

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES
February 27, 2013**

PRESENT: Nann Worel, Brooke Hontz, Stewart Gross, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Charlie Wintzer, Thomas Eddington, Katie Cattan, Francisco Astorga, Anya Grahn, Polly Samuels McLean

WORK SESSION ITEMS

General Plan – Discussion and Overview of Old Town Neighborhood

Planner Cattan stated that this work session was an update on the Old Town neighborhood section of the General Plan. She provided an overview of how the General Plan, and explained that it was set up around the core values of small town, natural setting, sense of community and historic character. Each core value would have its own set of goals, principles and planning strategies. The Neighborhood sections would be towards the end of the General Plan explaining the future direction of the neighborhood.

Planner Cattan remarked that area plans are different. They are more specific and give guidance to redevelopment or new development. The discussions in area plans are more specific than the types of conversations in a General Plan.

Planner Cattan stated that the General Plan for Park City is utilized as more of a policy document with general guidance. Code information is provided within the LMC and not addressed in the General Plan. Director Eddington noted that the General Plan guides and recommends what might come later in terms of the Land Management Code.

Planner Cattan stated that the City conducted a significant amount of public neighborhood outreach in 2010 and 2011. The different neighborhoods were assessed in 2010. However, a neighborhood charrette was done specifically for Old Town because of its importance. The neighborhood was broken into nine different parts to study the different challenges within smaller sections of Old Town.

Planner Cattan remarked that through the neighborhood outreach, the primary finding was that the essence of local is desired, such as locally owned commercial, community gardens, dedicated car share parking; mixed use development and convention space. There was more support for single family homes in future development. Mixed-use had ranked equal with affordable housing and senior housing. The survey also asked what type of affordable housing was most appropriate, and the Staff heard more support for single family homes. There were also suggestions for taking a portion of the burden of the cost of some of the smaller historic structures and using it for two purposes such as deed restricting for affordable housing, as well as historic preservation. Other affordable housing included mother-in-law apartments and separate accessory structures. There was definitely concern that incompatible monster homes are a problem in the neighborhood. Planner Cattan noted that there was also discussion regarding the need for opportunities for everyone in Old Town from the perspective of whether the homes are large enough.

Planner Cattan used the Lowell to Empire neighborhood as an example of specific neighborhoods. Planner Astorga pointed out Lowell Avenue west side and thought it was important to recognize the

different feel between the structures as far as size, platted lots and what exists on Lowell east. There are no historic homes on Lowell, however the development pattern tends to follow the standard configuration of 25' x 75'. There is an opportunity to look at this neighborhood in terms of future development when they rewrite the LMC or redo the zoning. Planner Cattan pointed out that there is a pattern all along the edge of Old Town and she believed it had a lot to do with the Treasure Hill development.

Planner Cattan commented on the Park to Woodside neighborhood and noted that there was a lot of discussion about slowing down traffic and access. There are more nightly rentals in this area. There was also a lot of discussion on power lines, the tramway and snow removal. Parking issues are also a major problem.

Planner Anya Grahn led the discussion on Historic Preservation. The Commissioners were given key pads to vote on a series of questions.

Question – Do you believe the Staff has sufficient existing planning tools to ensure compatibility in Old Town, including the LMC and the Historic District Design Guidelines.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 33% - Yes 67% - No.

Commissioner Wintzer thought a tool that was not used enough is the conversation about mass and scale and compatibility. He did not think those terms were strong enough in the LMC to be able to defend them. He thought they needed to go further in the purpose statements. If they want to be compatible, they need to strengthen the LMC to use those words.

Commissioner Savage stated that in his opinion, when they talk about tools it is the General Plan as well as the Land Management Code. The problem is that design guidelines per se are not incorporated into the General Plan, but they do have the opportunity through visual representation to come up with a much better understanding of what they believe compatibility means. It can include quantitative items, but it also has to talk about compatibility as it relates to the different sections incorporated into the General Plan; most importantly in Old Town. Commissioner Savage thought they needed more visual representations of what constitutes compatibility that can then be interpreted with respect to the LMC.

Director Eddington stated that the General Plan will make recommendations and give visual cues as to what is compatible. From that will stem design guidelines and Land Management Code revisions.

