

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
MARCH 13, 2013

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Jack Thomas, Brooke Hontz, Mick Savage, Charlie Wintzer

EX OFFICIO:

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington; Katie Cattan, Planner; Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney

=====

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

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

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

January 9, 2013

Commissioner Hontz reported on a conversation she had with Director Eddington earlier in the week regarding a general procedural issue and a specific issue related to the January 9th minutes.

Commissioner Hontz referred to page 66 of the Staff report, page 17 of the minutes regarding 99 Sampson Avenue, and noted that the conditions of approval did not reflect what was approved by the Planning Commission. She had concerns with the process because after the Planning Commission takes action the matter is scheduled before the City Council before the minutes come back to the Planning Commission for corrections and/or ratification. This was one of several times over the past six months that she found a substantial error primarily in the Findings or Conditions. Therefore, the item was sent to the City Council without an accurate representation of what the Planning Commission had done. Commissioner Hontz had asked Director Eddington to resolve the problem to make sure the information provided to the City Council is what the Planning Commission actually approved.

Director Eddington explained that when an item is scheduled before the Planning Commission, the project is publicly noticed for the Planning Commission meeting and the City Council meeting. As a courtesy, Park City has a policy to schedule the item before the City Council usually within one or two weeks after the Planning Commission meeting. In that time frame the City Council does not have the approved minutes of the Planning Commission meeting for their review of the project. However, the City Council should be getting the corrected ordinance because the day after the Planning Commission meeting, the project planner corrects the findings of fact, conclusions of law and conditions of approval and sends them to Mary May for inclusion in the minutes to correctly reflect what was discussed during the meeting. The project planner should also include the

corrections to the ordinance in their report to the City Council, which is due on Friday for the City Council packet the following week.

Director Eddington understood that there was a problem with the January 9th minutes and that the conditions provided for the City Council meeting did not accurately reflect the language added by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Hontz replied that this was correct. Director Eddington clarified that the bigger issue was that the Planning Commission would like the City Council to have the minutes from their meeting to understand exactly what was said and the reason for their decision. Commissioner Hontz agreed that the Council should have the benefit of the minutes; but her primary concern was that if the Planning Commission takes the time to work on the conditions of approval, that should be accurately represented in the conditions.

Commissioner Savage understood that Commissioner Hontz was suggesting that the minutes should not be submitted to the City Council until they have been finalized and approved by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Hontz replied that that could be one solution. Her main issue was lack of confidence in the current process. There was an issue specific to 99 Sampson Avenue in the January 9th minutes, but this same problem had occurred several times over the past six months on other projects. Commissioner Hontz was uncomfortable with the process in general. She finds something inaccurate nearly every month and it is usually something substantial in the findings and conditions. Unfortunately, by the time it is discovered, the inaccurate language has already been submitted to the City Council. The applicant then receives a letter outlining conditions of approval that were not what the Planning Commission approved. The City Council never knew what the Planning Commission approved because the condition was never changed or it was incorrectly written. In either case, what the City Council received was incorrect.

Commissioner Hontz clarified that she did not want to belabor and slow down the process, but the Planning Commission cannot spend all this time on something and not have it correctly reflected.

Commissioner Savage thought from a legal standpoint that the minutes should not be submitted to the City Council until they have been approved by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Wintzer stated that he always assumed the minutes were approved before going to the City Council. Assistant City Attorney McLean explained that Planning Commission minutes are not usually included with the City Council packet unless there was substantive discussion.

Commissioner Thomas remarked that the question comes about when the conditions of approval are inconsistent with what happened in the meeting. Assistant City Attorney McLean suggested that a modification to the process could be that if the application is routine and it passes without much discussion or changes to the findings or conditions, the Staff could take it to the City Council within the eight day turnaround. If changes were made to the findings of fact or conditions of approval, the Staff should continue the City Council item until the minutes are finalized. That would allow the Planning Commission the opportunity to make sure the minutes are correct, since the findings, conclusions and conditions within those minutes become the new proposed ordinance.

Director Eddington clarified that the day after the Planning Commission meeting the Staff would draft the revised findings and conclusions for the City Council report and send them to Mary May to be included in the minutes. Director Eddington believed that would remedy the problem. If there were

still concerns, the Staff could recommend that the City Council continue the item. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that if the Staff anticipates a controversial item, they could notice the City Council meeting for a later date, as long as it does not create timeliness issues.

Commissioner Hontz noted that Condition of Approval #8 on page 66 of the Staff report, page 17 of the minutes was still incorrect after her third request that it be corrected. It may appear to be a minor issue but it references how the trash is dealt with for the nightly rental at 99 Sampson Avenue. She wanted the condition to reflect the same Business License language that was read by Ms. McLean and reflected on page 13 of the minutes, page 62 of the Staff report. Commissioner Hontz stated that the condition should read, "Trash and recycling shall not be left at the curb for any period in excess of 24 hours and the property must be kept free of refuse." The condition as written references property management and the language was not even close to what was approved. Commissioner Hontz remarked that it was important for the applicant to have the proper language so there were no issues going forward.

Assistant City McLean noted that 99 Sampson Avenue was a CUP and the Planning Commissioner was the final voice. If the action letter had already been sent, she would make sure the applicant receives a revised action letter.

