

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
SPECIAL WORK SESSION – GENERAL PLAN  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
FEBRUARY 20, 2013

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Nann Worel, Brooke Hontz, Stewart Gross, Adam Strachan, Jack Thomas, Charlie Wintzer

EX OFFICIO:

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington; Katie Cattan, Planner; Anya Grahn, Planner; Francisco Astorga, Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney

=====

SPECIAL WORK SESSION – GENERAL PLAN

**ROLL CALL**

Chair Worel called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present except Commissioner Savage.

**PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no comments.

**STAFF OR BOARD COMMUNICATIONS/DISCLOSURES**

Commissioner Hontz stated that Planner Astorga was making copies of an email he had received today so the Commissioners would have it for their discussion.

Director Eddington reminded the Planning Commission that they were invited to the reception the following evening after the City Council Visioning at Hotel Park City at 5:30 p.m.

Chair Worel disclosed that she would be out-of-town for the March 13<sup>th</sup> Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Gross would also be out-of-town for that meeting.

Commissioner Thomas disclosed that he would be unable to attend the Planning Commission meeting on February 27<sup>th</sup>.

**WORK SESSION – GENERAL PLAN – Discussion and Overview of neighborhoods – the neighborhoods to be discussed include: Thaynes Canyon, Park Meadows and Bonanza Park/Prospector**

Planner Cattan reported that there were a total of nine neighborhoods. The Thaynes Canyon, Park Meadows and BonanzaPark/Prospector neighborhoods would be discussed this evening. Planner

Cattan provided a brief overview of the setup of the General Plan and how the neighborhoods are defined within the General Plan.

She outlined the four core values that emerged from Visioning. Small Town looks at land use, regional land use planning and transportation. Natural Setting addresses open space, resource conservation, and climate adaptation. Sense of Community looks at housing, parks and recreation, special events, economy and community facility. Historic Character relates to historic preservation.

Neighborhoods are set up after the Staff filters through the data collection, uses what they learned from the census, and looks at the built environment, as well as the existing trail systems, connectivity and walkability. They also look at the configuration of lots and the pattern of the neighborhood. Each neighborhood has guiding principles related to the aesthetics of the neighborhood.

Planner Cattan remarked that in the end, each neighborhood would have its own principles and strategies that relate to each of the four core values.

Planner Cattan reported that significant public outreach was done in 2011 and 2012. Meetings were set up for each neighborhood and the citizens were asked to fill out a survey. There was also a sticker presentation to determine what people wanted to see in each of their neighborhoods.

#### Thaynes Canyon

Planner Cattan stated that within the Thaynes neighborhood they saw a real connection to the Farm, but not much in terms of mixed-use within the neighborhood. In the raw data of what makes the neighborhood unique, what are the neighborhood icons, and what needs to be improved, the Staff used the data to figure out what needs to be addressed and what needs to be protected. That came from strategies as well as good planning practices. Planner Cattan noted that people were also asked to do an online survey to address types of preferred residential development and appropriate affordable housing in their neighborhood. For the Thayne neighborhood they heard a lot about single-family, mother-in-law apartments. There was less interest for multi-family housing in Thaynes. There was also a lot of support for sustainable initiatives. Planner Cattan pointed out that only 15 people participated in the survey for Thaynes; therefore, the data collection was small.

Planner Cattan reviewed a map of secondary homes and nightly rentals. She noted that there were only four nightly rentals in the Thaynes neighborhood. In terms of density, Iron County was less dense than the actual Thaynes neighborhood moving towards the golf course.

Planner Cattan outlined the natural and existing conditions. The density is approximately 3.16 units per acre per homes on average. There is no affordable housing in the Thaynes neighborhood. The occupancy rate is 65% primary residents. The primary occupancy rate was tied with Park Meadows, followed by Bonanza Park and Prospector. The owner/occupied rate was 59%, which exceeds all the other neighborhoods.

Planner Cattan had distributed copies of the data from the 2010 census so they would be able to compare all the neighborhoods.

Planner Cattan stated that Thaynes is a walkable neighborhood internally. However, there are few amenities within a quarter-mile to decrease vehicle miles traveled, which is how the walkability index is rated. For that reason, the walkability index for Thaynes was fairly low.

Planner Cattan commented on the strategies. The McPolin Barn is the gateway icon to Park City. She noted that they had talked about the City boundary being a shared greenbelt and wildlife corridor with the County. There has been a lot of emphasis over the years to protect the edge coming into the City with the entry protection and frontage protection zones.

Chair Worel referred to language about considering annexing the land up to the Ridge. She asked if that was being considered at this point or if it was something for the future. Planner Cattan replied that it is not being considered now but it could be in the future.

The Staff had prepared questions for the Planning Commission to vote on using their key pads.

Question - 1.2 states that Park City must work with Summit County to establish a regional greenbelt shared between the communities. It is a policy statement and the Commissioners were asked if they agreed.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% agreed.

Commissioner Hontz felt the City would want to cooperate based on the wording. However, if the other party did not want to cooperate, she questioned whether the City wanted it badly enough to pursue it.

Planner Cattan commented on Ivers SPA development that was approved for 30 units behind St. Mary's church. There is flexibility for them not to build on the designated building pads and shift development to the other pads. The Staff added a recommendation to the Park City General Plan to work with the County to shift units behind the line of sight at St. Mary's to protect the open space.

Question – Do you agree with the recommendation to work with the County to shift units behind the line of sight of St. Mary's.

Commissioner Thomas disclosed that his office is across the street from the Catholic Church. He was aware of the situation with the property and for that reason he would recuse himself from voting on the question. Assistant City Attorney McLean clarified that since this was a legislative work session, Commissioner Thomas could participate in the discussion of the neighborhood as a whole, as long as he disclosed his connection to the area. If he recused himself, he would have to leave the room. Commissioner Thomas preferred to leave the room and not participate in the discussion.

Commissioner Gross asked if the property was within the City limits. Director Eddington replied that it was outside of the City limits but within the entry corridor. The Ivers SPA came through in the early 1990's and it was amended in the late 1990's and early 2000.

