

**PLANNING COMMISSION/CITY COUNCIL  
JOINT MEETING  
October 24, 2012**

Planning Commission: Jack Thomas, Brooke Hontz, Stewart Gross, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Charlie Wintzer. Nann Worel arrived later in the meeting.

City Council Members: Dana Williams, Alex Butwinski, Dick Peek, Liza Simpson, Andy Beerman. Cindy Matsumoto was excused.

Ex Officio: Thomas Eddington, Planning Director; Katie Cattan, Planner

Vice-Chair Jack Thomas called the meeting to order at 5:15 p.m.

Planning Commission business was conducted prior to the presentation and discussion regarding Form Based Code for the Bonanza Park District.

**ADOPTION OF PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES – October 10, 2012**

MOTION: Commissioner Savage moved to ADOPT the minutes of October 10, 2012. Commissioner Strachan seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously by all Planning Commissioners present.

**STAFF AND COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS/DISCLOSURES**

Commissioner Wintzer disclosed that he owns property in the Park Bonanza area. If any part of the discussion relates to the Power Station issue he would recuse himself from that discussion.

**PUBLIC INPUT**

Jim Tedford, representing a group known as “Preserve Historic Main Street” commented on the proposed Kimball Arts Center Addition. Mr. Tedford read a letter he had prepared outlining other options for the Kimball Arts Center to consider since the current proposal would not meet the height requirements of the HRC zone and the Land Manage Code, as well as the Design Guidelines for Historic Site. Other options could include; 1) use of the vacant land and the additional 1500 sf parking area that could yield 600 sf of additional space. He noted that the adjoining property, the Town Lift Condos, has offered to let them use their loading dock. 2) The Kimball Arts Center could build over the present structure; 3) They could develop a new proposal that would comply with the current Code and Design Guidelines; 4) They could sell their property on Heber Avenue and build a totally new structure elsewhere that would not affect Historic Main Street; 5) They could keep part of their program in the present building, sell the vacant land, and build a new facility elsewhere; 6) They could apply for a CUP and Zoning Amendment under the existing LMC; 7) They could apply for a variance to the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Tedford noted that none of the suggested options would require changing the LMC to allow a Master Planned Development. He believed the whole conversation has zeroed in on a MPD as the only solution to a problem that does not yet exist. Mr. Tedford stated that changing the Land Management Code to possibly accommodate one development seems like bad policy.

**CONTINUATIONS – Public Hearing and Continue to date specified.**

Land Management Code Amendments – Chapter 1, Chapter 2, Chapter 3, Chapter 4, Chapter 5, Chapter 6, Chapter 7, Chapter 8, Chapter 10, Chapter 11, Chapter 12, and Chapter 15.

Vice-Chair Thomas opened the public hearing. There was no comment. Vice-Chair Thomas closed the public hearing.

VOTE: Commissioner Strachan moved to CONTINUE the Amendments to the Land Management Code, Chapters 1-8, 10-12 and 15 to November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2012. Commissioner Wintzer seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously by all Planning Commissioners present.

**JOINT WORK SESSION WITH CITY COUNCIL**

**Form Based Code and Traffic Study for the Bonanza Park District.**

Planning Director Eddington reported that the Planning Commission and City Council held a joint meeting in January to review a plan for Bonanza Park. During that meeting it was decided that the best way to pursue implementation of the Bonanza Park Area Plan was to move forward with Form Based Code. The City hired a consultant, Gateway Planning from Dallas, who has been working with the Staff since April. Representatives from Gateway Planning were in attendance this evening to present the draft Form Based Code.

Director Eddington stated that the Staff has worked with Gateway Planning on a number of iterations and tweaking the draft plan. The objective this evening is to give the Planning Commission and the City Council an overview of Form Based Code, and to allow the opportunity for input and questions.

