thomas thought it was important to enhance how they could work together.

Commissioner Gross was comfortable with the new configuration of the Park. He suggested the possibility of trying to bring in another parcel to the south so it gets closer into the Iron Horse District

to have that connection. He recalled seeing a visual of a plaza early in the process with roads on either side and a walking plazas down the middle, but they have moved away from that concept.

Commissioner Gross stated that he is always concerned about the traffic on Bonanza. He thought the prospect of a secondary road around Einstein's would be difficult to do. Commissioner Gross remarked that they were running out of options in terms of where to put density. They have established a donut around the City and they do not want density on the outside of that donut. However, they need places to put density inside the donut where they have connectivity with the rest of the neighborhoods, whether it is Prospector or what exists on the other side of Park Avenue. Commissioner Gross did not think they were trying to make the neighborhoods storefronts and industrial. He pointed out that there will be a lot residential density within this 100 acres.

Chair Worel liked the concept of a rectangular park because it provides more opportunities to be creative. She also liked it when the Wintzer-Wolfe proposal was overlaid with the Elliott Bonanza Park conceptual site plan. Chair Worel believed there were opportunities to get the different areas to work well together.

Director Eddington asked if the Planning Commission had comments relative to the policy points outlined in the Staff report.

Commissioner Gross had an issue with the liner businesses fronting the larger buildings. Most businesses do not like having small strips in front of them. He has seen the concept used around the Country, but there are very few examples and he questioned whether it was really practical.

Chair Worel asked if a study has been done to show how many small retail spaces would be feasible. Planner Cattan answered no. Planner Cattan stated that the built-in difficulty is the intent is to keep it a local district and to keep it Park City and not Kimball Junction. Director Eddington noted that there is an understanding that the concept is challenging. Liner shops have been used in other areas and to make them viable it could take tax abatements or tax refunds or other economic incentives to encourage local shops to locate there. For that get there is a give and that give is economic. He believed that liner shops was a way to keep it local and to create the local neighborhood everyone wants.

Commissioner Thomas stated that it is a delicate balance and behind that balance is the notion of wanting to be a small town. It is difficult to support that notion if they allow bigger boxes and more cars. Commissioner Thomas thought it needed more study.

Commissioner Hontz supported Table 4.2 and Section 6.7 on page 397 of the Staff report. She also supported the suggestion during public comment to ask the consultants to provide examples of specific places where liner shops are used. Commissioner Hontz emphasized that the examples should not be from Texas or California.

Planner Cattan asked if Commissioner Hontz was also referencing the comments about keeping some areas residential only. Commissioner Hontz replied that she supported the residential concept. She believed one of the plans they saw this evening works better without the road and only pedestrian pathways because the focus was on residential. When they shift away from multi-use it makes more sense to encourage the pedestrian. She pointed out that if they are trying to get people out of their cars they should not make it easier to drive. Commissioner Hontz stated that

there are great benefits to seeing the Bonanza Park area change and evolve and improve. However, they need to avoid eliminating the middle strata of housing that is attainable. She did not want everything to be deed restricted and there needs to be room for different types of housing units. Commissioner Hontz recognized that they cannot have something for everyone in this District, but they need to make sure they do not take away the opportunities that currently exist.

Commissioner Thomas agreed. He noted that this is the area where density will happen and should happen and it should be in a central place.

Planner Cattan asked for comments regarding height.

Commissioner Thomas stated that the Planning Commission needs to stand in front of buildings that are four and five stories to get a sense of the height. Floating balloons no longer works because it does not provide a sense of mass and scale. He suggested that the Commissioners visit four and five story buildings before the meeting on May 22nd. It could be done individually or as a group, but is important to have a sense of volume, mass and scale before they have the discussion on height.

Planner Cattan thought some issues could be addressed prior to the field trip. One is that typically in the MPD section, an MPD is not allowed extra height because it has affordable housing. She noted that the priority of the City Council is to have affordable housing on site. If that is not feasible it then goes to off-site locations and in-lieu fees. Planner Cattan stated that she is always asked why the City is giving extra height within a mixed-use future district when extra height is not granted anywhere else to put in affordable housing. She felt one of the biggest challenges in the future would be to keep the local in Park City. Planner Cattan requested feedback on whether or not they would like the height of the initial affordable housing requirement to be within the envelope, and allow additional height for attainable housing; or if they just wanted to require it within the three story limit.

Commissioner Hontz thought the question was whether a four or five story building was keeping Park City Park City. Commissioner Thomas preferred to look at buildings before having the discussion.

Planner Cattan suggested that they schedule a site visit to look at buildings within Park City first, and then visit Salt Lake or other places outside of Park City.

The Work Session was adjourned.