

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES
October 10, 2012**

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

WORK SESSION ITEMS

Snow Creek Crossing – Concept Plan Discussion

Commissioner Thomas disclosed that many years ago he was involved in the original MPD and CUP drawings for this project under a different owner. He did not believe that would affect his ability to be fair in reviewing this plan.

Planner Astorga remarked that the purpose of the work session this evening was to give the Planning Commission the opportunity to provide input and direction to the applicant on the concept plan prior to a pre-master planned development application and public hearing.

Planner Astorga stated that the original master planned development was approved in 1993; however, since that time the regulations have changed in terms of the MPD procedure and specific requirements. The Staff report provided a history of the previous approvals.

Planner Astorga noted that the applicant's representatives were before the Planning Commission this evening to consider the possibility of adding 17,700 square feet of retail throughout the project. Planner Astorga presented the original approved MPD that he found in the records. The original MPD included both banks that currently exist. He reviewed an exhibit showing the three specific areas being proposed for additional density. Planner Astorga reported that the original MPD was approved for 90,000 square feet and the existing Snow Creek Crossing is approximately 87,000 square feet. The 87,000 does not include the DABC Liquor Store.

Planner Astorga stated that 17,700 square feet is a hypothetical density that could be obtained through the TDR program. Before density can be transferred from one portion of town to another, specific requirements of the TDR must be met. He noted that the Snow Creek Crossing site qualifies to be a receiving zone. Planner Astorga explained that the Planning Director has to sign off on the density that could be transferred. In the one year since the TDR Ordinance was adopted, less than one unit equivalent from an Old Town lot on Norfolk had been approved. Director Eddington noted that there were actually two because another one in Old Town had asked for a certificate of determination regarding density. Commissioner Hontz suggested that people might be more willing to go through the TDR process if they knew other people wanted to buy them.

Planner Astorga reiterated that the applicant was looking for feedback on the concept before spending time and money on the specific component of an official pre-application.

Pete Gillwald and Jill Packham were representatives for the applicant.

Pete Gillwald with Land Solutions Planning, stated that the objective this evening was to present their concept plan and offer ideas for transitioning uses, open space, and parking; and to see if there were opportunities within this parcel to warrant looking for TDRs and determine whether this

was a viable process.

Mr. Gillwald stated that they looked at the existing site and came up with three basic areas where commercial density could be increased. They could create additional parking by moving elements around and add employee parking behind the Snow Creek Clinic.

Mr. Gillwald clarified that Snow Creek never asked to be a receiving zone and they were not looking to expand the retail square footage. However, since the City believed this was an appropriate location for density, they decided to move forward with the concept plan being proposed.

Mr. Gillwald presented an aerial view of the Snow Creek Center in its existing condition and the surrounding properties. He reviewed the survey that was done years ago showing all the improvements on the site. The site is divided into six different lots. Mr. Gillwald indicated a square on the plan that represented the liquor store and noted that the size did not represent the actual footprint. He had counted 300 parking spaces on site. Mr. Gillwald pointed out the large landscape area across from the Teriyaki Grill that divides the center into two separate parcels. He stated that over the years Jill Packham has spent a lot of money and time watering that area and mowing the grass, but it is truly an underutilized area. It does not connect to anything and it creates a barrier between the east and west sides of the parcel.

Mr. Gillwald noted that Retail Building B is the space that provides the greatest opportunity to increase square footage. In conjunction with Retail Building B, he proposed relocating the bus stop currently located behind the liquor store. He recommended shifting the bus stop more towards the east and allow Retail Building B to become a pedestrian mall walkway connecting from the bus stop through retail space B, and into that area between the Market and the Teriyaki Grill, where he showed a small expansion of Retail C. Mr. Gillwald remarked that there is open space between the Teriyaki Grill and another building. However, a sewer line runs in that location and he did not believe it was an appropriate building location.

Mr. Gillwald stated that the parking would need to be shifted around in order for Retail Building B to fit. All the parking would be maintained from the west side of the building all the way over to Retail Building A, which is an approximately 4,000 square foot footprint with a proposed drive-thru access.