Director Eddington introduced Scott Polikov and Jay Narayana from Gateway Planning, and Diego Carroll with Parsons Brinckerhoff, the sub-consultant for the transportation component of the proposal. Mr. Diego was working with Gateway Planning to make sure the street network functions properly with regard to grid patterns and connections to SR248 and SR224, as well as to tweak internal streets and intersections.

Director Eddington noted that Bonanza Park is a 100 acre area that the City is looking to overlay a form based code. The City was looking at re-development, mixed-use opportunities and new street patterns to create mixed-use neighborhoods for the area. The discussion this evening was primarily focused on Form Based Code. Rocky Mountain Power issues would not be addressed this evening.

Mr. Polikov explained the format of the presentation. The first part would introduce Form Based Code and what it is. The second part would talk about the iteration of the original plan and the proposed revision to that plan, and why the revisions were recommended. Transportation issues would also be discussed as an important component of the 5 million square feet of development in

Park City. It is significantly more development than what is on the ground today and in an area that is constrained by limited access. Mr. Polikov would also show graphic examples to explain how Form Based Code actually works.

Mr. Polikov stated that Form Based Code is not necessarily abandoning the use base structure, but instead of use being the primary focus, the form of the neighborhood becomes the primary focus. That involves looking at how the streets are designed in terms of function, sidewalks relative to the frontages of buildings, how the buildings sit on the lot, and how they form public spaces. Mr. Polikov remarked that Form Based Code is a modern application of the way Main Street was originally conceived and implemented.

Mr. Polikov remarked that Gateway Planning was proposing a new zoning ordinance that focuses on the characteristics of the vision plan that the City has been working on for a couple of years, and translates it into development standards. Regardless of who owns the property or the inside of the building, there is predictability as to what it would look like, how it would function and how it would feel. In the Form Based approach, development is the most important but they still regulate use. The difference is that use is not the primary regulation as it is in conventional zoning.

Mr. Polikov presented a slide of a Form Based Code that was developed for the resort community of Padre Island. Instead of mountains it had the bay and the Gulf of Mexico. However, like Park City the property values were high, it has a seasonal population, and a need for affordable housing. The question was how to translate all of that into a design context that could help form the basis for a way to rationalize and include the policy goals in the basic zoning decision. Mr. Polikov explained how they went through a process of developing a master plan and developing the code itself. He pointed out that currently Bonanzas Park is a mismatch on two levels. One is that the property is worth a lot. The question was whether they were creating an environment in which they could get a rent structure for development that would justify the expenditure of investing in a development context that matches the cost of doing that development. On the other hand, in looking at what Charlie and Mary Wintzer have done in the Iron Horse Corridor, it is important to preserve small business and not price people out. Part of the goal is to make sure they do not create a series of unintended consequences like they do in typical conventional zoning.

Mr. Polikov believed Park City has done a good job keeping the national franchise building out, but they still have entitled buildings based on what they are. When that building is no longer viable, it is stuck because it was designed to be a specific use. Form Based Code creates an environment where the building form over time can evolve in its use and it can easily re-invent itself. It shifts to the market when the market does well, and it gives the City the opportunity to determine what they want over the next ten to twenty years as Bonanza Park builds out in terms of the essential design characteristics, public spaces and how the different parts relate to each other. Mr. Polikov pointed out that currently there is no relationship in Bonanza Park. The City had already tackled the issues, but conventional zoning was a mismatch for the Bonanza Park area.

On the question of why the community would want a Form Based Code for this particularly project, Mr. Polikov stated that it promotes community ownership of the public realm. It goes back to what used to be a successful coordinated effort by the public and private sectors to activate great public spaces. Conventional zoning is a really bad match for figuring out great public spaces. Secondly,

Form Based Code gives more predictability to the development community because they have a better idea of what is expected. Therefore, they have a better idea of what their proforma structure should look like, and what kind of conversation they need to have with the equity partners and the banks. Form Based Code also catalyzes changes that the City wants. Mr. Polikov stated that Form Based Code is less subjective in terms of design considerations. The Planning Commission and City Council will always have to make some interpretation in discussions with the applicant and the neighborhood, but there is a visual or graphic vocabulary that makes that conversation more meaningful.