February 27, 2013 – Work Session Minutes

Commissioner Hontz referred to page 97 of the Staff report, page 9 of the work session minutes, third paragraph from the bottom, and the discussion regarding the right-of-ways as open space. She recalled that the Commissioners voted against using right-of-ways as community gardens, but she thought when the question was re-asked using it as open space, that use was supported by the Planning Commission. Commissioner Hontz questioned the accuracy of 100% voting No. Director Eddington had the same recollection that the vote was 100% no on community gardens and 100% yes when asked about open space.

Planner Cattan pointed out that the question asked pertained to using rights-of-way as community gardens, which did result in a No vote. Commissioner Hontz thought the question was re-asked a different way than it was stated in the presentation. She asked the Staff to verify because the correct answer would be important if the Staff uses it to write the General Plan.

February 27, 2013 – Regular Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Hontz referred to page 113, page 9 of the minutes, fourth paragraph, and corrected Chair Wintzer to correctly read either Commissioner Wintzer or Chair Worel as appropriate.

Approval of the minutes of January 9, 2013 and February 27, 2003 were tabled to the next meeting.

Public Input

Mary Wintzer came forward to comment. Commissioner Wintzer recused himself and left the room.

Ms. Winter recalled from the BoPa discussion last week that she had pointed out a bus route shown through their property on the proposed BoPa map. She noted that the road was drawn through their property by Rodman Jordan seven years ago. Mr. Jordan was a former partner of Mark Fischer's and Mr. Fischer has since severed those ties. Ms. Wintzer remarked that the resort map has a green arrow indicating pedestrian bike connectivity, and she had spoken with Planner Cattan about putting "potential or possible road or walking paseo" through their property since it was still under discussion. Planner Cattan had advised Ms. Wintzer to take her request the Planning Commission or the City Council so they could direct the Staff to either put "possible road or pedestrian or bike connectivity or walking paseo" and remove the foregone conclusion that there would be a road through their property.

Assistant City Attorney McLean pointed out that since Commissioner Wintzer was recused from this discussion, the Planning Commission did not have a quorum and could not discuss the request. The matter was tabled to the next meeting. Director Eddington offered to bring the BoPa map to the next meeting to aid in their discussion.

Chair Wintzer returned to the meeting.

STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Commissioner Wintzer submitted written comments regarding Echo Spur and asked if it needed to be read into the record. He noted that it was the same comments he submitted at that last meeting.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the Commissioners have the right to have whatever they want put into the record. They should submit it to the person recording the meeting and it would become part of the record. Commissioner Wintzer asked if the comments submitted needed to be read during the meeting or if a written copy could be handed to the Commissioners. Ms. McLean replied that either way was acceptable.

The Planning Commission adjourned the regular meeting and moved into Work Session.

WORK SESSION

General Plan – Discussion and Overview of Old Town, Resort Center, and Masonic Hill Neighborhoods

Planner Cattan reported that the General Plan is structured to start with a discussion of the core values. All of the elements would sit within the four core values, followed by suggested strategies to achieve the goals and core values. At the end of the document is a summary of the nine neighborhoods. When a project comes in within a specific neighborhood the Planning Commission can utilize the document as guidance to help in their decision-making.

Commissioner Wintzer thought it would be helpful to include a vision of Park City in front of the neighborhood summaries. For example, they have talked about connecting Park Avenue to the Resort Center, but nothing addresses where it goes once it gets to Park Avenue. He suggested that the General Plan include a map of Park City showing the desired routes for transportation, vehicles,

and pedestrians. Commissioner Wintzer felt they were making connections within neighborhoods without carrying it over into the next neighborhood. He thought it was important to understand the big picture of Park City. It could be as simple as an aerial photograph with connection arrows.

Vice-Chair Thomas stated that this has been his mantra from the beginning. They know there is ongoing planning in each of the neighborhoods and ongoing aspects. Whenever he tries to unfold a design problem he looks at the relationship of all the parts because he wants to understand the big picture. He needs to understand how they are interconnected and how they relate. There are layers of components such as transportation for cars, transportation for people, pedestrian walkways, and where the nodes they are trying to create in the community should occur. They want the components of small town, natural setting, sense of community and historic character, and he believes those are unfolded in the layers of the network of the community. Vice-Chair Thomas believed this was fundamental. It is where they breathe in the aesthetic components and other important aspects.

Director Eddington stated that the Staff would make sure that was included. Over the past three meetings they have committed to focusing on neighborhoods; therefore, the presentation and discussion have been micro-focused. He believed the Planning Commission would begin to see more overlapping and the bigger picture.

Vice-Chair Thomas remarked that understanding how things are interconnected could change attitudes towards some of the micro-components of each neighborhood and how they function.

Commissioner Wintzer realized there would be a transportation master plan for connecting the resorts to BoPa, to Main Street, etc. However, if that picture is provided at the beginning, people can see what unfolds and how it goes together. Vice-Chair Thomas commented on visual aids such as a large-scale map of the entire community that would help them put all the neighborhoods in context.

Commissioner Wintzer presented an aerial map he had printed of the Resort Center. Having the map for reference when he started reading the Staff report made a significant difference. He suggested that the Staff report include a map of the neighborhood being discussed.