Mr. Gillwald stated that the three locations identified made the most sense for expansion. It preserves the buffer, median and berming and landscaping along Snow Creek Drive and it still maintains the sidewalks in an internal reconfiguration. Parking was increased by 50 spaces and the building footprint was increased by four-tenths of an acre. Approximately seven-tenths of an acre of open space would be lost.

Using photos of the existing site, Mr. Gillwald explained the proposed changes and where the additional density would occur. He requested feedback from the Planning Commission on the proposed concept and available options for transferring density.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the question for this work session was similar to what the City Council was asked to consider with the Kimball Arts Center and the LMC amendments. It was not whether the applicant should pursue the proposal, but whether the Planning Commission was open to the applicant submitting a pre-application based on the concept. She clarified that giving a

nod of support was not committing to an approval, and the applicant still needed to go through the application process.

Commissioner Wintzer applauded Mr. Gillwald for coming to the Planning Commission early in the process before spending time on a concept that may not be acceptable. He fully supported the fact that the applicant was looking for opportunities to use TDRs. This neighborhood is under-utilized and it is a key area in town where height would not be negative. However, Commissioner Wintzer felt Mr. Gillwald had taken a 1980 approach to a 2012 project. He noted that minutes from the previous approval talked about a strip mall look and feel, and he believed the proposed plan would add to that rather than change it. Commissioner Wintzer would support housing, which was not favored in the original approval, but he felt the City was now going in a different direction. He suggested that using the idea of the BOPA plan for Bonanza Park would be a better approach for Snow Creek Crossing. That would mean going vertical on top of existing buildings, more housing, and less strip mall look. Commissioner Wintzer encouraged Mr. Gillwald to look at different options. This was a great opportunity to create a neighborhood and he recommended going bigger and higher.

Chair Worel asked if there was a demand for additional retail? Jill Packham, the property manager, stated that they have been fully occupied since the beginning of the development. In the 13 years that she has been managing the property, there have only been a few short-term vacancies.

Ms. Packham stated that the problem with a complete redevelopment is taking out the economic source while redeveloping. Chair Wintzer believed it could be added on to vertically without taking it out or losing existing tenants.

Commissioner Hontz concurred with Commissioner Wintzer. She likes the site and she supports moving TDRs to that site. Commissioner Hontz favored a mixed-use concept and encouraged Mr. Gillwald to find a way to factor in mixed use and height, particularly on the Market side. She liked how the parking lot was broken up in the location of Retail B because it would lessen the appearance of a sea of parking; however, she thought they would need less parking than what currently exists and what is additionally proposed. Commissioner Hontz suggested eliminating the parking by the Health Center, particularly because of how it would interfere with people trying to access the retail. Commissioner Hontz thought the project should go bigger and higher with less parking and no drive-thru. She would like a physical break in the parking that also has people walking in and out of the facilities. Commissioner Hontz was open to a pre-application and she favored most of the ideas presented in the concept plan.

Mr. Gillwald remarked that some of the existing retailers on one end want more parking because parking is tight. Parking on the other end of the site is less utilized because those uses are not high intensity and there is more movement where people come and go. He explained that he was hesitant to add on top of existing structures because those structures were not designed for a second story.

Commissioner Thomas vaguely recalled some of the discussion from 17 years ago. One recollection was that everyone thought this was a good site to put a large building because it begins to disappear. That was a negative for the Market because it is not visible and people cannot find it. Early in the previous process they talked about upper level functions, affordable housing and

housing units above the retail. Commissioner Thomas believed the calculations would show that the building could bear additional load on masonry walls designed to accommodate the vertical load. Commissioner Thomas echoed Commissioner Wintzer and Hontz with regard to verticality. He liked the location of Retail Building A because it breaks up the parking mass. He suggested more character in the architecture, a more contemporary look for Retail Building B, and less of a strip mall appearance. Commissioner Thomas was not fond of Building C. He believed they could do a small scale building. The trellis could be removed, but the separation between the large building mass where the Market is and the other commercial spaces is essential. Landscaping and a smaller scale building would break up the strip mall effect. The commercial facades are not consistent with the character of the community. Commissioner Thomas thought the pedestrian connections and relocation of the bus stop were good ideas. He believed there was the ability for vertical massing on the site.