Question - Do you believe that the Planning Commission has sufficient existing planning tools to ensure compatibility on steep slopes in Old Town. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 17% - Yes 83% - No

Planner Grahn noted that the next set of questions focused on infill and design in Old Town. Infill and new additions in Old Town should be compatible within the neighborhood context and subordinate to existing historic structures. One of the steps towards doing this is to conduct an intensive level survey to understand the building typologies, urban fabric and the pattern of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Savage asked if subordinate to existing historic structures meant within the neighborhood or outside the neighborhood. Planner Cattan stated that it would be within the neighborhood. Director Eddington thought that it would be the radius around the house.

Planner Grahn remarked that the second and third steps would be to define the compatibility and define what subordinate means. She noted that the General Plan defines subordinate. Within historic preservation subordinate design refers to additions or new construction that is visually contiguous to a historic structure, yet reinforces the visual dominance of the historic structure. While a smaller addition is visually preferable to achieve subordinate design, various design strategies can achieve subordinate design with increased size. Subordinate design can be achieved through six principles.

The Commissioners were shown photographs related to each of the following six principles:

Principle 1 – Simple design to prevent competition with primary façade.

The Commissioners were asked whether this principle was true or false in terms of subordinate. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - true.

Commissioner Hontz suggested using larger photos for better readability. Commissioner Savage asked if people would have the ability to expand the photos in the online version of the General Plan. Director Eddington replied that the photos and the maps could be expanded. Depending on the format, they should also be able to enlarge the text. Commissioner Hontz suggested that the good examples could be highlighted with a border of green and the bad examples could have a border of red plus the little x. Commissioner Wintzer thought it would be helpful to have dates on the photographs, recognizing that it was not possible on all photos.

Principle 2 – The cornice and upper level setbacks are consistent with the historic building.

Thinking of subordinate, the Planning Commission was asked whether or not they agreed with this principle. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 83% - Yes 17% - No.

Director Eddington noted that there is a transition requirement in the design guidelines to show differentiation. The one person who voted “no” caught the fact that there was no transition or variety in the photos. Commissioner Savage stated that he had voted “no” because he thought it looked overly consistent.

Principle 3 – The new building shall be setback or a visual “seam” is provided.

The Commissioners were asked whether or not they agreed with this principle.

Director Eddington stated that the “seam” is like a transition element pursuant to the design guidelines.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - Yes.

Principle 4 – The massing and setbacks of new construction should compliment and reinforce the visual dominance of the historic structure.

The Commissioners were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with this principle. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - Agreed.

Principle 5 – For larger additions, break up the massing of the addition into smaller modules that related to the historic structure.

The Planning Commission was asked whether they agreed or disagreed with this principle. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 83% - Agreed 17% - Disagreed.

Commissioner Hontz recommended changing the language because even though the concept is good to break up the mass, the examples shown were not compatible with the historic structure or with the neighborhood.

Planner Cattan remarked that subordinate was the criteria rather than compatibility. She asked if Commissioner Hontz thought the structures were subordinate to the historic structures in that scenario. Planner Hontz explained why she disagreed that the new additions were subordinate in any of the photos shown.

Principle 6 – Complimentary street and wall treatments

The Commissioners were asked whether or not they agreed with this principle. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - Yes.

Planner Grahn remarked that the Staff had looked at ways to define compatibility, which included mass, scale, and orientation and other ways to measure compatibility.

The Planning Commission was asked to vote on principles of compatibility through a series of questions and related photos.

Principle 1 – mass, scale and height of the building should follow the predominant pattern of the neighborhood.

The Commissioners were asked whether they agreed or disagreed. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 83% - Agreed 17% - Disagreed

Commissioner Strachan disagreed because the neighborhoods have already changed and every house is massive. He thought it should be tied to a specific smaller home. Director Eddington asked if the buildings should be more compatible with the historic setting. He pointed out that if it is not the neighborhood, they need to find a new definition. Commissioner Strachan thought they could identify certain structures as the ones against which compatibility is measured. The structures could be in each sub-neighborhood or in Old Town as a whole.

Director Eddington proposed language, "Mass, scale and height of the building should follow the predominant pattern of the historically designated structures in the neighborhood." The

Commissioners supported that language.