Chair Thomas understood that the Staff had deadlines imposed for completion of the General Plan, but somehow they need to be able to study the networks beyond the neighborhoods.

Commissioner Savage stated that when he first became involved with the Planning Commission he suggested that they think about the General Plan in the form similar to a Disneyland map. His suggestion was not well received, but what he was hearing this evening was conceptually close to his idea. Commissioner Savage believed that it made sense to look at the big picture in a visual fashion, and talk about that with respect to the neighborhoods and transportation. It would be a low granularity vision of what they are trying to do. As the General Plan continues to evolve, they would have a metric to use in projecting a 30 years vision. Commissioner Savage has been continually frustrated by the unwillingness to commit to what that vision really looks like in a graphic form. They spend a lot of time talking about the size of the box in Old Town, but they spend very little time on what they really want the big picture to look like in 30-50 years.

Vice-Chair Thomas noted that they were looking at making decisions in each of the neighborhoods. He suggested that they might be fearful of making a decision in the neighborhood that may be inconsistent with long-term planning for transportation, circulation, or other elements. Commissioner Savage agreed that it was a big risk.

Vice-Chair Thomas recommended that the Staff provide a large map showing each of the neighborhoods. He thought it should be done sooner rather than later as the Planning Commission continues discussing each neighborhood and each planning district.

Planner Cattan noted that the Park City Traffic and Transportation Master Plan has a high level circulation plan that identifies future connectivity nodes, as well as a possible transit center in Bonanza Park, and where improvements would take place. A thorough study was done to create that Master Plan. Planner Cattan stated that typically the General Plan and the Transportation Plan are interconnected and work together. She understood the comments about different component layers. It is the mapping of layers that shows how it all works together, along with development nodes of commercial versus residential. The important question is how each place functions and what is the pattern on the community scale. Planner Cattan believed there could be a section in the General Plan that layers the different elements of the General Plan and how they work together. There is specificity within the Resort Center discussion about pedestrian connectivity and future connectivity to Main Street, but there has never been a study that talks about the solutions.

Director Eddington reiterated that for the next meeting the Staff would print out the big map and show neighborhood connections from the mid-high level. Commissioner Savage suggested that the Staff take a picture of the entire Park City city limits and computationally have the ability to superimpose one layer on top of the other so they could actually see how things work interactively. It would help them see how a decision made today would impact the ability to achieve the future vision. At this point, he did not believe the Planning Commission had the context or the content to make good quality decisions as it relates to the big picture in the community.

Vice-Chair Thomas pointed out that in a community, neighborhoods continue to grow and are planned. He assumed there was agreement on what they would like the Staff to provide for future meetings and that the Staff understood their direction.

Old Town Wrap-up

Planner Cattan noted that the Planning Commission would begin with a wrap-up discussion on Old Town. She recalled that due to time restraints at the last meeting, the Commissioners saw the slides and answered the questions, but they did not take the time to make comments.

Vice-Chair stated that he heard positive comments regarding the images Ruth Meintsma presented at a previous meeting. Unfortunately, he was absent from that meeting and he would like to spend a few minutes with Ms. Meintsma to look at those images. He understood that Ms. Meintsma was also planning a tour of Old Town for the Planning Commission.

Vice-Chair Thomas believed that streetscapes are an important component of Old Town because it is all about the relationship of buildings and spaces on both sides of the street. It is about the fabric of the immediate neighborhood and the relationship of those streetscapes that cannot be captured from a cross-canyon view.

Director Eddington noted that the Planning Commission had that conversation more from a micro-level than from a height/story point of view. He recalled that they talked about what the streetscape looks like and that ideally it should be done from a car or more importantly, from a pedestrian experience.

Commissioner Hontz pointed out that the Planning Commission tried to figure out whether they needed to identify specific structures or iconic structures within each neighborhood, and if they needed to designate what the setting and feel of that particular streetscape should look like. She recalled from the discussion that what was reflected was not quite what they wanted. They had all commented on how they wanted it to feel and how they wanted to get that point across.

Commissioner Wintzer asked if the Planning Commission would get a redlined version of the neighborhood presentations showing the comments that were made and where they were incorporated. Director Eddington replied that the Staff was using the redlines to edit the General Plan document. Commissioner Wintzer preferred that the Commissioners see the edits in a timely manner while it was still fresh in their memory. Director Eddington noted that the changes are reflected in the document the Commissioners would see at the end of the month. He understood that was a longer time frame than they would like, but the advantage would be to see everything more comprehensively rather than piecemeal.

Commissioner Wintzer asked whether the Old Town plan was information gathering or if it was the rough draft of the Old Town plan. Director Eddington replied that it would be included as a portion of the General Plan. Vice-Chair Thomas remarked that one of the layers should be the visual sequence of moving through the community.

Planner Cattan asked for comments regarding 5.1 - Old Town, infill and new additions should be compatible within the neighborhood context and subordinate to existing historic structures. Commissioner Wintzer commented on the number of times the old General Plan talks about mass and scale in Old Town. He would like mass and scale to be referenced more in the new document. It is a constant argument and he wanted to see it emphasized. Commissioners Hontz and Thomas agreed. Vice-Chair Thomas stated that his first notes under historic character were scale, fabric, proportion and relationship.