Commissioner Thomas thought a site visit would be helpful when an application is submitted.

Commissioner Strachan concurred with the comments of his fellow Commissioners. He recommended that Mr. Gillwald work on a substantial pedestrian and bike connectivity because currently there is no way to safely bike or walk to that location. When people reach the intersection of Kearns and Park Avenue they cannot figure out how to get into Snow Creek. People try to go through the Olympic structure but it is a dead end. Commissioner Strachan felt that was an important issue that needs to be addressed. He agreed that the plan could use more height. He also agreed that there should be residential; however, he thought that could be worked out with on-site affordable housing. He assumed the residential units would demand pedestrian and bike connectivity.

Commissioner Savage stated that a business is run opposite from reading a book. When you run a business you start at the end and do everything necessary to get to the front. Commissioner Savage remarked that Snow Creek is gem property in a fabulous location and he would look at it as a blank slate. He believed there was strong endorsement from the Planning Commission, the Planning Department and the City related to the validation of the implementation of an aggressive TDR program to create density in places that are suitable for higher levels of density. He encouraged Mr. Gillwald to do everything possible to optimize the value associated with that opening and think about how he would design the project with privilege with a 15-20 years horizon, and think how that would work into the plan under the current constraints. Commissioner Savage thought there would be support for that type of concept and neighborhood with significant density. Commissioner Savage noted that the Planning Commission was scheduled to have a work session discussion about Park City growing inward and it talks about TDRs and creating density where appropriate. He emphasized that density was very appropriate in this location.

Commissioner Thomas asked if the access through the Jess Reid building would have to remain. Ms. Packham was unsure how that access was created. Commissioner Thomas believed that could be a point of conflict with the bus location. Commissioner Thomas pointed out that prior to the Olympic Park, that area was a physical connection to the Snow Creek Center and he felt it was important to show how that pedestrian link weaves its way through the community. He encouraged the creation of some type of pedestrian benefit.

Planner Astorga reported that the Staff had issues with some standards for the MPD that the applicant would need to mitigate. The first was open space. Currently the site has approximately

29% open space and additional density would decrease that number. Regarding parking, Planner Astorga agreed with the Commissioners, but noted that he has to abide by the standards outlined in the LMC. Once the General Plan is updated they would be able to update the Land Management Code, at which time they could address maximum and minimum standards. He clarified that some technical aspects may not work with the current proposal, and based on the current Code, he would not be able to ignore that once the pre-application is submitted. He wanted to make sure the Planning Commission and the applicant understood that constraint.

**General Plan – Discussion and review of draft “Small Town” Chapter
(Application #PL-12-01529)**

Planner Cattan provided an update on the General Plan process. They held four meetings with the Task Force to discuss each of the Core Values of the General Plan. A fifth meeting was held to summarize the discussion and to go through the controversial discussion points. After four months with the Task Force, the Staff was ready to actively engage the Planning Commission in the discussions.

Planner Cattan noted that a special work was scheduled for Tuesday, October 16th, to continue this discussion.

Director Eddington presented a slide showing the foundation for the entire General Plan based on the 2009 Visioning. The goal of doing the General Plan was to focus on the Core Values as chapters, as opposed to doing the traditional elements. The message from Visioning was not to change the Core Values. However, the Vision document also talks about the attributes of arts, culture, skiing, and exceptional benefits for residents, which do evolve from change. Because the Core Values stay the same they are the basis for the General Plan.

Director Eddington reviewed the influence levers and the measureables, which are the matrix of evaluation used for the General Plan. The Staff would begin using that matrix for projects presented to the City Council.