Mr. Polikov stated that a mix of uses by right goes back to the point that no one knows what the demands will be in the 100 acres of Bonanza Park. It is a very limited opportunity for redevelopment. They do know there will be a demand for all types of housing and more neighborhoods serving retail; but it is impossible to know what type of retail to expect in the next three or four years. This is the opportunity for the owners in Bonanza Park to function separately; and at the same time the code binds them together. The power of Form Based Code is the benefit of a master development without having to have single ownership.

Mr. Polikov provided an example of Roanoke, Texas which is a small community north of Fort Worth, Texas where Form Based Code was applied. It is not a resort community but he believed it was very similar to Park City and the Bonanza Park area. He presented a slide of what Oak Street looked like when they first started the project in 2006, and another slide after it was re-developed showing how it had transformed in six short years. Mr. Polikov pointed out that Form Based Code does not force anyone out of business or require anyone to abandon their current use in their current building. The Code was drafted to allow the existing basic use with potential improvements within a range under Park City's non-conforming building provision.

Mr. Polikov explained the planning process and the drivers they looked for when they drafted a Form Based Code for Bonanza Park.

Referring back to Roanoke, Texas, Mr. Polikov pointed out that the transformation was more than just the private sector taking advantage of the Form Based Code. It was also the City deciding to invest some of its funding into the reconstruction of Oak Street. Mr. Polikov remarked that the outcome of Form Based rezoning and creating a de facto master developer environment, as well as the public investment in the infrastructure, is that Oak Street became a community destination. More importantly was the increase in the assessed value of the land in six years. He believed the investment in Oak Street would be paid back in less than ten years.

Unlike most projects in Park City where there is a single owner and single developer, Mr. Polikov encouraged a conversation regarding the public role in investing in the infrastructure to activate re-development. He pointed out that in addition to being an aesthetic strategy, Form Based is also an economic strategy for how the public and private sectors can partner on mutual investments that generate positive returns for both sectors, and at the same time generates an outcome that benefits the community.

Mayor Williams referred to the before and after slides of Oak Street and the municipal funding. He

asked what was done with the power company. Mr. Polikov replied that consideration was given to burying the lines; however, they were able to work with the utility company to move the power lines to an alley behind the commercial corridor. He noted that burying the lines would have tripled the cost. If they had not figured out a way to move the power poles it would have presented a challenge in terms of pedestrian experience, ADA compliance, street frontage, etc. Commissioner Thomas asked about the before and after width of the street. Mr. Polikov replied that the street was narrowed curb to curb to slow down traffic. He noted that slower cars move more effectively in a confined area.

Council Member Peek asked why the grade had changed on the left side of the street. Mr. Polikov replied that it was due to drainage issues. Council Member Peek clarified that the grade of the road was dropped as opposed to raising the left side. Mr. Polikov replied that this was correct. He explained that there was also an issue with the natural grade that had to be resolved. Mr. Polikov believed they would experience the same issues in Bonanza Park.

Director Eddington presented slides that addressed the input received from the stakeholders. Gateway Planning came to Park City in April and May and had a number of meetings with stakeholders, neighbors, and others in the community to hear their input on the draft plan that the City Council and Planning Commission saw in January. The stakeholders provided significant input and talked about coordination, affordable housing, tweaking some of the areas where there were potential future road networks, and the size of the Spur Park.

Director Eddington presented a slide of the original Bonanza Park plan from January and explained how they tweaked the plan to come up with different alternatives. He reviewed the elements of three alternatives that were selected based on their important components. Director Eddington noted that the idea of boulevards had initial support, but after a few days of stakeholder discussion the idea was abandoned because it was questionable whether it could be safely utilized as open space. The discussion focused back to the Spur and pocket parts.