Commissioner Hontz felt this was another situation where alternative solutions besides working with the County might produce better results. In her opinion, the question should be whether they would be in support of not having dwelling units in that location. Commissioner Wintzer agreed, because the question worded by the Staff would result in 100% yes answers, without delving into the problem.

Director Eddington stated that if the Planning Commission agreed that it would be better to move development out of the pod in the open space area into the other area, it would coincide with the question of whether they agreed with the Staff recommendation to shift units behind the line of sight of St. Mary's. The question was restated, removing the language, "to work with the County".

Restated question - Do you agree with the Staff recommendation to shift units behind the line of sight of St. Mary's.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - Yes. Commissioner Thomas had left the room and did not vote.

Director Eddington clarified that the Commissioners wanted to discuss other alternatives besides working with the County. Commissioner Hontz answered yes, noting that annexation and an outright negotiation of purchase were two of a long list of alternatives. She pointed out that if there is an approved SPA with associated development rights, they need to respect those and understand the best way to facilitate if they feel strongly about moving them.

Planner Cattan noted that the lots are located at the beginning of a County Road. Therefore, the option of annexing would also bring new responsibilities tied to those properties, unless it was open space and undeveloped. Commissioner Wintzer remarked that it would be difficult for the City to go that far out to snow plow a subdivision.

Assistant City Attorney McLean pointed out that currently the property was not part of the City's Annexation boundary area. That would have to be addressed before annexation could be considered.

Question – Do you agree with the level of detail.

Planner Cattan noted that the document is called the General Plan, but there has been significant discussion through other applications indicating that the General Plan does not always provide enough guidance. The question was more overall in terms of specificity in within the General Plan update.

Commissioner Hontz used the drawing presented to explain why she was unable to say whether there was enough detail in that particular drawing to understand if there was a real value in moving those units. Planner Cattan remarked that it was still at a high level in terms of having a line of sight

and finding a way to move the development to one side of that line of sight. She pointed out that it was not to the exact science of specifying number of units, etc. The question was whether or not the Commissioners agreed with the level of detail in general.

Director Eddington indicated the line of sight and pointed out which pods the Staff recommended should be moved and where they should be moved to.

Commissioner Wintzer clarified that the recommendation reads that everything should be behind the line of sight. Director Eddington answered yes.

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

Director Eddington remarked that the intent was to keep the General Plan general; but give direction in policy when needed.

Planner Cattan noted that 1.4 of the General Plan stated that Thaynes neighborhood is a local neighborhood in which primary residents choose to live. The section talks about keeping Thaynes a primary neighborhood and making sure it has the amenities to meet the needs of the primary residents. Transportation, trail access, sidewalks, parks and access to public transportation are a priority in this neighborhood.

Commissioner Wintzer noted that the last sentence, "Future annexation should require" was incomplete. Planner Cattan replied that the full sentence should read, "Future annexation should require affordable housing."

Commissioner Hontz questioned how that would occur since a recent project already had that requirement. Planner Cattan replied that language states, "rather than multi-family housing, affordable housing opportunities should take the form of small cottage style co-housing development, similar to the Snow Creek development. Multi-family housing is not appropriate."

Commissioner Hontz was uncomfortable with the term "co-housing". She was not opposed to small cottage style development similar to Snow Creek development. She was concerned that "co-housing" might be a fad that would not apply several years from now.

Question – 1.5 states, Compatible options for the Thaynes Canyon neighborhood includes single-family homes, attached accessory dwelling units and detached accessory dwelling units. The Commissioners were asked whether or not they agreed with this statement?

Planner Cattan clarified that the Staff did not support multi-family.

Commissioner Wintzer noted that Thaynes Canyon is already platted and has established CC&Rs. He asked if the Staff was suggesting this for Thaynes Canyon. Planner Cattan stated that it would apply to new development on the edge, or in the event of a replat they would still say that single-family is appropriate. She remarked that the Code could also be changed to allow an attached or detached accessory dwelling unit as an allowed use. Commissioner Wintzer has concerns with automatically making changes within a finished subdivision without involving the homeowners.

Planner Cattan stated that currently Thaynes has a CUP process for accessory dwellings; however, only one accessory dwelling is allowed within every 300 feet. Commissioner Wintzer asked if the City could trump the CC&Rs. Planner Cattan replied that the CC&Rs would govern. She explained that the accessory dwelling would be a modification to the current use table.

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

Commissioner Wintzer emphasized his comment that the City needed to be careful about making changes and adding to finished neighborhoods.

Director Eddington understood that there was general agreement that a development such as Snow Creek, where they went into a neighborhood and did a replat and built, would be an appropriate concept. Commissioner Wintzer concurred. He just wanted to make sure that the neighbors were involved in the conversation if that approach is taken. Planner Cattan noted that accessory dwelling units would not be allowed if they are prohibited by the CC&Rs, regardless of the City Code. Assistant City Attorney McLean clarified that whichever is the more restrictive applies. For example, if the CC&Rs require a 20' setback and the City Code requires 10', the HOA could enforce the CC&Rs and make the setbacks 20 feet.

Question – 1.5 states that rather than multi-family housing, affordable housing opportunities should take the form of small cottage style development similar to the Snow Creek development. Multi-family housing is not appropriate in this neighborhood. The Commissioners were asked whether or not they agreed with this statement.

Commissioner Thomas noted that multi-family housing could be in any form, including cottage-style. Director Eddington clarified that the language addresses building types. Per the LMC, multi-family housing is defined as three or more units in a single building. Chair Worel understood that the language required affordable housing in the Thaynes neighborhood to be single family type structures. Planner Director replied that this was correct. Planner Cattan pointed out that multi-family housing would be appropriate in Park Meadows due to the context of condominiums.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 60% - Yes 40% - No.

Planner Cattan asked if multi-family housing should be considered for the Thaynes neighborhood. Director Eddington stated that he and Commissioner Thomas had an internal discussion a few weeks earlier regarding the possibility of having a structure that appeared to be a single family house, but could be three affordable units. The issue was the unlikelihood of that actually occurring, which prompted the recommendation to move away from multi-family housing in Thaynes.