Planner Cattan stated that small town, consisting of land use, regional planning and transportation elements were the discussion points for this evening. Complimentary to that are the Core Values of Natural Setting, Sense of Community and Historic Character. They are interconnected and one cannot sustain without the other. She noted that topics for the next meeting would be Natural Setting and Historic Character. Sense of Community was an involved discussion that would require a separate meeting.

Planner Cattan provided an overview of land use, regional planning, and transportation. The recipe for Small Town is 1) to maintain and build upon existing neighborhoods and strengthen them; 2) allow for compatible infill and redevelopment; 3) protect the edges of the neighborhoods with wildlife corridors and open space connections, as well as looking at the overall town and a greenbelt going around the City itself; 4) protect the cherished places such as open space and view corridors; 5) try not to widen existing roads; 6) keep the traffic flowing.

Planner Cattan presented a view from the Armstrong Trail to show what she meant by infill of lots within Old Town and out in Park Meadows, as well as redevelopment in Bonanza and the Park City

Mountain Resort. She reviewed a slide with an overlay to show the green areas for wildlife corridors and open space throughout town. She also identified the transportation systems.

Director Eddington pointed out that on a larger scale the City was working with Summit and Wasatch Counties on creating nodal development. It's the same idea locally versus regionally.

Commissioner Savage referred to the summary and noted that individual words can carry a lot of meaning, both intentional and unintentional. When describing the slide and talking about point number 5, Planner Cattan used the language, "try not to widen roads". He pointed out that the language on the slide was more definitive. Commissioner Savage stated that in setting goals they try to quantify things. The wording, "Do not widen roads" is quantitative and says that the road will not be widened period. He believed the City would not be able to live up to that goal, and he suggested that they think through each element individually to create a sense of parameters or boundary conditions around which those various points could be considered in a reasonable way.

Planner Cattan requested that as the Commissioners read through the materials, that they highlight anything they feel needs to be addressed and send those changes or comments to her.

Commissioner Hontz remarked that the intent is to reduce the number of words in the document. She felt it was well written in terms of a draft of what they want to say. However, every word needs to pack a punch and it needs to be the right word. Commissioner Hontz believed that 50% of the bullet points were not worded correctly. She thought Commissioner Savage had used a great example of the difference between "try" and "do not". She pointed out that the wording, "Preserve Steep Slope" contradicts their intent to "not develop on steep slopes." It is important to say exactly what they mean. Commissioner Hontz had gone through the draft and made corrections that she would send to the Staff. Planner Cattan encouraged the Commissioner to set up an individual appointment with her if they preferred to discuss their changes.

Commissioner Thomas commented on the opposition when Bonanza Drive was widened at the direction of the City Engineer. He thought the Planning Commission needed to be careful and not allow Engineering to drive the issues because engineering solutions are not in line with the recipe for small town and the character of a small town. Engineering solves the mechanical problems related to traffic flow and transportation.

Commissioner Thomas stated that he thinks of a place and a small town and asks whether something fits into that consideration. He thought Commissioner Savage had a good point about not widening the roads. Moving through a small town is sluggish, and that is the nature and the character of a small town. He clarified that he would not be the wordsmith but he would keep track of the concepts.

Planner Cattan presented a slide showing the build-out of Park City, which was part of the presentation given by Charles Buki. The slide showed the history of Park City build out starting with 1881 to present day.

Commissioner Thomas asked if it would be helpful to talk about what has occurred over the past 20 years and what they might have done differently. He noted that in planning the Flagstaff development the idea was that sprawl in smaller pieces would be less visible. However, in reality,

sprawling development across the mountain created more visible impact and it would have been better to concentrate development in one area and go vertical. It would have also accommodated mass transit.

Commissioner Wintzer found the minutes from the original Snow Creek Subdivision fascinating in terms of the change in concept from 17 years versus now. Commissioner Strachan remarked that it was the most intensive 17 years that the City had seen for a long time.