Commissioner Wintzer referred to the language, "infill compatible with the neighborhood context" and suggested that they reference "historic" in the neighborhood context. Otherwise, it could mean compatible with the last three monster houses that were built. If the goal is to be compatible with historic structures, that needs to be mentioned. Director Eddington noted that Commission Strachan raised the same issue at the last meeting, and Planner Grahn was re-examining the section to include historic context.

Commissioner Hontz stated that her comments related more to the text and she would send a written copy to Planner Cattan.

Commissioner Wintzer thought the first paragraph regarding Park City Standards of Compatibility was a strong statement. He suggested bold type or something to make it stand out so it does not get lost in the wording.

Planner Cattan read 5.2 – To maintain local, state, and national historic district designations, the City must prevent incompatible infill, significant modifications/alterations to historic structures, and the loss of historic structures.

Planner Cattan noted that 5.3 was to expand the historic to include secondary/accessory sites. Commissioner Hontz recalled a discussion about encouraging smaller secondary buildings and that the Planning Commission was generally in support. However, she thought there needed to be some discussion and balance to keep incentives for one owner from becoming an impact to the entire neighborhood. She used a parking scenario as an example. If the City incentivizes having secondary structures as a benefit, it has to be a true benefit for the neighborhood.

Planner Cattan asked if Commissioner Hontz thought there should be an additional parking requirement for an accessory unit or if she had a different idea. Commissioner Hontz did not believe they had successfully addressed parking in Old Town at all. It takes a different approach and they have not yet figured out what that is. She suggested looking at other communities to see what they found to be successful.

Commissioner Savage asked if parking and traffic was in the 25 year vision portion of the General Plan or if it was something separate. Director Eddington stated that it would be part of the General Plan on a conceptual level. Commissioner Hontz thought parking needed to be addressed in a separate section. Planner Cattan noted that the Staff had drafted that section and then realized that they needed to study it thoroughly and come up with a solution. She stated that it is a combination of management through Public Works and the Land Management Code requiring parking onsite, and a balance between the two.

Commissioner Hontz was uncomfortable with some of the concepts without knowing what would happen from the parking standpoint. Vice-Chair Thomas thought parking was part of the network system he had mentioned earlier.

Commissioner Savage stated that his frustration stemmed from trying to have constructive conversations about the content of the plan without having a common understanding of the context of the plan. He emphasized his preference over the next few meetings to focus the General Plan discussion on the big picture rather than the granular way they have been doing it. Planner Cattan replied that prior to the neighborhood discussions, all the other sections were the big picture. Commissioner Savage remarked that the Planning Commission has talked about the need to have a big picture discussion looking 25 years ahead, but that has never happened. Vice-Chair Thomas pointed out that things do not happen overnight and planning is a long arduous process. He used mass transit in Salt Lake City as an example of a long planning process.

Commissioner Savage clarified that he was not trying to be critical. He just wanted to get to the point where they could work from the big picture and then scale down to the smaller pieces.

Commissioner Wintzer believed the mass and scale problem in Old Town is created by the automobile. Historically, houses in Old Town were built with small footprints and no garages. With every project they talk about mass and scale and parking rights, and it is difficult because the two issues conflict with one another. The historic houses fit on the steeper lots because people walked up to their homes.

Using that concept and thinking about some of the biggest challenges in Old Town, Director Eddington asked the Planning Commission if the biggest issue would be the challenge of parking or the mass and scale of structures. Commissioner Savage answered parking, because parking destroys the opportunity to have an attractive neighborhood fabric. Vice-Chair Thomas thought mass and scale was equally important. Commissioner Hontz remarked that people park on the street because they built their lot to the maximum and left no room to park on-site. She concurred that both were equal problems.

Commissioner Hontz noted that her remaining comments regarding Old Town were minor. If the Commissioners were ready to move to the next section, she would review her comments with Planner Cattan at the end of the meeting. Planner Cattan was willing to meet with individual Commissioners after the meeting, unless there was something that needed to be discussed as a group.

Commissioner Wintzer wanted the group to discuss connectivity between Old Town and the resorts. He referred to the first paragraph in 5.8, "Main Street is truly the heart of the community connected to local neighborhoods, Snyderville Basin, the Wasatch Back and SLC through the trails systems, state-of-the-art public transportation, transit center, SR224, a ski lift to PCMR, and possibly future connectivity to Deer Valley and the Cottonwood Canyons." Commissioner Wintzer felt strongly that the connectivity should not be accomplished with a car. He supported a Deer Valley connection with a gondola, but he would not want to see a road to Deer Valley. He assumed that a connection from Park Avenue to the resort would be a pedestrian connection. Commissioner Wintzer felt it was important to re-write the paragraph to make sure the languages does not imply cars.

Planner Cattan remarked that a sensitive discussion is what will happen with the greater Wasatch Front. She thought it should be addressed through a mitigation strategy in terms of studying the impacts and setting up principles to avoid impacting the back country ski experience. Commissioner Wintzer clarified that he was in favor of a better connection between Main Street and the existing resorts. He had mixed feelings about a connection from the Cottonwood Canyons to Park City and suggested that it might be premature to have it in the General Plan. Commissioner Wintzer offered suggestions such as a gondola, trails, or a rail connection as connectivity measures to eliminate use of the car.