Commissioner Savage asked how many historically designated structures were in Old Town as a percentage of the total number of structures. Director Eddington believed there were approximately 425. Commissioner Savage stated that if the historic structures have been destroyed over the years, and they were trying to maintain the level of compatibility within these neighborhoods, he thought they were pushing the pendulum too far the other direction because they would end up with little houses in a neighborhood where the houses are significantly larger. He believed that would exasperate the problems of smaller versus larger. Commissioner Strachan pointed out that reducing mass and scale was the general consensus of the public during the visioning process because they felt it was out of control. The structures were too big and not representative of what they wanted to see in Old Town. Commissioner Savage agreed that it was the consensus, but the question was what the consensus meant. He felt that choosing a number of small historic houses as the benchmark for measuring future applications would not be fair to the applicants who want to build a house suitable for their living requirements. Commissioner Savage gave his ideas for what he thought would be a better approach for determining compatibility. He noted that he and Commissioner Strachan have different perspectives on compatibility. If they could not come to an agreement on what was acceptable, it would be difficult for the applicants that come before the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Strachan did not think it was a question of small versus large. There are several historic homes with large additions that were done very well. Commissioner Hontz concurred. She thought it would be interesting to see an analysis on whether those larger historic homes are the same or drastically different from what they were seeing now. Director Eddington pointed out that some of the scale issues of compatibility have already been addressed in the steep slope criteria. However, they would not see the fruits of that labor until they see more construction. Planner Cattan stated that rather than taking away overall square footage, the issue is how the building compliments the mass, scale and height of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Wintzer pointed out that many people who build in Old Town are from out-of-town and do not have a real feel for Old Town. He believed part of the solution was to educate people on what is important to keep connectivity in the neighborhoods. Director Eddington asked the Commissioners if compatibility was more size and scale or more design. Four Commissioners thought it was size and scale and two thought it was design. Commissioner Wintzer thought it was easier to define size and scale than it is to define architecture. Commissioner Savage stated that size and scale are negative attributes and design is a positive attribute. If they could present what they were trying to do in a positive way, he believed they would see more compatibility as a result.

Principle 2 – Proportion of façade elements should be compatible in scale, proportion, texture and finish to those on the historic structure.

The Commissioners were asked whether or not they agreed with this principle. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 83% - Yes 17% - No

Principle 3 – The relationship of solids to voids on primary facades should be similar to those seen on historic structures.

The Commissioners were asked whether or not they agreed with this principle.

Commissioner Gross asked for an explanation of solid and void. Planner Cattan replied that a solid would be an actual wall and the void would be doors and windows.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 83% - Yes 17% - No

Principle 4 – Rhythm and spacing of buildings on streets should follow the predominant pattern of historic buildings on the street.

The Commissioners were asked whether or not they agreed with this principle. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 83% - Yes 17% - No

Principle 5 – The rhythm of entrances and/or porch projection should reinforce the established pattern along the Street.

The Planning Commission was asked whether or not they agreed with this principle. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 83% - Yes 17% - No

Commissioners Strachan had voted no because he did not like the established pattern along the street. Commissioner Hontz thought the language “established pattern” was the issue, since one could argue that the Mall is an established pattern. Commissioner Strachan suggested changing the language to “established pattern of historic buildings.”

Principle 6 – Roofs of new building should be visually compatible with the roof shapes and orientation of surrounding historic sites

Commissioner Hontz did not think the photo with two garage doors should be shown as a positive example. Planner Grahn clarified that the Staff was not endorsing double garage doors. The photo was included to show the roof line. Commissioner Hontz recommended that the Staff find another picture to use as an example of a great roof line.

The Commissioners were asked whether or not they agreed with this principle. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - yes.

Principle 7 – Additions and modifications made to historic structures should be visually and aesthetically compatible with the structure.

The Commissioners were asked whether or not they agreed with this principle. The Commissioner voted and the result was: 100% - Yes.

Principle 8 – Floor level elevations should relate to the street grade and reinforce the neighborhood pattern

The Commissioners were asked if they agreed with this principle. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 83% - Yes 17% - No

Principle 9 – The directional expression of the front elevation should reinforce the overall pattern established on the streetscape.