Planner Cattan presented a slide showing developed land and open space. The red color identified the developed land. She pointed out that Park City has managed to retain a substantial amount of open space. It is a good trend, but the question is whether they want to continue outward growth through further annexation and development within annexations. Commissioner Strachan understood that the open space also included the Resorts. He thought it would be interesting to see only the non-resort open space. Planner Cattan replied that they would be able to see that at the next meeting. Commissioner Thomas thought sensitive lands should also be taken out of the equation.

The Commissioners were given clickers to anonymously vote on a series of questions.

1) Has Park City grown inward or outward since 1970? The voting result showed the majority thought Park City had grown outward.

2) According to the community vision, do you believe Park City has an obligation to grow inward? The voting result showed the Commissioners were split on strongly agree and agree.

Planner Cattan noted that Park City experienced significant growth during the mining boom and then it slowed down due to lack of mining. It increased again in 1970 with the ski industry. The population growth was only 200 people, but the residents units grew by 50% from 6,600 to 9,471. In Summit County population continues to grow.

Planner Cattan reviewed the average size of a house built within various decades. In looking at the in-between point of each range, the median would be higher than the average because certain homes within Old Town are regulated to a standard to be smaller and that pulls down the average size. The average size of a single family home is 7,000 square feet.

3) City-wide, what concerns you most about home size in Park City? The voting results showed that compatibility was the primary concern for all the Commissioners.

Planner Cattan presented a slide of future residential development showing how neighborhoods begin to be divided up. The Staff tracked everything in GIS so the numbers were actual in terms of remaining pending vacant lots or pending units per master planned developments. Residential is 2100 and commercial was 447,000 square feet. The numbers for Bonanza Park did not take into consideration all the redevelopment. It only addressed vacancies. Director Eddington noted that the assumption of 80% buildout is correct based on the analysis. They are currently at 9500 units and they could build out to approximately 11,700.

Chair Worel asked if lodging was counted as commercial. Director Eddington explained that lodging is considered residential.

Planner Cattan commented on Goal 1 - growing inward and protecting undeveloped lands. She explained that it can be accomplished by diversifying existing neighborhoods, supporting development and re-development in the core commercial, and protecting areas from development that should remain open space.

Commissioner Strachan remarked that diversify was one of the vague terms that exist throughout the General Plan and makes it useless.

Planner Cattan explained that on the issue to diversify existing neighborhoods, they were taking a neighborhood by neighborhood approach to the General Plan. The document will have sections reflecting the Core Values along with strategies that provide more explanations, and then it will be divided up into nine neighborhoods. The language will specifically state which strategies are appropriate and it will go as far as identifying what is compatible in those individual neighborhoods for infill development.

On the issue of supporting development and re-development of the Core, Planner Cattan noted that this could be accomplished by allowing a range of commercial uses and keep the industrial uses within town. Another element for planning large areas is to go through master plan development process.

Planner Cattan stated that during the Task Force discussions there was a heated discussion on revise minimum lot sizes within existing zones to allow smaller, more compact development and redevelopment. The Task Force believed that increased density should only be allowed in neighborhoods in exchange for open space. Another strategy was to adopt floor area ratios to create homes size and allow purchase of TDR credits. After considerable discussion, the Task Force wanted to adopt FAR ratios and allow homeowners to exceed the FAR ratio if they meet home efficiency standards.

Commissioner Thomas stated that if the intent is to encourage smaller homes they should not allow additional square footage. It is easy for someone to buy their way into a larger home by spend money on efficiency standards. Commissioner Wintzer pointed out that a larger energy efficient home uses the same amount of energy as a smaller lower efficiency home. Commissioner Savage thought they should also consider the cost of energy efficient homes and how it could impact affordable housing.

Commissioner Hontz thought the strategies needed to build on one another to avoid conflicting strategies in working towards the goal.

4) Revise minimum lot sizes within existing zones to allow smaller, more compact development and redevelopment. NOTE: No density transfer to protect open space is required. The voting results showed a 67 yes/33 no split among the Commissioners.

4a) NOTE: Density transfer to protect open space is required to utilize this. The voting results showed another 67/33 split.