Director Eddington presented a slide showing the current concept. He reviewed the network utilized for the character zones, as well as the network that Parsons Brinckerhoff analyzed regarding transportation.

Planner Katie Cattan stated that when the Staff presented different ideas to the Stakeholders, there was definite support for keeping the Spur Park in a central location. Director Eddington clarified that right-of-way issues were tweaked and they also made sure that some of the roads line up better on bifurcating property lines so everyone would have an equal "give-get".

Diego Carroll addressed the transportation strategy for the most current plan. He indicated a five-leg intersection on each side of the Spur that was eliminated when the plan was revised. He pointed out that there was significant input from both Parsons Brinckerhoff and from Matt Rifkin and his group at InterPlan.

Mr. Carroll reviewed a slide showing the existing street network, and noted that it works well for cars but not for pedestrians. There were also issues related to access management for UDOT standards

on SR224 and SR248. Mr. Carroll presented a slide showing the currently proposed network. He emphasized the amount of additional connectivity provided in the new plan as opposed to the connectivity provided in the existing street network. It allows traffic to be dispersed into multiple streets and then access SR224 and SR248 at multiple points. Mr. Carroll pointed out that the connectivity also provides advantage for walking trips and it is also attractive for transit and cycling.

Going back to access management, Mr. Carroll stated that the proposed network provides a more favorable approach to managing access. Curb cuts and driveways were eliminated along SR224 and 248 and replaced with streets.

Mr. Carroll presented a slide showing the recommendations from the SR224 study that was done by Fehr and Peers for Park City. He noted that the study is consistent and fits well with the Parsons Brinckerhoff plan for Bonanza Park. Only a few minor differences need to be calibrated between the two studies.

Mr. Carroll highlighted a few of the recommendations that resulted from coordinated discussions between the Planning Staff, Parsons Brinckerhoff and InterPlan. The primary recommendations were 1) connect Homestake to Bonanza; 2) tighten the intersections at the Spur; 3) recommendations related to parking. Mr. Carroll stated that having a strong parking management plan in place was critical to making the network work efficiently. His recommendation would be to implement parking policies that allow visitors or residents to park once, to encourage park share, and to take advantage of on-street parking.

Mr. Carroll stated the recommendations for transit improvements came specifically from InterPlan. It is important to have a transit plan be in place right away because it is critical to making the network function.

Mayor Williams asked if the consideration of the aerial transit park was the idea of Parsons Brinckerhoff or whether it was based on other input. Mr. Carroll replied that Parsons Brinckerhoff benefitted from InterPlan and Matt Rifkin's involvement and previous work on the transportation master plan as one option.

Director Eddington explained that InterPlan looked at potential opportunities if the area developed as residential, as a way to provide easy access for employees. The other opportunity considered was that the Resort Gateway Character zone that wraps around SR224 would continue to be resort base with easy access to PCMR. Another opportunity was to create a central parking location for visitors in the area. Director Eddington noted that the biggest challenge currently was with PCMR, Empire Avenue and SR224. The thinking was that if they plan for a future transit center that would benefit the area, why not tie an aerial to bus or any other kind of transit in the area.

Mr. Polikov noted that they were talking about 500 million square feet of development at build out and the need to seek access permits or work with UDOT for future long-term coordination in terms of perimeter roadways. The only way to get the UDOT engineers to sign off on such an intensification of this area is to do a combination of reducing the exterior curb cuts, increasing the cross access to move within Bonanza Park, and have a long-term transit environment. Mr. Polikov

stated that if rail eventually comes to Park City, it is better to discuss the implications now. It was not too early to begin talking about shared parking, parking management, transit and how it all works together. Mr. Polikov stated that in addition to rezoning through the proposed Form Based Code, two questions needed to be addressed. The first is determining the public investment to match the private investment; and the second are the policy issues that must be dealt with in parallel that will make this feasible in terms of long term transportation policies.