The Commissioners were asked if they agreed this principle.

Commissioner Strachan noted that “established pattern” was used again and it should be reworded as previously discussed.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 83% - Yes 17% - No

Planner Grahn moved to Section 5.2 regarding Old Town. To maintain the local, state and national historic district designations, the City must prevent incompatible infill, significant modifications or alterations to historic structures and the loss of historic resources. This reinforces the existing guidelines and preservation policies.

Commissioner Savage wanted to know the primary quantitative benefit to Park City of maintaining the National Historic District designation. Director Eddington replied that it was probably not quantitative unless people wanted to utilize tax credits for certain projects. He believed the qualitative benefit was a certain status and realness. Commissioner Savage asked what the negative would be if they lost the national designation. Director Eddington remarked that there is a status that goes with having a nationally designated historic district.

Commissioner Hontz commented on economic development. Cultural tourism is booming and trending to increase. If they lose their national designation people might not be as interested in coming to Park City to experience the cultural tourism aspect.

Commissioner Strachan thought they could quantify it based on the revenues generated by Main Street businesses, because that is clearly historical and people go there for that reason. Commissioner Strachan noted that Telluride has a historic Main Street. They built a new area on the south side that is brand new and modern and has condos and commercial that is not tied to the historic center of the town. The property values in the historic center are much higher than in the new portion.

Planner Grahn noted that the Historic District Design Guidelines help retain the National Register. For that reason they expect a higher quality of construction. In working with historic buildings the construction is more time-intensive, which raises the values and produces local jobs.

Planner Grahn stated that in the past, building design has been shaped by snow shedding, parking, real estate demands, etc.

A question for the Planning Commission was whether going forward the design should be focused more on the architectural context of the neighborhood. 1) Yes, we should develop stricter architectural standards; 2) No, stay the same; 3) This is false, we have not focused design on snow shedding, parking and whatever other demands exist in the historic district.

Planner Grahn clarified that the question related only to Old Town.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 50% 2) 0% 3) 50%

Planner Cattan moved to Section 5.3. Secondary accessory structures, ruins and archeological sites should be recognized as historically significant and listed on the local, state and national registers. Planner Cattan noted that they would focus on secondary accessory sites, mining sites and updating to add ski inventory.

Director Eddington noted that they have the mine era and the decline of the mine era. Skiing would be the next logical era.

The Commissioners were asked to vote on whether they agreed with adding sites that are representative to the start of the ski areas. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 67% - Yes 33% - No.

Director Eddington noted that the HPB was asked the same question and they were unanimous for moving into the ski era.

Question - Should Park City consider incentives for preservation of secondary structures.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 67% - Yes 33% - No

Commissioner Hontz requested that they expand on incentives because there were more ways than what is highlighted in the current plan. She encouraged them to be as creative as possible and to include more carrots.

Commissioner Savage thought Old Town Crested Butte looks like a ghetto and he thought they needed to be careful about an incentive for preservation versus preservation to make something better. In his opinion, they should continue to focus on beautifying the neighborhoods and making it historically consistent and historically preserved, but attractive and not down-trodden.

Question - Should Park City consider incentives to reintroduce the secondary structures to the pattern of Old Town.

Commissioner Hontz stated that if it relates to the size of the house and the lot and an attached garage, she would rather have a secondary structure that turns into a garage. She would answer yes if it subordinates some of the vehicular components of design.

Commissioner Strachan asked if there was a mandate from vision for secondary structures. Planner Cattan stated that it was more to reintroduce the pattern of Old Town. In looking at the Sanborn maps, the typical house would have one and sometimes two accessory structures for storage, etc. New development is typically one structure. There is an exception for accessory structures but they have to be in the back yard and are subject to other limitations.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 67% - Yes 33% - No

Question - Should Park City consider incentives to preserve mining structures while encouraging work force housing. The Commissioner voted and the result was: 67% - Yes 33% - No.

Planner Cattan moved to Section 5.4 – Old Town. The Character of Historic Sites should be retained and preserved.

Planner Cattan commented on two suggested new zoning practices that should go into the Land Management Code. The first is that lot combinations should be limited within existing blocks to respect the historic fabric of the blocks. She pointed out that this would take an internal look from the street and both sides when looking at the context of lot combinations.