Vice-Chair Thomas stated that they were talking about growth patterns that encourage mass transit versus dispersed growth patterns. Director Eddington understood that they were also talking about restructuring the existing developed areas in how they address transportation. Commissioner Wintzer did not want the General Plan to restrict cars, but he did not want to encourage it.

Commissioner Savage stated that the Park City General Plan is specific to Park City. The connectivity to the Wasatch Back and other things mentioned is something the Planning Commission should consider in the context of what they want Park City to be. If they do a good job with the General Plan and have a vision, they can consider ideas of connectivity to other areas, such as the Cottonwood Canyons, within the reference of the frame work of their vision.

Planner Cattan thought the General Plan should include the discussion to anticipate what might happen over the next ten years. Commissioner Hontz thought the General Plan should be specific about what they want it to be. For example, without significant study they may not know whether they want the connection to occur with the Wasatch Front ski resorts. Therefore, the General Plan needs to say that a better analysis looking at specific criteria would be required before they would consider that connectivity. If the Planning Commission is confident about the internal Park City connection between Deer Valley, that also needs to be specified in the General Plan. Director Eddington believed that the internal connection definitely needed to be stated in the General Plan.

Commissioner Wintzer reiterated the need to provide a connection between Main Street and the resorts. He also thought it was important to find a way to get people to Park City without using cars. He emphasized that the General Plan should encourage all connectivity without vehicles.

Commissioner Wintzer believed several places in the General Plan were conflicted. They talk about encouraging more primary residents in Old Town, but it also encourages more bandstands and activities in Old Town. He noted that most people do not want to live next to a bandstand. He believed they needed to find a way to provide more balance to avoid conflicting interests. Commissioner Wintzer stated that the worst thing that happened to Old Town is that people no longer live there and it no longer generates sales tax. That is the main reason why the merchants were having a difficult time. On the other hand, Old Town is a great place to recreate and socialize. Without a balance they would slowly weed out everyone, and everything would become second homes.

Commissioner Wintzer could not find where vertical zoning and streetscapes on Main Street were addressed in the document. He believed vertical zoning was one of the best things the Planning Commissions did on Main Street and it is important to make sure it continues. Commissioner Hontz pointed out that the Planning Commission recently learned that vertical zoning is not impervious. The LMC obviously needs to be revised, but the General Plan also needs to address it better.

Resort Center

Director Eddington presented a slide of the resort center neighborhood in conjunction with the Old Town neighborhood to show the area where the two overlap. He noted that the discussion this evening should focus on creating the connectivity between Old Town and the Resort Center. Another slide outlined previous plans that were done for this area, as well as some of the more recent plans with regard to transit center studies and work being done by PCMR. Director Eddington remarked that the intent was to look back at the past and look towards the future. He believed there was a real opportunity to tie things together to make life easier for the neighborhood and for the Resort by coalescing it into one document. The neighborhood plans talks about principles that would benefit and guide the lower Park Avenue area plan.

Commissioner Hontz asked if Director Eddington was suggesting another plan. Director Eddington explained that they were talking about doing a plan that would coalesce some of the old with the new. Commissioner Wintzer noted that BoPa and the two resorts were the only big growth areas left in Park City. He believed they needed a separate area plan for all three, if for no other reason than to stop them from competing with each other. Commissioner Hontz agreed, but she preferred to compile everything in a binder and write a ten page area plan for the General Plan. She noted that there was more going on in Bonanza Park and it had been studied less. Commissioner Hontz thought it was better to streamline the area plan to move forward. Commissioner Wintzer stated that because the connection between those three areas, as well as Main Street, was such a large issue in terms of transportation, it would be beneficial to do more research on each one individually.

Planner Cattan outlined the process and everything that had to be considered when the Staff wrote the principles. They were not straying from what exists, but each piece builds off the piece in front of it. When the Planning Commission reviews it, they need to discuss each piece to see how connectivity works. Commissioner Hontz asked if it was as simple as creating a matrix of what needs to take place and where it should occur. Director Eddington replied that it was more complicated than a matrix because some things are out-dated. There are so many different documents and most of them are fairly similar. The intent is to tie some of it together to create predictability for the Planning Commission, the Resort and for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Wintzer pointed out that the area plan is for the Resort Center and they need to be careful not to include other pieces in the area. Planner Cattan noted that when Gateway was hired to do the Form Based Code for Bonanza Park they were also asked to hire an engineering firm to look at the new grid and make sure it flows and connects. If they had an area plan, they would be able to connect the 224 study with the proposed transportation route, and work closely with the Resort on how transportation should flow in that area to make sure the two work seamlessly together.