City Council Member, Alex Butwinski, asked Commissioner Hontz to restate her objection to cottage-style, co-housing development similar to the Snow Creek development. Commissioner Hontz stated that she objected to the word "co-housing". Mr. Butwinski noted that "co-housing" was a generally defined term in the current development situation in Town. Whether or not she accepted that word, he felt that saying "co-housing development similar to the Snow Creek development," loosely implies that Snow Creek has co-housing. Director Eddington clarified that that the Snow

Creek development is not considered co-housing, which is why Commissioner Hontz asked that the word be eliminated. Commissioner Thomas agreed that the word “co-housing” was too restrictive because it defines a particular type of housing.

Council Member Butwinski believed that co-housing was part of their vision and it should be considered as part of the goals for affordable, attainable housing. Mr. Butwinski did not think it was too restrictive if they said “including co-housing”. Director Eddington asked if he was suggesting language, “...including co-housing, may be single-family cottage development similar to Snow Creek, etc.” Mr. Butwinski replied that he his suggestion would make co-housing supplemental rather than restrictive.

Commissioner Hontz pointed out that the idea of the language was to require single-family and nothing else. The language needed to be revised to reflect that or it needed to state that other types of housing would be allowed. She asked if there was consensus among the Planning Commission to limit the housing to single family, which could also mean co-housing.

Planner Cattan amended the language to read, “...to take the form of small cottage style, single-family housing developments similar to Snow Creek Development. Single family could include co-housing, land trusts or other styles. Planner Cattan reiterated the intent that multi- family was not appropriate in this neighborhood. However, she noted from the voting that several people disagreed with that intent.

Question: Of the nine neighborhoods in Park City, Thaynes and Masonic Hill are the only neighborhoods that lack any deed restricted affordable units. Should the Thaynes neighborhood have deed restricted units in the future: 1) yes, all neighborhoods should have affordable housing; 2) yes, primary residential neighborhoods should have affordable housing; 3) no, Thaynes lacks the amenities necessary for affordable housing.

Chair Worel asked how deed restricting affordable housing would work with the established CC&Rs. Planner Cattan replied that a home could be purchased and become deed restricted by the City, or it could occur through a future annexation.

Regarding Option 2, Director Eddington pointed out that the primary residential neighborhoods were the ones being presented this evening; Bonanza Park, Park Meadows and Thaynes.

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

Commissioner Strachan was surprised that 50% voted for Option 3 because Thaynes has great amenities. It is the closest single-family premier Park City neighborhood near the liquor store and a grocery store and it has great trails. The only neighborhood that was even close was Park Meadows. In his opinion, if Thaynes lacks amenities, then none of the other neighborhoods have amenities.

Commissioner Wintzer stated that he was in the 50% because he could find nothing within a walkable distance. It starts above the golf course and heads down a very busy road. One then needs to cross another busy road in order to go anywhere. He could see Commissioner Strachan’s point, but he had not thought about it when he voted. Commissioner Strachan agreed that the

amenities are not as close as bigger cities, but it is a reasonable distance for Park City. He stated that the Dan's grocery store, the liquor store, the Rite-Aid and Fresh Market were the only amenities in town.

The Commissioners voted on the same question again. The result was: 1) 50% 2) 33% 3) 17%.

Commissioner Hontz suggested that the Staff replace some of the photos that were used to reflect the aesthetics of the Thaynes neighborhood with ones that were more recent and accurate. Planner Cattan stated that a Planner would be out taking better and more updated photos, and also include the natural and pastoral scenes as well as the built environment.

Planner Cattan remarked that the language regarding aesthetics talks about the pattern of the lots and protecting views, rather than the river stone or the type of railing.

Question: Should the aesthetics within Thaynes begin a discussion on regulating materials.

Planner Cattan stated that the LMC regulates materials in the type of design allowed within Park City. However, it does not specify a 12" timber versus a 6" timber in the Thaynes neighborhood. She asked if the Planning Commission preferred to see that type of specificity or if they were satisfied with only talking about lot configurations and the pattern of the overall neighborhood for the future.

Commissioner Gross asked if that would include the Richards annexation. Planner Cattan replied that it would influence any new annexation.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 50% No – 50%

Commissioner Wintzer thought they needed to look at incorporating design guidelines for City-owned right-of-ways to possibly get uniformity in signage, plants, fencing materials, etc. that ties into the neighborhood. A lot of time is spent designing what goes inside the lots in the subdivisions, but people actually walk and drive along the edge. Commissioner Wintzer pointed out that there are guidelines to let people know what their neighbor can do, but no one knows what the City can do.

Commissioner Thomas stated that his issue with guidelines is that they always seem to be a frozen moment in time in terms of what is appropriate now. The vernacular changes and evolves, which is something they continually struggle with for the Historic District. Commissioner Thomas stated that if design guidelines are created, there needs to be a design factor that allows for evolution in that set of guidelines. Most of the HOAs he works with are beginning to do that with their guidelines.

Planner Cattan asked the ones who voted in favor of regulating the materials, which materials they would like to see regulated. Commissioner Thomas stated that once they begin regulating siding materials and exterior walls they fall into the frozen moment in time concept. He preferred to leave it more open. Commissioner Wintzer referred to a new house with all flat roofs up Deer Valley Drive that fits very well into the neighborhood and into the hillside. He assumed it was not allowed by the CC&Rs and somehow the owner obtained permission. To Commissioner Thomas' point, that would have never been allowed ten years ago.



Director Eddington emphasized that there are architectural standards in the LMC that are fairly high level, and that may be enough. The Staff would look into it further to see whether the standards are sufficient or if they need to be supplemented. Commissioner Thomas pointed out that they were quick to create design guidelines, but they veer away from requiring a higher level of design. He was unsure why the City continued to allow non-professionals to work in the design environment. Director Eddington noted that the City Council has had that same discussion.

Planner Cattan reviewed the last section that ties all the principles and strategies back to the individual neighborhood. Commissioner Hontz referred to a map in their packet that showed future conditions. She was bothered by the language regarding a park and ride somewhere in the entry corridor. In her opinion, a park and ride should not be located in areas where they would not want people to gather and terminate, particularly on this road in this neighborhood. Commissioner Hontz pointed out that there was no desire for a commercial node in that area; therefore, there would be no benefit to having a park and ride situation.