Question – Does Planning Commission agree with looking at the context of the block for plat amendments. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - Yes

The second suggested zoning practice is to set a maximum width of structures and additions based on historic context. Planner Cattan stated that in situations where traditionally more than two lots are combined, a maximum width would be established for the house to maintain the built environment.

Question – Does the Planning Commission agree with establishing a maximum width for structures and additions. The Commissioner voted and the result was: 100% - Yes.

Question - Would the Planning Commissioners support utilizing the under-utilized right-of-ways as parking areas. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - No

Question - Would the Planning Commission support utilizing under-utilized right-of-way to access private parking.

Planner Cattan noted that currently the City has a conditional use permit allowance to give access to a private home through the City right-of-way.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 67% - Yes 33% - No

Question - Would the Planning Commission support utilizing under-utilized right-of-way as open space. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - Yes

Question – Would the Planning Commission support utilizing under-utilized right-of-way as community gardens. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 83% - No.

Commissioner Wintzer thought a better question was whether they would support it for community purposes. He believed a landscape area where people could sit would serve a better purpose than a community garden in Park City's climate.

The question was changed and the Commissioners were asked to vote on whether they would support utilizing under-utilized right-of-way as community open space. The Commissioners did not formally vote with the software devices, but gave a 100% "Yes" verbally.

Planner Cattan moved to Section 5.5 – Old Town. To prevent demolition by neglect, stricter enforcement of municipal regulations, public programming and financial assistance shall be utilized. She clarified that this was only reinforcing current policy. Planner Cattan personally thought they

needed stricter enforcement.

Commissioner Wintzer thought the enforcement should also include life/safety and fire protection because abandoned houses are unsafe and become a fire hazard in Old Town. Director Eddington noted that the Code has been modified to include a provision that allows the Chief Building Official and the Planning Director to take action if there are health, safety and welfare issues.

Section 5.6 – Old Town. Financial Incentives should be made available to facilitate intensive restoration, rehabilitation and preservations projects. Planner Cattan noted that this was also reinforcing the existing policies.

Chair Worel called for public comment.

Ruth Meintsma referred to the discussion on subordinate design the photos related to the question about cornices. In looking at one photo, she noted that historically, there was a large garage that was attached to the house that was as high as the roofline of the current addition. It was very tall and narrow, but not as wide, and it had a driveway. She asked if someone would be able to replicate the garage if they came forward with the historic photo. Ms. Meintsma noted that the height looks wrong now, but the disparity in height was actually there in history.

Ms. Meintsma was told that it could be replicated because it was historic.

Ms. Meintsma referred to another photo and thought the open cement void completely destroys the house. She believed that a single detached garage would have allowed landscaping that would completely camouflage the large addition that no one likes. It is a large amount of cement, it is all heated and there is no landscaping. It is a big empty space and it looks blighted. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that the design followed the guidelines in terms of the garage, but the result was not what the City wants.

Ms. Meintsma noted that the term “seam” used in the presentation is called a “separation” in the guidelines. In her opinion, visual “separation” was more accurate and makes sense.

Ms. Meintsma referred to the photos of monstrous houses. On one in particular, if the original structure was painted a different color it would make a huge difference and everyone would recognize it and see the smallness of it rather than the massiveness. Sometimes it is more than the obvious and she believed the details could make a huge difference.

Ms. Meintsma referred to a photo where, per the guidelines, the garage was placed in the back. She pointed out that it created a terrible scenario of a massive wall with tons of cement. Ms. Meintsma pointed out how this problem could be reversed by building a single detached garage in a different location on the site and adding trees and landscaping. She believed that change would result in seeing the historic structure as it was originally. Ms. Meintsma remarked that sometimes things look so wrong, but in reality, a few simple changes can make it right. In some cases, the guidelines still don't have it right. Ms. Meintsma named examples of structures in Old Town to show that other things besides size can impact a historic structure. Ms. Meintsma agreed that an addition should be subordinate to the historic structure. However, the adjacent structure should have the same subordination as the addition, but that is not addressed anywhere in the guidelines.