Vice-Chair Thomas thought it should be studied. He would want to know how it connects to the adjacent neighborhoods and if it connects where it needs to. They should not do anything that would be inconsistent with future plans and growth. The City tends to compartmentalize the issues without understanding the grown pattern or how it fits within the entire neighborhood. Vice-Chair Thomas believed that was true in all neighborhoods, but it was most critical for this area because of the tremendous flow of traffic and people. Commissioner Hontz concurred. However, with so many important things that need to get done, she was concerned with how studies get prioritized. She questioned whether anything additional was needed for this area, but she understood that the Staff was advocating the need. Planner Cattan stated that it adds to the overall concept of connectivity to make sure it works, particularly if they put an east-west connection between the Resort and Park Avenue. Commissioner Wintzer pointed out that if they plan to do that, it is important to know where it would go and what it would connect.

Vice-Chair Thomas remarked that with every node of connectivity there is more potential for density and other commerce in that node. They also need to consider the consequence of not putting it in the right place. Director Eddington understood from the comments that future connectivity should

not be one-directional, single-mode. There should be as many alternatives as possible to get from one point to another.

Question – Do you see the need for a cohesive Area Plan for the Lower Park Avenue/Resort Center Area. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 75%

No – 25%. Commissioner Hontz remarked that if they were asked to re-vote she would probably change her vote to yes.

Planner Cattan presented the Area Plan Principles.

Area Plan Principle 1 – Support redevelopment of the Resort Center through public/private partnerships to stimulate private investments in the RDA area. Planner Cattan read a quote from the RDA Plan, “The principle objective of this plan is to promote redevelopment by stimulating private development within the project area.” She noted that this was a major theme of any RDA.

Question – Do you agree with the Principle and the concept of public/private partnerships. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 100%.

Commissioner Wintzer stated that if they were to have public/private partnership re-development, it is important to make sure Resort development does not schlep down towards Park Avenue. That should be addressed somewhere in the plan to protect the mass and scale on Park Avenue. Commissioner Wintzer referred to language regarding a joint parking structure, and noted that Park City addresses traffic issues by building more parking structures. He agreed that it was needed for the Resort Center, but the goal should be to reduce the amount of traffic. One possibility could be employee parking at a park and ride. The purpose of a parking structure should be to mitigate impacts to the neighborhood.

Area Plan Principle 2 – Improve the guest experience of arriving and leaving the resort. This Principle talks about circulation improvements, wayfinding mechanisms and improvements, and parking improvements.

Planner Cattan stated that circulation improvements talks about management of load in and load out, and the primary entry points at the main intersections that impact this area. It also talks about public transit improvements and new modes of public transportation identified in the Jack Johnson study. Planner Cattan read language from the Jack Johnson study on page 14 of the Staff report.

Commissioner Wintzer requested that the Staff provide the Commissioners with a copy of the Jack Johnson study for review and reference. Planner Cattan stated that another component was additional east/west connections. Commissioner Wintzer stated that the grade between Park Avenue and the Resort is steep and challenging, which is why an area study is so important. They need to make sure it can be done in a way that makes sense.

Commissioner Savage asked if Area Plan Principle 2 shown on the slide was the same as the one in the document. Planner Cattan replied that it was the same; however, the slide only showed the three main points. It did not have all the subcategories. Commissioner Savage wanted to know

which one the Commissioners would be asked to vote on. Planner Cattan replied they would vote on the plan contained in the document.

Commissioner Wintzer read from the document regarding parking improvements. "Public/private partnership to remove prohibitive costs for development on parking lots." He pointed out that a partnership would not remove the cost. It would only shift the way it was paid. He thought "to reduce the cost" was more accurate wording.

Question: Do you agreed with Area Plan Principle 2. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 100%.

Area Plan Principle 3 – Provide a series of transportation and connectivity improvements to allow better synergy between the commercial and event economic engines bed base.

Planner Cattan presented a slide where blue squares represented the bed bases and red circles represented the economic nodes. She pointed to a section that referred to Deer Valley, which was only partially shown on the map. In the bigger picture they would see another node heading out towards Kimball Junction for bed base and economic.

Commissioner Savage commented on the significant amount of discussion regarding a gondola between Main Street and the Resort. Given that there could be taxpayer participation in that type of project, he would like to understand why they could not go from the base of PCMR into Main Street and from Main Street to Deer Valley. Commissioner Savage clarified that it did not all need to occur at once, but there would be merit to a long-term design for connecting the upper bed base.

Question – Do you agree with Area Plan Principle 3. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 100%.

Area Plan Principle 4 – Include pedestrian connectivity between PCMR, the local civic buildings and public gathering areas coupled with public transportation opportunities.

Planner Cattan stated that within the RDA, and another reason for calling for an Area Plan, is that RDA funding goes between two different areas. In looking at a return on investment and a return on community, pedestrian connections would benefit the resort, but it is primarily a local community benefit.

Commissioner Wintzer reiterated his concern about being sensitive to the mass and scale of Lower Park Avenue.

Question – Do you agree with Area Plan Principle 4. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 75% No – 25%.

Commissioner Savage stated that he had voted No because he felt this was a minor consideration in the context of a General Plan. In his opinion, if they get everything else right, the connectivity would occur as a matter of course without being its own separate initiative. He recommended it as a subcategory in the General Plan rather than its own Principle. Secondly, Commissioner Savage did

not believe that connectivity between the Resort Center area and the connection areas proposed made sense. Getting to City Park from PCMR currently is not difficult if someone has the inclination to do so. Commissioner Savage did not think this problem was a big enough issue to deserve this much attention.