Commissioner Thomas noted that when the Bay Area Rapid Transit was built, park and ride stations were located throughout the environment and each station became a central place for growth, commercial activity and density. He concurred with Commissioner Hontz's observation. Director Eddington thought the park and ride could be more appropriately tied into the Snow Creek shopping or BoPa. Commissioner Hontz emphasized that the destination should not be at the beginning or end of a trail.

Planner Cattan stated that the Planning Commission would have the opportunity to discuss park and ride situations with the Park Meadows neighborhood.

Commissioner Strachan commented on the large lots in the Thayne neighborhood, and he requested that the Staff add a sentence under Natural Setting Planning Strategies stating that lawns and high water use yards should be discouraged. Commissioner Thomas thought the same strategy should expand to the entire community. Commissioner Strachan was unsure whether it should apply to Old Town because the lots are small and families need some lawn area for their children. He believed that lawns do have a place in some areas and he was not willing to ban them throughout the entire City.

Director Eddington suggested the possibility of a percentage of area calculation similar to what was discussed for an MPD. Commissioners Thomas and Hontz concurred.

Commissioner Gross asked for an explanation of Principle 11B, "Maintain the unique Park City experience through regulating design of the built environment." Planner Cattan explained that it addresses the design of the built environment to maintain architectural standards. Commissioner Gross replied that the Park City experience is more than just within the built environment. Director Eddington asked if Commissioner Gross was suggesting that they expand the language to include some of the other concepts that make up that experience. Commissioner Gross answered. He thought adding a period after the word "design" and eliminating "built environment" made the language more inclusive.

The Commissioners pointed out misspelled words in the Principles and Strategies. Director Eddington noted that they were using Adobe and Design for the presentations. The Staff will spell check everything before it is finalized. He encouraged the Commissioners to continue to point out misspelled words.

Planner Cattan called for general discussion on the Thaynes neighborhood. Commissioner Wintzer believed that Thaynes would start getting rebuilt fairly soon. When that occurs, they could see a shift towards second homes if they are not careful.

Chair Worel called for public comment on the Thaynes neighborhood.

Rob Slettom stated that Thaynes is one of the oldest areas and it has the poorest quality water. He has been a Thaynes resident for 17 years and a prior to that, a resident of Park Meadows and Old Town. Mr. Slettom also sits on the Board of Directors for the Thaynes Canyon HOA 1. He noted that there are three HOAs within Thaynes Canyon. Out of the three HOAs, Thaynes 1 encompasses Payday Drive and Thaynes Canyon Drive down to the Three Kings intersection. Mr. Slettom noted that the HOA has an active architectural committee that has been overseeing some of the remodels. The CC&Rs in Thaynes 1 do not allow accessory apartment with the exception of one that was grandfathered in. From time to time that becomes a real problems because the space above the garage is large enough to fix six or eight kids during the ski season, and each one has a car. The subdivision has parking regulations but enforcement is difficult. Mr. Slettom stated that as the Planning Commission looks at accessory apartment throughout Park City, they need to consider that occupancy is very critical and the problems related to off-street parking. Mr. Slettom referred to page 14 of the handout, Section 1.4, and language about extending the bus routes. Several years ago he was one who helped put the kibosh on extending the bus route down Pay Day Drive and going on Thaynes Canyon Drive. At that time, the buses were primarily servicing the tourists and every time the bus made a detour the bus time was extended and the passengers had to ride through all the neighborhoods. Mr. Slettom believed that was a still a consideration for concern. Mr. Slettom noted that 1.5 states that Thaynes should remain a quiet residential neighborhood dominated by single family homes. He could not imagine what it would be like to have a City bus go by your house every ten minutes. He recommended the possibility of an on-call bus.

Commissioner Wintzer remarked that from a different perspective, he had friends who raised their children in Thaynes and they complained that their kids could not ride the bus to go skiing. Planner Cattan stated that there was also the ongoing debate about the transit system being more oriented to tourists rather than locals.

Mr. Slettom was not entirely opposed to bus service in Thaynes if it could be done in a proper way. He agreed with the assessment about keeping Thaynes a quiet neighborhood. Sometimes with accessory dwellings or deed restricted affordable housing the quietness starts to go away.

### Park Meadows

Planner Cattan reported that the Staff had received different feedback from the Park Meadows Neighborhood Outreach. With the old Racquet Club, now called the MARC, there was definite interest for a restaurant or neighborhood deli, public art, and a dedicated car-share parking area.

Planner Cattan stated that there were three different area maps and all three showed the trend for something more than just the Rec Center and the desire for a community gathering place. On the question of what makes this neighborhood unique was the great access to open space around the edge and the view of the mountain areas and open space. The Park Meadows neighborhood is also family oriented with primarily full-time residents, and has a suburban character. The icons of the neighborhood were the Racquet Club, Round Valley, the Park Meadows golf course, Park City Hill, the schools and Eccles. Planner Cattan believed this neighborhood was the model neighborhood for good planning.

Desired improvements to the Park Meadows neighborhood during Outreach included improving sidewalks, a year-round pool, improvement to the tennis courts, allowing cross country and snowshoes on the golf course. Other issues mentioned were too many people live in one home and that the cut-through traffic needed to be managed.

Planner Cattan stated that some of the responses indicated that 100% of residents have access to recreation out their back door. For affordable housing the most attractive was to create more single family homes for affordable housing, or mother-in-law apartments within a primary home. Planner Cattan showed a side by side comparison of the responses heard from the Thaynes Neighborhood and from Park Meadows. Some of the trends were similar. Planner Cattan noted that 50% did not think more affordable housing was needed in the Park Meadows neighborhood.

Commissioner Strachan asked if Park Meadows currently had affordable housing. He was told that most of the affordable housing is located in Park Meadows. The Park Meadows neighborhood boundary includes Snow Creek and the Racquet Club which has most of the affordable housing.