Hope Melville pointed out that the large historic house at 421 Park Avenue is on 2-1/2 lots. A new big building on a small lot is not the same as the historic structures on larger lots, and she believed that was a major factor when looking at re-platting to combine lots. If they allow the same size big buildings as the Old Town Historic big buildings, it should be built on more space.

Mary Wintzer stated that she had a conversation with someone who has walked to work for nearly 40 years and noticed the decrease in sunlight and open space over that time period. As things have evolved it has become darker and colder and more dangerous because of the ice. She lives on the Rossi Hill side, and when she looks from the other side of the canyon, it looks like they have much more space on their side of the canyon. Ms. Wintzer stated that in the 1980's when they first wrote the Land Management Code, they set the rules for quality of life because property was not as valuable. Since then the City pushed and pushed to fill the coffers and acquire more building fees. She recognized that it may have been good economically, but they are now seeing the devastation in Old Town because of it. Ms. Wintzer suggested that they go back a little bit and incorporate both the economic and the quality of life aspects. Years ago she thought they were almost there and had infill, but then people started pushing harder and the City started accommodating. If they had adhered to the rules and not just considered revenue, they would not be having these problems in Old Town.

Mike Sweeney asked if Ms. Wintzer was talking about only Main Street or all the buildings in Old Town. Ms. Wintzer stated that she was talking about Old Town in general.

Commissioner Wintzer noted that the current General Plan was written in 1997-1998. In reading the General Plan, there are eight or ten places that make similar comments about the mass and scale of new development threatening Old Town. That was talked about and put in the General Plan 20 years ago but they never followed through.

Ms. Melville stated that another factor in the idea of having more primary residents live in Old Town is that people will not want to live there full-time without a yard or some land around their home. When something is built to the edges, it is apparent that no one would be living in that house year-round. Every time they approve building up to the edges without a backyard or side yard, it is one less primary residence in Old Town.

Planner Cattan suggested that if the trend is to build to the maximum, then the City needs to look at reducing the maximum.

Ms. Wintzer realized that they cannot return Old Town to what it was, but the rules were set for common sense and what is happening now creates additional fire protection and traffic issues. She believed they still had the opportunity to keep things from getting worse and to protect Old Town from further devastation.

The Staff and Commissioners discussed nightly rentals.

Planner Astorga presented a color coded map taken from the census showing the different types of occupancy in Park City. The gray was vacant lots. Red identified vacant housing. Green was occupied housing. Planner Astorga stated that the focus would be on the Resort Center, Deer

Valley and Upper Deer Valley and Old Town.

Planner Astorga noted that both Deer Valley and Upper Deer Valley have a trend of vacant housing. It was the same with the Resort Center and Old Town.

Planner Astorga presented an exhibit identifying second home ownership. The dark tone represented higher percentages of second homes. The lighter tone was a lesser percentage. He indicated the same trend in Upper Deer Valley, Deer Valley and the Resort Center. Planner Astorga thought it was interesting how only a small area of Old Town had a higher percentage of second homes.

Planner Astorga noted that the Planning Commission had discussed the definition of nightly rental at the last meeting. He stated that the only exception is that nightly rental is allowed everywhere except for in the Protected Open Space and Restricted Open Space. Nightly rental is a conditional use in the HRL zone.

Planner Astorga reported that there are approximately 4,000 nightly rentals in Park City out of an approximate total of 8500 units. The total percentage of nightly rentals was 46%. Commissioner Savage asked for a breakdown of the 46%. Planner Astorga replied that 46% represented all housing units used as nightly rental including single-family and multi-family and condos. It did not include hotels. Mike Sweeney stated that 22% of the total hotel units were placed in the nightly rental pool. Planner Cattan clarified that the 46% was only residential unit types. She noted that the percentage could be higher because the information was only based on those operating under a business license.

Planner Astorga noted that the Planning Commission previously reviewed data that was focused on the primary residential neighborhoods. He presented numbers this evening that focused on the resort oriented neighborhood as well as Old Town. The nightly rental percentages for the Resort Center, Lower Deer Valley and Upper Deer Valley were 72%, 83% and 60% respectively. The percentage for Old Town was lower at 48%. Planner Astorga remarked that Old Town should be a mix of primary residence and resort-oriented because of its proximity to the resort and other amenities. He noted that there were 993 nightly rental units in Old Town, which is 25% of the nightly rentals throughout the City.