Commissioners Wintzer thought it was a big problem because of the grade issue. However, he was unsure of the purpose or whether the connectivity would be used. Commissioner Savage commented on the number of times each week that he observes people with skis and backpacks walking up to the Resort. He agreed that sidewalks or an improved staircase would be a benefit, but they still cannot change the grade. He did not understand the underlying motivation for making this a high priority when the connectivity addresses a modest number of people.

Director Eddington stated that the connectivity was not just intended for pedestrians passing through. It is a fabric connectivity. The area between the Resort and Park Avenue has redevelopment capacity for civic uses, affordable housing and possibly market housing that could provide opportunities to link to PCMR.

Commissioner Wintzer thought they should be careful not to create a drop-off center on Park Avenue where locals can drop off their kids without driving to the Resort.

Area Plan Principle 5 – Public investment in historic sites, public buildings, affordable housing and public gathering areas to ensure best use for increased return on community. Planner Cattan read another quote from the Jack Johnson study of 2009, “Consider additional uses for the library center that enhance rather than detract from the civic and park characteristics that the community currently enjoys at the site. A community garden or relocation of the senior center to this parcel are both examples of projects that could be entertained without compromising existing attributes of the Library Center and greenspace.

Planner Cattan stated that the study also talks about the opportunity to show what Park City is in terms of a community, what they value within this area, and prioritizing those improvements. She noted that this is where they start talking about return on community. Some of the ideas included in several of the different studies were senior center, work force and affordable housing, a community co-op education facility, community gardens, neighborhood center, a small scale neighborhood service. Planner Cattan asked if the Planning Commission had other ideas to add.

Commissioner Wintzer noted that they keep talking about community gardens, but in reality the reward is only three weeks out of the year because of the climate. He preferred to focus on open space that would be usable year-round. Commissioner Hontz believed the use of open space was imperative. If they wanted community gardens, she suggested using the roofs.

Question - Do you agree with Area Plan Principle 5. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 100%.

Area Plan Principle 6 – Decrease impacts of the destination resort on surrounding residential communities.

Question - Do you agree with Area Plan Principle 6. The Commissioners voted and the result was:
Yes – 100%

Area Plan Principle 7 – Balanced decision-making.

Commissioner Savage clarified that balance decision-making referred to the concept of “gives” and “gets” as it relates to balance throughout the entire General Plan and not just one specific area. Planner Cattan stated that Principle 7 was primarily for the Resort Center area, particularly with the RDA, and realizing that a different benefit may be achieved at the Resort Center in terms of economic development versus the return on community with the Library and civic areas.

Commissioner Wintzer asked if the Redevelopment Authority was the City Council. Planner Cattan replied that this was correct.

A vote was not taken on Principle 7.

Principle 4.2 – Resort Neighborhood: Home to year-round events and recreational activity. Commissioner Wintzer felt this was another area where scale and mass was an important factor. He would not favor big box recreation.

Question – The Commissioners were asked whether they agreed or disagreed. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 100%.

Principle 4.3 – The Resort Center Neighborhood: A model for green practices.

Question: The Commissioners were asked whether they agreed or disagreed. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 75% No – 25%.

Planner Cattan noted that PCMR has done a good job starting that momentum.

Principle 4.4 - Resort Center Neighborhood: Maintain the rural character of the transition area between the Resort Center and the Thaynes neighborhood.

Planner Cattan indicated an area that has not been annexed into the City. It is an island piece that is still in the County. That piece should be annexed into the City in the future. The current zoning is 1 unit per 120 acres and that density should be maintained. Commissioner Hontz thought that should be specified in the General Plan so anyone coming in for an annexation would not think they were getting another subdivision.

Commissioner Hontz read from page 23 of the Staff report, “Future development at the corner of Thaynes and Three Kings should be set back from the road and pulled closer to Snow’s Lane. This area would best be left as open space or developed in a compact manner implementing conservation subdivision design.” She asked if the language was suggesting that the whole area would be best left as open space, or whether the area per the Staff design was the best design because it left the area closer to Three Kings open. Commissioner Hontz thought the intent needed to be clarified. Commissioner Hontz was unsure of the zoning or whether there was entitlement, but

if they wanted to keep it as open space it needed to be carefully worded so it would not diminish negotiations in the event of an acquisition opportunity.

Question - The Commissioners were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with Principle 4.4. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 75% No – 25%.

Vice-Chair Thomas called for public input.

Michael Barille provided background on some of the topics from the standpoint of someone who was involved with the studies done of the Resort area. He stated that at the time, they were trying to point out that Park City Mountain Resort is uniquely situated next to town and it much more integrated than most resorts are to an establish downtown. Yet, there are obstacles such as grade, and the local knowledge that it would be intuitive for a visitor to stay at the Resort and use other options to get around town besides a car. The question was what they could do to increase that likelihood. Mr. Barille explained that some of the east-west connections and dealing with grade were the thought that as transportation systems improve with wayfinding signs, other people besides resort employees would use that corridor. It would open it up and encourage a guest experience.