Planner Cattan presented a census map showing secondary homes and nightly rental. The darker blue was more secondary homes and the yellow dots indicated nightly rentals. She presented another map showing the density in various areas. The natural conditions of Park Meadows was the great access to open space all the way around the neighborhood leading into Summit County.

Planner Cattan stated that Park Meadows was a great place to look at mix of density within a neighborhood. The density ranges from .14 to 39.41 units per acre. The population is 2,604 people, making it the most populated neighborhood within Park City. There is a mix of single-family, condos and multi-family. Park Meadows is tied with Thaynes for occupancy with 65% primary. The units are 50% owner-occupied and 30% renter occupied.

Planner Cattan reported that the Park Meadows neighborhood is tucked behind Boot Hill and the entryway, with a comfortable buffer for wildlife. She presented a map showing the open space of Round Valley. Boot Hill is protected, but one area in between that goes over the back side of the ridge into Summit County is not protected.

Question – The City should work to ensure that the area between Mountain Top and Round Valley does not become fragmented due to development. The Commissioners were asked if they agreed with this statement. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 83% No – 17%

Question – What is more important? 1) preventing fragmentation of open space; 2) creating a greenbelt around the city; 3) equally important; 4) neither is important.

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

Planner Cattan stated that Park Meadows is the last stop in Park City heading east towards Salt Lake City.

Question – Do you agree with a park and ride within the entry corridor.

Planner Cattan explained that the thought was to capture ridership since it was the last stop out of town. The Commissioners voted and the result was: No - 100%.

Planner Cattan stated that in reviewing the core values they talked about TDRs and allowing more density within neighborhoods. The Commissioners were very clear that additional density should only be allowed within an existed platted neighborhood if open space was acquired for it and there was a TDR exchange. Planner Cattan provided an example showing how a TDR could work within Park Meadows, making sure that there was access to the right-of-way and that the new lots were in the context of the neighborhood in terms of size and pattern. She clarified that a TDR and a plat amendment would have to occur, and that would result in a highly public process. It would also require agreement by the HOA.

Commissioner Gross disclosed that one of the examples shown was literally in his backyard.

Commissioner Wintzer asked there was any way the public process could be trumped. Planner Cattan answered no. Commissioner Wintzer was skeptical on the idea in general, but he did not want to completely close the door on having a conversation if there was a way to add even one affordable unit.

Planner Astorga understood that currently the Code allows density without a TDR credit. Planner Cattan replied that under the current Code someone could apply for a re-subdivision without the credit, but it would still require the public process. It would also require meeting the minimum lot size, as well as a vote of approval by two-thirds of the HOA.

Commissioner Hontz reiterated her previous concern about making sure the mechanism works and that the City derives value where the TDR credit comes from. She was still uncomfortable talking about TDRs without having a better understanding. Commissioner Hontz wanted to see that the value actually exists, instead of just giving density away. It should be valued so high that someone would be willing to sell and/or buy. She was willing to transfer density but she wanted it to be value desired.

Commissioner Gross preferred to see an additional level at Bonanza Park with nine units rather than nine houses behind his street. Commissioner Wintzer noted that Park Meadows was the second subdivision in Park City. Holiday Ranchette had the biggest lots in Park City and it was in a financial mess because the lots did not sell. It was designed as horse property and no one wanted a horse. Therefore, the land is being maintained and irrigated but without much use. Commissioner

Wintzer thought it was important to make sure the value scale they set for what they get is high enough to be worth it.

Commissioner Thomas remarked that the homes at Holiday Ranchette compared to the rest of the community was a dramatic difference in size and quality. It is a different neighborhood with a different character than the rest of the community.

Question – Do you agree with the concept of utilizing TDR credits for future subdivision to preserve open space?

Commissioner Hontz stated that her vote would be “it depends”, based on the mechanics of the TDR. Director Eddington understood that Commissioner Hontz wanted language that would guarantee that value is associated with the TDR and that the density would come from somewhere else to be located in the right location. Commissioner Hontz agreed, adding that she would also want to make sure the value was worth it. The question was how that could be quantified.

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

Planner Cattan asked if there were any lots that those who voted no would see as a yes. She asked if there was something contextually wrong with the lots the Staff suggested, or was it the overall strategy.

Director Eddington asked if the Commissioners had any concerns about tear down and rebuilds in the Park Meadows area with the scale of housing. Commissioner Gross pointed out that it is already occurs in Park Meadows. They have architectural committees and it is welcomed. Commissioner Gross did not see it as a concern.

Planner Cattan presented the next slide talking about aesthetics and the pattern of lots and protecting the views. She noted that they were not addressing materials or building forms. Commissioner Hontz pointed out that 2.5 talks about preserving the aesthetics of the Park Meadows neighborhood. She questioned whether some of the photos shown were an iconic aesthetically pleasing set of structures and whether they wanted to preserve that look. She personally would like to see the photos of the condos replaced with a better example. She did not mind the condos but it was not a good representation for the statement.

Commissioner Gross suggested changing the statement to say, “The livability of the Park Meadows neighborhood should be preserved.” Planner Cattan noted that this statement related to the aesthetics of the built environment. Commissioner Thomas did not think the statement was as meaningful in the Park Meadows community as it might be in other communities. Commissioner Wintzer concurred. He did not believe the General Plan talked about quality of design as much as it should. They somehow need to raise the quality and level of design but that has not been addressed. Chair Worel asked where that should be addressed in the General Plan.

Planner Cattan restated Director Eddington’s question and asked if the Commissioners felt threatened by future infill and tearing down older homes and replacing them with larger homes that take up the majority of the lot. She noted that the plats do not identify the exact building pad area.

Commissioner Thomas asked if there was a building size limitation. Director Eddington replied that it was only identified by setbacks, not FARs.

Dick Webber, representing the Park Meadows HOA, explained that there are platted house pads and barns pad. If someone wants to tear a house down and build a new home outside of the original pad footprint, they need approval to do so from the adjacent neighbors on both sides and the neighbor in front and the neighbor in back. Planner Cattan asked if that was the case for all lots within the Park Meadows neighborhood. Vice-Chair Thomas noted that there are defined areas in Park Meadows that are narrower and smaller than the City setbacks and those are platted lots.