4b) NOTE: No benefit for a second lot unless there is an acquisition of a TDR to preserve open

space somewhere else. The voting results showed a 70/30 split.

Planner Cattan presented various photos of what small town infill and redevelopment could look like. In Thaynes it might look like a detached apartment above a garage. Multi-family in Bonanza Park. In Park Meadows it might be an attached accessory apartment. It could be row homes by Public Works.

5) Do you agree with the examples on the previous slide of small town infill and redevelopment? The voting results showed that two Commissioners disagreed.

Planner Cattan presented a color coded slide showing where development has already occurred and where it will occur in the future. In terms of regional growth in Park City, there are 2,575 total UE's that can be built. Summit County has 8,720 units. Jordanelle in Wasatch County had the highest rate. Director Eddington assumed the Wasatch County number could go higher with MIDA. He expected to see a shift in the center of power in the region from Park City to Jordanelle.

Planner Cattan indicated the pending entitled units for Park City, Western Summit County and Wasatch. She noted that there were 23,000 units but the acres for those units were 32,000.

Planner Cattan reviewed Goal 2 – Park City will collaborate with Summit County, Wasatch County and Salt Lake County towards the preservation of place through regional land use planning. The first strategy is to create a shared regional vision. Planner Cattan did not believe they could go much further without setting the tone of doing something similar to what was done with Charles Buki in terms of regional visioning. She noted that some of the strategies would need to be better identified after the regional visioning process.

Commissioner Savage commented on the apparent adversity between County Management and City Management and he felt the City could be proactive in conjunction with hiring a new City Manager that would help mitigate those issues moving forward in the future. City Council Member Butwinski pointed out that there could potentially be four new County Council members in November and the people coming in have no frame of reference to help with that collaboration. Commissioner Hontz was unsure how they could create a shared regional vision when it has been so difficult to schedule timely meetings with the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission. She was not opposed to having collaboration as a strategy, but she did not think it would happen.

Planner Cattan stated that collaboration would be similar to what Salt Lake City has done with their 20/40 plan. There was collaboration between counties and cities to create a vision for the future and it was done by working with Envision Utah. Planner Astorga reported that it was part of the MPO, the Metropolitan Planning Organization, and a representative from each city attended the meetings. The collaboration efforts was started a long time ago as a Wasatch Front long range planning effort to identify specific nodes of development and land use patterns and transportation. Planner Astorga understood that Planner Cattan's point is to start the dialogue now so in 10, 20 or 50 years there would be collaboration along the Wasatch Back.

Director Eddington was aware of the frustration in trying to schedule a joint meeting; however, the Planning Commission and the County Council have held two or three joint meetings amongst themselves, which shows that the issue of collaboration in the County is set in motion. Director

Eddington pointed out that the County is in a waiting mode because of the election, which puts the City at a disadvantage.

6) Do you support the strategy of working on the goal towards regional collaboration? The voting results showed that one person did not support the strategy.

7) What is the City's role in the effort towards a regional visioning process? Initiate the process or wait to see if the idea catches on and we receive an invitation.

The Commissioner felt the question was confusing.

Planner Cattan noted that the question came from a discussion on whether Park City should be a leader or take a secondary role. Commissioner Hontz did not think either one was appropriate. The City should be a participant in the overall process.

Planner Cattan commented on Goal 3 – public transit, biking and walking will be a larger percentage of residents' and visitor's utilized mode of transportation. Director Eddington stated that Park City has always talked about the challenges of land use and transportation and how they influence each other. He explained that the goal addresses alternative modes and which opportunities they should focus on. Part of the question of utilizing alternative transportation is whether they would be willing to fund alternative modes of transportation.

8) Would you be willing to consider and fund alternative modes of transportation? The voting results showed that one person was not in favor primarily due to the funding aspect.

Planner Cattan reviewed the strategies associated with Transportation. Keeping the streets narrow to maintain the small town character. Implement completes streets of the traffic and transportation master plan. Prioritize walkability improvements as identified in hot spot areas where existing trip demands are located close to one another.

The Work Session was adjourned.