In terms of establishing the larger fabric, Mr. Barille stated that historically there was a lot of discussion regarding locations for enhanced transit pieces. For example, the parking lot for the skate park or the north end of City Park might be considered for future structured parking or some type of transit node as a central point to get between Bonanza Park, Deer Valley, PCMR and downtown. Mr. Barille remarked that PCMR has always viewed themselves as a recreational amenity to a bed base and a historic district that they do not wholly own and control. The Resort is very willing to look at ways to connect those pieces. He thought the City had the opportunity to engage PCMR as they lay the ground work for the General Plan.

Alex Butwinski clarified that he was speaking as a citizen giving input and not as a City Council member. Mr. Butwinski stated that he has spoken with Mr. Barille in the past regarding the east-west connection. Personally, he did not see it as a functional connection for someone walking with a backpack and skis. He asked if anyone present this evening had actually walked with skis and a backpack from the Library, up the stairs and over and up Manor Way to the center of the Resort. It is a significant climb and a long way to go. Mr. Butwinski did not believe it would be much different on an east-west connection between Miners and Manor Way. If the first question is who will use it, the next question is whether they would want to make that pod a redevelopment area, which is basically a destination of its own. As a citizen, Mr. Butwinski could not see the point. He could not see people making the effort to walk up that street unless there was a reason to do it. Mr. Butwinski agreed with Commissioner Savage in terms of not putting a lot of focus on one area unless they know what they want it to be.

Planner Cattan asked if Mr. Butwinski would see people utilizing the east-west connection in ten years when the parking lots are built out and there is an Alpine Village.

Mr. Butwinski stated that people might walk and use it more in the summer, but he was still not convinced people would walk it in the winter. Director Eddington understood from Mr. Butwinski's comment that it would depend on what was in the redevelopment area. People may walk up to

PCMR or walk down to City Park, depending upon what's there. Mr. Butwinski stated that they keep talking about connectivity, but the question would be what is it really connecting and who would use it. That is an important question in terms of what they want the area to be. Mr. Butwinski clarified that he personally could not see it, but he was interested in knowing if others could.

Commissioner Wintzer concurred with Mr. Butwinski and Commissioner Savage in terms of the uncertainty; however, he believed the Area Plan would look at the best place to put it and whether it was worth it. Vice-Chair Thomas stated that a lot of thought needs to be given to the termination points and how it connects to other parts of the community. It is an important consideration because that is the point where they would be stimulating the potential for growth.

Tim Brennwal, VP of Development, Powder Corp., agreed with both sides of the discussion. In his mind it only makes sense to have that connection. People obviously walk more in the summer, but they do walk in the winter. If they make it easier in the winter, it was questionable whether that would encourage more people to walk. If the already efficient transportation system is improved as they move forward, people will always take the path of least resistant. If there is a bus stop nearby, people will get on the bus and ride.

Mr. Barille thought it would depend on the transit service. Currently, if you get on a bus at PCMR, depending on the route, you might ride through three neighborhoods before you arrive at the downtown transit center. Other routes are more direct. Frequency of service was another factor. As transit evolves, it could change their assumptions about which nodes to connect. If the Bonanza Park plan comes to fruition, that may also change their assumptions. Mr. Barille stated that timing and layering were important and there was no reason to build it until there is a need.

Jenni Smith, VP of Operations, PCMR, remarked that more walking goes on than what they think, in both summer and winter.

Planner Cattan stated that if Park City is headed towards year-round recreation and the area gets busier throughout the summer, she believed it would get utilized more. If a camp aspect is added, it would be great for the community, as well as for the parents dropping off their children, to know that there was a safe connection.

Ruth Meintsma commented on pedestrian connectivity. She understood that the area in question was from the Resort to Lower Park and facilitating the stairs or other improvements. Ms. Meintsma believed the importance of the connection was underestimated. Living in Old Town and being out on the street a lot, people are always lost looking for the Resort. She stated that lack of identification was the main issue. For instance the stairs are unlabeled and if you access those stairs you have no idea where you are. She believed that if visitors understood the streets layout like the locals, there would be more walking. Ms. Meintsma recalled a picture from the last presentation of people walking at night carrying snowboards with lights around. She really thought that picture was great. People walk now, but the goal for the future should be for everyone to park their cars and walk everywhere. Ms. Meintsma noted that Smartphones have an app that will track your path. However, the app does not work in Park City because the stairs are not labeled. She believed that facilitating that movement and labeling streets would make a big difference.

Mr. Barille commented on the issues regarding mapping and suggested that the Staff and Planning Commission use Google Earth during their presentation and discussion. GIS is a great tool but it is not particularly integrated with the rest of the world. He thought Google Earth would be a better tool.

Director Eddington stated that the thought behind connectivity might also be the ability to create a right-of-way in an area where they cannot really create a road due to the grade. He believed there was a potential to create a "new road" that ends up being a walkway.

Mr. Butwinski agreed, but he still felt they first need to know what they want there. Vice-Chair Thomas favored Director Eddington's idea because it allocates the space for something to evolve. It might start out being pedestrian oriented and then evolve into something else.

Commissioner Savage requested that the Masonic Hill discussion be continued to the next meeting. Planner Cattan stated that Masonic Hill, Upper and Lower Deer Valley and Quinn's Junction were the last areas to discuss. Commissioner Hontz thought they could complete all three in one meeting.

The Park City Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: _____