Commissioner Hontz remarked that if people want bigger homes, Park Meadows or Thaynes is where that should occur.

Mr. Webber recalled that open corridors was a big asset for how the specific pads and pods were laid out. It was broken into open space, pasture and pads. Commissioner Thomas concurred, but clarified that it was only for the Holiday Ranchettes and not for all of Park Meadows.

Planner Cattan understood that some phases of Park Meadows do not have designated building pads and were governed by setbacks. She suggested that they look at either defining building pads or increasing the setback requirements to maintain the pattern in that neighborhood. That would help avoid the problem of someone tearing down a structure and building a monster home within the smaller home community.

Question – Should the aesthetics within Park Meadows include a discussion on regulating materials. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 33% No – 67%.

Commissioner Gross asked how they would encourage local food production and sales. Planner Cattan replied that it could be through community gardens. She noted that there were great opportunities within Park Meadows for community gardens, particularly on the cul-de-sacs with shared green space. Another way would be to allow a farm stand at the MARC. Greenhouses would be another option.

Commissioner Thomas asked with each neighborhood, how they were encouraging pedestrian connectivity between each one and other critical nodes in the community. The pointed out that the neighborhoods are not independent entities; they are connected to everything else. He thought that should be considered. Commissioner Wintzer thought the trail map should identify exit trails going out and coming in within the neighborhood. Commissioner Thomas clarified that he was more focused on pedestrians and was less concerned about vehicle connectivity.

Planner Cattan explained that within all the neighborhoods they have streets, pedestrian paths and bike paths contributing to a full connected system. It is a principle they should always be moving towards. Commissioner Wintzer suggested that they identify where those should be to show connectivity from one neighborhood to another. Planner Cattan outlined potential connectivity possibilities. Commissioner Strachan stated that he would add the same strategies on lawns. The Commissioners concurred.

Chair Worel called for public comment regarding Park Meadows.

Paul Marsh, current chair of the Holiday Ranches, stated that they are a fairly active HOA and they work very well with Planning Department on architectural issues, setbacks and other issues. Fifteen years ago the HOA adopted a policy that they would be consistent with the City to avoid sending mixed message to architects and owners in terms of what could be developed. As this process moves forward, Mr. Marsh requested that the HOA have the ability to provide input and be a resource for the City. He offered that level of participation to the Planning Department directly and with individual Commissioners. The HOA would be able to provide background and accuracy on development issues. They would also be able to say whether an idea would work and could be supported. Mr. Marsh noted that Park Meadows is one of the highest principally occupied developments in the community.

#### Bonanza Park/Prospector

Commissioner Wintzer disclosed that he owns property in the Bonanza Park area. Since this was a General Plan discussion it did not relate to his property.

Planner Cattan reported that from the Neighborhood Outreach in 2011 they found that there were definite areas that were utilized, that the neighborhood area was appropriate for mixed-use development, a park and ride, dedicated car share parking and public arts. There was support for a neighborhood convenience store.

Planner Cattan presented a slide showing the number of secondary homes and nightly rentals by census block. There is a predominantly single-family neighborhood within the Prospector Square neighborhood. However, there is an exception for nightly rental within one of the patted neighborhoods. Planner Cattan noted that Bonanza Park/Prospector is one of the more dense neighborhoods in Park City.

Regarding future development, the priorities included 100% access to outdoor recreation, sustainability initiatives, and transportation. People in that area use the car less and bike more often. Forty-two percent sometimes walk. For future development there was a preference for more single family homes. Planner Cattan assumed the majority of citizens who participated in the Neighborhood Outreach live in the Prospector neighborhood rather than Bonanza Park. Mixed-use was also a higher preference than what they had seen in the other neighborhoods.

In terms of affordable housing, single family housing equal with multi-family family and apartments. Mother-in-law apartments and primary homes also rated high. Planner Cattan indicated a wildlife corridor at the edge of the neighborhood that goes up to the PC Mountain and back towards the Aerie.

Character defining characteristics included an average density of 8.07 acres. The range of density was 0.7 to 260 per acre. The population ranked with Park Meadows at 2,500. Planner Cattan estimated that 45-50% of the affordable housing in town was in this neighborhood. The primary residence occupancy was 51%, which was lower than Park Meadows and Thaynes. The owner-occupied housing was 22% owner-occupied. There were more rental units in this neighborhood at

29%. Bonanza Park/Prospector is considered one of the most walkable neighborhoods in terms of proximity between amenities and housing.

Commissioner Hontz noticed that the affordable housing boundary also included Snow Creek. Director Eddington replied that Snow Creek was technically in this neighborhood according to the boundaries. It was included in the Park Meadows neighborhood by mistake. Commissioner Hontz had circled the pods of what she knows to be affordable housing, but it did not match the list. She noted that Fireside and Iron Horse were the same price point as affordable housing. Planner Cattan stated that the list only included deed restricted units. Commissioner Hontz asked about the units on Cook Drive. Director Eddington acknowledged that a few deed restricted units had been omitted.

Commissioner Gross referred to the 60 unbuilt units and asked how much density they were interested in putting into BoPa. Planner Cattan stated that the 60 unbuilt units represent platted lots that are yet to be developed. The number 60 is not a clear picture for that neighborhood in terms of redevelopment. Commissioner Gross wanted to understand how the density would change when they look at the 100 acres of Bonanza Park. Director Eddington stated that they could see anywhere from 900 hundred up to 1780 units in Bonanza Park, based on the amount of mixed-use development and every square foot built out.

Commissioner Thomas had done a model of the Bonanza Park area for the City and the number of units that could potentially be built out under the existing Code was staggering. Commissioner Thomas noted that they approximately 5.8 million potential square feet under the existing zone. He asked if they were contemplating creating incentives for more density when the potential density was already staggering. Director Eddington replied that the Bonanza Park Area Plan talks about the opportunity for some increase in density for the "give and gets". The incentives for increased density were insignificant and it follows the Form Based Codes.