Mr. Polikov requested feedback on the proposed regulating plan. He recognized that the Council Members and Commissioners had not had sufficient time to review the information and he did not expect them to be familiar with the details of the proposed code. The objective this evening was to present an overview and give them a few weeks to absorb it, so when they meet with the Planning Commission they would have a better working knowledge of the details.

Mr. Polikov stated that they started with seven or eight character zones and decided on four; 1) the mixed use center; 2) the resort gateway; 3) neighborhood shopping and 4) the Iron Horse Industrial Arts Corridor. He noted that an adopted regulating plan is the pathway to which development standards apply to which area. Each of the four character zones will have their own set of design standards. The intent is for different parts of Bonanza Park to have a different feel and function.

Mr. Polikov presented images that they agreed would be the manifestation for kinds of development that could occur under the proposed development standards four character zones. Mr. Polikov stated that another purpose of the regulating plan is to key the different street types necessary to compliment the different characteristics. Red identified the existing Type A streets, which are the more pedestrian oriented streets. Blue identified the existing Type B streets, which are service area streets. It is unrealistic for every street to be Type A, and other types of area activity need to be accommodated. Priority streets, primary streets, and secondary streets were also part of the system, which was more for the purpose of prioritization of the investment moving forward.

Jay Narayana commented on how to use Form Based Code in a hypothetical situation. For example, identifying a specific piece of property on the regulating plan. In the hypothetical example they were looking at property on the Spur. After the property has been identified, the second step is to identify the character zone. The next thing is to consider whether a public space element is required and to look at ski designations on all frontages. If the property is adjacent to any streets, each character zone has a requirement under the code regarding a specific standard.

Ms. Narayana stated that the meat of the standards would be in the building form and development standards for each of the zones. Height, building frontage and parking requirements would be regulated in the development standards. Ms. Narayana stated that the building form standards establish the envelope and the skeleton. The next section, which is building design, would be how to wrap that skeleton. They have been working with Staff to strengthen that section with more images to show some of the elements that would be addressed. Ms. Narayana remarked that the street design section ties the design of the streets to the design of the buildings. The next thing is to look at open space standards and open space types. She noted that the proposed code has standards for private/common open space because Bonanza Park is an urban redevelopment where public and private open spaces work with each. Mr. Polikov clarified that this pertained to balconies, courtyards and similar elements.

Ms. Narayana stated that they were still working on the details for sustainability standards. In terms of code administration, Ms. Narayana explained that they would be looking at more of an administrative approval process, because Form Based Code has a more detailed coding process than standard suburban zoning. She noted that there would be a separate process for review of design exceptions because things that are more subjective would still go to the Planning Commission. They were still working with the Staff on a more definitive process. Any changes to the overall zoning district of the Form Base Code would go back to the City Council.

Ms. Narayana pointed out that they had only presented the main highlights of the code. Other sections were still being worked on with Staff.

Planner Cattan stated that in the original area plan for Bonanza Park they talked about deed restricted uses within that plan, such as accredited educational facilities or business incubator space. Through more brainstorming, the Staff has concerns with deed restricting uses within a building and giving incentives within a fourth or fifth story. She provided a hypothetical example to demonstrate why the Staff decided that it was not the right planning tool for what was proposed. The issue was addressed in the Staff report and she requested input from the group on whether or not they agreed with the Staff's concern for deed restricting uses. Planner Cattan thought it was more appropriate to come up with economic development tools rather than zoning tools in terms of height and density.

Mr. Polikov recognized that this was a lot of information that was presented quickly. He wanted to make sure it all made sense and whether it was an approach that could intuitively and specifically help realize the detail that the plan lays out. As they move into the refinement process, it was important to know whether they were on the track or if the track needed to be modified.

Commissioner Wintzer remarked that this was an exciting code to read. It is reader friendly and easier to understand. He intuitively liked the fact that you could see where you were going. Commissioner Wintzer felt it was definitely a tool worth looking at and pursuing down the road.