Planner Astorga reiterated the Staff recommendation that the PCMR neighborhood, Lower Deer Valley and Upper Deer Valley should remain resort-oriented neighborhoods. He outlined the benefits for allowing nightly rentals in Old Town, which included ski in/ski out access, a walkable community for visitors, economic impact, the local experience and close proximity to resorts. The negatives is that it puts a burden on the neighborhood, creates parking issues, loss of full-time neighbors and sense of community, loss of predictable behavior, and garbage and traffic issues.

Commissioner Wintzer thought a bigger negative is the fact that a nightly rental property does not generate sales tax when it is vacant. To Commissioner Wintzer's point, Mike Sweeney stated that hot pillows and hot beds make Main Street work, and without the occupancy it is difficult. The merchants are trying to figure out a formula that brings people to Park City year-round as opposed to something that is bi-module. He noted that some of merchants only have one or two months to make enough money to survive the year. Commissioner Gross believed that was common in the

retail industry. He pointed out that some merchants only make their money during the Christmas season.

Commissioner Strachan thought another benefit of nightly rental in Old Town is that it focuses all the tourists in one area. Commissioner Hontz remarked that another negative is that some people build bigger houses for the purpose of having more bedrooms to make a bigger profit on a nightly rental. More bedrooms equal more people and more cars. As pointed out in public comment, a larger house reduces the amount of yard and light and it discourages the owner from wanting to live there or stay there.

The Commissioners were asked to vote on a series of questions regarding nightly rentals.

Question – What do we do regarding nightly rental in Old Town neighborhoods?

1) Do nothing and let the market drive it; 2) Limit the number and put an overall cap on the number of nightly rentals in the neighborhood. For example, these neighborhoods should not have more than 90% nightly rentals.

Commissioner Hontz requested a third option. At the last meeting the Planning Commission had requested information on the economic benefit and the actual number of nightly rentals. Planner Astorga remarked that a third option would be to look at the economic impact of nightly rentals. Director Eddington noted that it would have to be researched by Staff and brought back at the next meeting.

Commissioners Gross and Worel questioned the overall cap on Option 2 and asked how that could be accomplished. Commissioner Worel asked if it would work the same as a liquor license. Commissioner Wintzer stated that if they cap was 90% they might as well have 100%. It was pointed out that the question related only to Old Town. Director Eddington clarified that the 90% was relative to resort-oriented and it should be ignored for this question.

Planner Astorga re-read the question and the Commissioners voted on the two options discussed. The result was: 17% - Do nothing. 83% - Limit the number.

In addition to the economic impacts, Planner Astorga asked if there was additional information the Commissioners would like the Staff to research to help in their decision regarding nightly rentals.

Commissioner Strachan encouraged research into other communities that have done overlay zones and dictated where the nightly rentals could be in the neighborhood. He believed that would help plan the impacts. If they intend to limit the number, it was important to make sure the nightly rentals allowed were in the right places. The Commissioners discussed the issue of whether or not a CUP could be sunsetted if a nightly rental was eliminated in a specific location. The Staff would pursue an answer and report back to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Savage asked if it was possible to change the way nightly rentals are taxed. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that business licenses are tied to actual City costs, but the City cannot alter the business license according to State Code. Commissioner Savage clarified that his question related to taxes. Planner Astorga would research his question.

Question – The Main Street RDA is set to expire in 2022. It is a funding source for matching grants. The Planning Commission was asked if the General Plan supports a second extension to keep this funding stream. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 67% - Yes 33% - No

Question – Should Main Street be prioritized as a public transportation hub for Park City. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 67% - Yes 33% - No

Question – Do we need to increase local anchors on Main Street.

Commissioner Gross asked the Staff to define an anchor. Planner Cattan replied that the Post Office is a place where locals have to go. Commissioner Gross asked if Roots would be considered an anchor. Director Eddington stated that it could be a bank, a market or other magnet stores. Commissioner Gross thought magnet was a better word choice than anchors. The Kimball Arts Center is also considered an anchor.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - Yes

Question – Do you agree with policy to require civic expansions within adaptation of historic structures?