Planner Cattan commented on the pattern of the area and noted that there were a lot of single family homes at the eastern edge of the Prospector neighbor. The lots become larger as you move into the commercial area. The development gets tighter along the hillside by Fireside

Commissioner Wintzer believed the Prospector single family homes were 99% built out. Any new development would be mixed-use. Director Eddington noted that there was still a few vacant lots in Prospector.

Planner Cattan stated that the plan talks about Bonanza Park and Prospector being a mixed-use neighborhood where locals live. One of the greatest threats to the relatively affordable Bonanza Park and Prospector neighborhoods is gentrification. As the City adopts new policies to create a great neighborhood for locals, it is imperative that the locals be kept in the equation. The overriding goal for this neighbor is to create and maintain affordable housing opportunities. To support local start-up businesses and services is also essential to maintain affordable leases within the area.

Planner Cattan noted that 3.1 states that as the neighborhood continues to evolve, multi-family residential uses should be concentrated within the Bonanza Park redevelopment area and



Prospector Square commercial area. Single family dwellings should only be allowed within the existing single family subdivision on the eastern edge and low density character zones of the Form Based Code.

Question – Do you agree with the statement overall of multi-family in the Bonanza Park Area and maintaining single family on the eastern edge of Prospector. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 67% No – 33%

Commissioner Thomas stated that the problem with voting is that it eliminates creative thinking and the options and variables. It was hard to be that absolute and he encouraged the Commissioners to be open-minded.

Question – If you were to direct future re-development of the BoPa area, what would be your top priority: 1) creating jobs; 2) residential development; 3) 50/50 mix.

Assistant City Attorney McLean asked for clarification of the BoPa area. Planner Cattan replied that it was the Bonanza Plan area from Bonanza Park west.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 80% 2) 0% 3) 20%. Commissioner Wintzer did not vote.

Planner Cattan referred to 3.4 which talks about Bonanza Park and Prospector being a model for sustainable re-development.

Planner Cattan presented a map where she had highlighted the yellow area for Prospector Square. Prospector has great pedestrian paths that are very under-utilized because it faces north. She and Director Eddington discussed whether it should have been included in the original area plan to make sure there was more connectivity. It would definitely be within the General Plan as something to look at in the future.

Commissioner Thomas pointed out that there is internal connection but it is closed on all ends. It was like a path to nowhere. Commissioner Strachan agreed. It would have a purpose if it went all the way through and continued east into the neighborhood. Planner Cattan stated that Aspen Villas was another issue of connectivity. That neighborhood has one connection on the corner to get into the rest of Prospector. There is no way for the Cook Drive area to connect into the Prospector neighborhood without cutting through Aspen Villas. With so many families living in the area, the goal is for safe connections throughout the neighborhoods. There is a great underpass, but as Bonanza Park develops out, there needs to be a direct connection to the Rail Trail.

Question – Do you believe pedestrian and street connectivity should be improved within the Prospector area: 1) yes; 2) no; 3) unsure. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 100%.

Commissioner Strachan did not believe the neighborhoods were defined properly. In his opinion, BoPa and Prospector are different and they should have their own discussion. Commissioner Strachan thought the General Plan should be separated in that respect. He understood that the

work was already done, but putting them together was a mistake. Commissioner Wintzer concurred with Commissioner Strachan, and he did not think it was too late to separate them in the General Plan.

Director Eddington thought the line for Prospector was already unclear. He believed there was a future opportunity to better connect the residential section to the commercial section. Commissioner Strachan thought the reasonable place to draw the line was Bonanza Drive.

The Commissioners discussed the Bonanza Park/Prospector areas, the appropriate boundary lines for separation, and the pros and cons of making them separate. Commissioner Strachan felt they could run into problems in the future, because once BoPa is developed, the people who live there would have a much different view about the General Plan. They will have different ideas on what it is to be mixed use, whether they want more commercial, more single-family, etc. It will be a different Parkite living there. He pointed out that a Parkite living in Old Town is different in General Plan terms than a Parkite who lives in Park Meadows. Commissioner Wintzer agreed. Commissioner Thomas suggested that they create subzones with different numbers and calculations because it is uniquely different.

Director Eddington questioned whether they really wanted to separate the commercial from the residential. He thinks of Snow Creek as being very connected to Dan's, the liquor store, the coffee shop, and the general commercial character. He believed it would be less of a neighborhood without the commercial character.

Commissioner Thomas remarked that the guidelines for future planning may be different for this subzone than what currently exists. Director Eddington agreed that there was a differentiation between the two, but in his opinion, connectivity between the two neighborhoods is essential because Prospector is uniquely fortunate in terms of its commercial area. Commissioner Wintzer did not disagree. However, he wanted to make sure that whatever occurs in BoPa would not schlep down the road because there is no separation.

Planner Cattan stated that the Staff could make revisions; however, the data has been collected and neighborhood input was given on the boundaries presented. It would be difficult to separate the data. Commissioner Wintzer stated that it was much easier to change a drawing than to change a building. He was not comfortable moving something forward on the reason that it was too late to make the change. He requested that the Staff look at the possibility and allow the Planning Commission the opportunity to at least have the conversation. He agreed with Commissioner Strachan that this is a unique neighborhood and it is important to make sure they get it right.

Director Eddington referred to the map and noted that there was no recommendation in the General Plan to alter any zoning in that area. He explained that connectivity was the primary reason why the overall neighborhood was defined the way it was. The land use is protected, but the neighborhood is more than just that land. Commissioner Thomas clarified that the concern is that the large commercial structures would metastasize into the residential neighborhoods. Director Eddington replied that the Staff could draft specifically defined language with regards to the zoning to alleviate the concern.

Commissioner Strachan remarked that one of the Principles for Bonanza Park and Prospector was, “to locate regional institutions and service centers”. He felt that language was a problem because that could not be done in a single family neighborhood. He indicated an area on the map on the far east side near the Skid Row bike trail, and noted that it was developable land. It belongs to the County but the lots are platted. Commissioner Strachan was uncomfortable with a General Plan that does not specify that that area is to remain single family and has directives to put in commercial or higher density development.

Commissioner Hontz thought Commissioner Strachan made a good point. She noted that the first Principle is “infill development for TDR”; however, they had only specified BoPa for that, but not Prospector. Commissioner Hontz believed that necessitated the same discussion that they had for Park Meadows, but she did not think there was an opportunity in Prospector. Commissioner Hontz stated that even if the two are not separated, they should at least break down the Principles because Principle 1A does not work for Prospector.

Planner Cattan thought the same was true with Park Meadows and Thaynes, because all the Principles do not apply to everywhere within those neighborhoods. It is a strategy that could be applied if appropriate. Commissioner Hontz agreed that there might be opportunities in the Park Meadows and Thaynes neighborhoods, but it was not even a question for Prospector. Planner Cattan reiterated that not every Strategy and Principle would apply to every lot within every neighborhood. Commissioner Strachan pointed out that the language does not say that. The sections in Prospector are so different that some of the Principle and Strategies are not applicable to the eastern part and some are not applicable to the west. Park Meadows and Thaynes are different because those neighborhoods have a homogenous group of people and use patterns.

Commissioner Thomas stated that if Prospector was broken into subzones, they could be more specific as to what would be allowed in each subzone. Commissioner Strachan suggested three subzones; BoPa, Prospector commercial and Prospector residential. Director Eddington remarked that there were several ways to accomplish what they want, and the Staff would work with the different options.

Commissioner Strachan referred to the last question and stated that walkability around the east side of Prospector in the family section was great. However, he did not think it was good through the commercial section. Commissioner Wintzer thought walkability could still be better in some spots on the east side.

Question – Do you see Bonanza Park as a central hub for public transportation: 1) yes; 2) no; 3) must be studied further. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 50%  
3) 50%.

Planner Cattan had left out a big box discussion. She presented the major existing commercial in the area and the square footage of each; ranging from Frontier bank at 13,414 square feet to Fresh Market at 52,678 square feet. The Yarrow is two stories at 144,246 square feet. Commissioner Gross thought Snow Creek and Dan’s should have also been included. The Staff had not included Snow Creek and Planner Cattan agreed that it could have been included. Planner Cattan stated that the current General Plan within the existing Bonanza Park Supplement, lays out what exists in

terms of Rite-Aid and future development. However, there is no set limitation. The Staff believes the new General Plan should set a square footage limit for future big box.

Question – Along the entry way for Park Avenue, would you agreed that setting a maximum footprint of 20,000 square feet would be appropriate, and nothing beyond 20,000 would be allowed.

Commissioner Thomas stated that typically the maximums become the minimums. He wanted to know how they could create variety if everything maxes out at 20,000 square feet. Director Eddington replied that Form Based Code was probably the first step and most effective way to achieve that variety. Commissioner Wintzer noted that Form Based Code does not restrict the size of anything, except for the streets. Director Eddington stated that Form Based Code does not have that restriction now, but it will eventually. When the Bonanza Park Plan was written, they talked about wanting variety in terms of height, development and fabric on the street.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 60% No – 40%. Commissioner Wintzer did not vote.

Director Eddington asked if the 40% who voted no thought it should be more restrictive or less restrictive. Commissioner Gross stated that he voted no because he could not figure out which was best.

Chair Worel thought the Planning Commission needed to discuss it further. Commissioner Thomas had mixed feelings. He could see 20,000 square feet being a reasonable maximum, but he was concerned that everything would end up being 20,000 square feet. Director Eddington agreed that people would build to the max. Chair Worel stated that she had voted no for that reason.

Director Eddington stated that they could talk about building liner shocks around larger buildings and possibly mandate it as part of the Form Based Code. Putting smaller buildings around the larger building gives the appearance of relating better to the walkability of the streetscape. Commissioner Thomas remarked that it gets into a philosophical discussion about scale, encouraging small businesses and breaking the spaces down. He noted that Telluride does not allow big boxes and there is nothing over 20,000 square feet in Telluride. The Commissioners discussed various examples and ideas. Commissioner Thomas thought they should ask for what they want as opposed to hinting at it. He suggested breaking up the facades of the blocks with smaller scale businesses, and allowing the larger volume to happen with the block where it has less visual impact. Commissioner Wintzer thought it would be controlled by the car, because people will not visit a Best Buy if they cannot drive close enough to load their merchandise.

Director Eddington stated that the Staff would look at various options and bring it back to the Planning Commission. He suggested that it might be accomplished with design versus square footage.

Chair Worel asked if there were any examples of urban areas that use cell phone lots for taxis. Assistant City Attorney McLean discouraged them from talking about taxi cabs because it has its own set of issues.

Chair Worel called for public input.

Commissioner Wintzer recused himself and left the room.

Mary Wintzer, speaking on behalf of Wintzer Wolf Properties, referred to the map shown on pages 141 and 187 of the Staff report, and wanted to go on record saying that the area labeled "future bus route", has not been determined, and Wintzer Wolf Properties has not agreed to that in discussions with the Planning Department. Director Eddington pointed out that the red line Ms. Wintzer was referring to was intended to be a trail. Ms. Wintzer was very enthusiastic about a walking path, a paseo, since their neighborhood is walkable. Wintzer Wolf Properties was not enthusiastic about having a connective route through their project that buses and salt trucks would use disturbing business and residents.

Planner Cattan noted that the green line was still a road and that color needed to be changed on the Bonanza Park map. She clarified that it would not be a bus route but it is a street. Ms. Wintzer would not be opposed as long as the street is a paseo and not open to traffic. She had walked from Iron Horse straight through to Kearns and it was no more than a three minute walk to get from one street to the other. If there would be a bus cutting through their property, she would echo the same concerns addressed by Rob Sletton regarding the Thaynes objection to buses.

Commissioner Thomas referred to page 3 of the large packet and reference to "future right-of-way dedications and pedestrian improvements on paths imperative to actualize the vision of live, work and a walkability urban district." He agreed that future right-of-way dedications and pedestrian improvements were imperative, but he wanted to make sure that it was not implying that that particular grid layout was imperative. Planner Cattan replied that the grid layout needed to be modified to show the pedestrian paseo. Mary Wintzer suggested revising the language to say, "proposed future improvements." Director Eddington stated that the Staff would work on revising the language.

The Work Session adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