Planner Cattan explained that guidance in the General Plan would say that adaptive reuse of a historic structure on Main Street should be considered first, before building a new structure.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - yes.

Question – Prioritize the following for Main Street. 1) authenticity of historic resources; 2) increase local anchors; 3) public improvements; 4) programming of street.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 25% 2) 35% 3) 20% 4) 19%

Director Eddington stated that the General Plan talks about diversification of the economy and includes ideas such as potential R & D opportunities with small outdoor suppliers. They talk about high altitude training center, adaptation of green industries and potential higher education, culinary institute kinds of campuses.

Question – Do you see this diversification as a threat or a supplement to the economy. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 33% - threat 67% - supplement.

Question – Is the City doing enough to promote arts and culture? The Commissioners voted and the result was: 17% - Yes 83% - No.

Question: The City's current transportation is primarily based on vehicles. How strongly do you feel that Park City should broaden our transportation system to include:

Gondolas or Cabriolet – 1) Strongly agree; 2) agree; 3) neutral; 4) disagree; 5) strongly disagreed.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 50% 2) 17% 3) 33% 4) 0% 5) 0%

Trolley/Streetcar – The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 17% 2) 33%
3) 17% 4) 33% 5) 0%

Smaller buses that can move around Old Town enabling people to reach the resorts without having a car – The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 17% 2) 50%
3) 0% 4) 17% 5) 17%

The concept of the Interconnect – The Commissioners voted and the result was:
1) 33% 2) 50% 3) 17% 4) 0% 5) 0%

Director Eddington clarified that Interconnect was not the Ski Link gondola connection from Solitude to the Canyons.

Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) - The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 17% 2) 50%
3) 0% 4) 33% 5) 0%

Question - Should we work with UDOT and the County to widen State Road 224 to get more traffic in and out of town more quickly. Possibly add an addition vehicular lane in and out.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 33% - Yes 67% - No

Question – When Park City speaks of economy we often think of the tourism economy. How would you rank the different aspects of this tourism economy in terms of economic importance. The Commissioners were asked to rank their top three priorities of: 1) winter skiing; 2) summer biking/hiking/golf; 3) arts/cultural events; 4) concerts; 5) Sundance.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 27% 2) 35% 3) 11% 4) 12%
5) 24%

Based on a show of hands for their choices, Director Eddington did not believe the votes were registering accurately.

Question – The Commissioners were asked to choose their top challenge facing Park City in the future. 1) traffic; 2) growth; 3) brain drain (no jobs for younger generation to come back to); 4) a single focus economy; 5) tourism threats from other developments overseas and in America; 5) lack of community with an increase in second homeowners.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 17% 2) 33% 3) 0% 4) 17% 5) 0%
6) 33%

Question - In 2030 the transportation network in Park City will include:

1) basically, maintaining the current road network; 2) expanding the current road network;
3) expanding bus service; 4) or incorporating alternative modes.

The Commissioners were asked to vote for one choice they would want to happen. The result was:

4) 100%

Question - Park City has two primary access points; 224 and 248. If Park City considered a third ingress/egress, which is the most appropriate: 1) Interconnect rail for SLC; 2) An I-80 connection to Meadows Drive; 3) A buildout/completion of Guardsman Pass; 4) Tunnel under Deer Crest to Snow Park; 5) Do nothing.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 33% 2) 0% 3) 0% 4) 17% 5) 50%

Question – If you had \$10 million in your pocket and had to spend it on a planning project this year or lose it, what would you spend it on: 1) open space trails; 2) investment in a new transportation mode; 3) a green grid for local energy production; 4) seek capital for higher education campus/culinary institute; 5) something else.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 50% 2) 50%

Question – Who is the most important entity for the City to collaborate with to maintain our core values for future generations of Parkites: 1) Summit County; 2) Wasatch County; 3) State of Utah; 4) UDOT; 5) UTA.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 33% 2) 0% 3) 33% 4) 17% 5) 17%
Commissioner Wintzer noted that due to the late hour the Commissioners were not able to give their general comments this evening. He requested that the Staff set aside 30 minutes at a future meeting to hear their comments.

The Work Session was adjourned.