Commissioner Thomas thought they should definitely go in the direction of Form Based Code. However, he had concerns that he wanted to open for discussion. Commissioner Thomas referred to the plan on page 104 of the Staff report and noted that an important component was the pedestrian circulation and the separation of pedestrian from automobile. Originally there were pedestrian corridors weaving into the plan and he felt that was important to provide a different experience coming into that part of the community. Commissioner Thomas stated that it also provided a visual, organic connection into the center of the community. He understood the perception that this becomes more urban, but he had problems with the notion of pulling out that pedestrian connectivity.

Director Eddington assumed Commissioner Thomas was talking about the green pedestrian bicycle corridors. He noted that there were also view corridors in the nodes at each corner. Commissioner Thomas understood the problems and issues; however, he was not completely sold on the idea and he wanted to hear other comments. Director Eddington stated that the discussion with the



Stakeholders was that it could be very challenging. In some cases it could break up blocks of buildings that were otherwise solid, and the give/take started to get challenging for the private property owners in some areas. Director Eddington noted that they were able to make it work in terms of giving square feet for square feet, but it was difficult and close and it bifurcated some properties. As a result, they started to propose access to the central part. It was not continuous access but it used the roads in a complete street concept. Because it bifurcated the buildings, the Staff recommended a tunnel and opening near the Spur to get people in there. Director Eddington stated that they were able to keep a part of it, but at the same time they recognized the challenges of creating that kind of open space for a 20 foot wide path that was dedicated to bikes and pedestrians.

Mr. Polikov remarked that complete streets or pedestrian oriented streets would have to be implemented in order for this approach to be effective, because the streets need to function as safely and inviting for pedestrians as for cars.

Commissioner Thomas asked for an explanation of the Type A and Type B streets. The group reviewed the cross sections in the Code on page 71 and 72 of the Staff report.

Council Member Simpson stated that she walks that area frequently. She would be less concerned about pedestrian and bike only trails if they had more walkable streets and sidewalks.

Council Member Peek asked about mass transit and how it would interact with the entire Bonanza Park area. It appears that Snow Creek Crossing feeds into a rather small road and he thought the road was too narrow to accommodate a bus. Director Eddington identified the road and noted that it was being proposed as a Type A, which would be pedestrian friendly. He stated that that the road was wider than it looked and buses could get down it. It would definitely be wider than the existing driveway into the Holiday Village area.

Council Member Peek asked if there was a transit plan for the different character zones. Director Eddington replied that a specific location had not yet been identified. Given that this is a 10, 20 or 30 year plan, there could be possibilities in the existing Public Works transit barn site for potential future transportation. When they did a quick walkability analysis for the plan, nearly everything in Bonanza Park was within a five minute/quarter-mile walk. The idea is to park once and walk everywhere; therefore, the transit facility could go anywhere, but the specific location has not been identified. Council Member Peek pointed out that the dense housing and the Industrial Arts area would need transit for itself. He noted that walkability to and from that hillside area did not appear to be identified either.

Council Member Simpson asked for the meaning of "transit facility". Director Eddington replied that it could be a transit center similar to what they have at the bottom of Main Street. Council Member Simpson clarified that the buses could drive on any street. Director Eddington replied that this was correct. Ms. Narayana commented on the limited amount of detail in the code and noted that the details would be worked out as they move forward. Council Member Simpson stated that as Bonanza Park builds out it will be a moving target and they may not see the need for a transit facility for 15-20 years. To a certain degree, the development that happens is going to determine the best

location for the transit center, and the City will be operating transit throughout that period of time. The routes will change based on need and what gets developed first or last.

Council Member Beerman understood that in the prior version the trails followed the view corridors. Since they decided to put buildings there and not do trails, he asked if adjustments were being made for the view corridors. Director Eddington replied that some of the view corridors would be lost and they would find view corridors down the road through some of the rights-of-way.

Commissioner Strachan stated that Form Based Code was the right direction, but the devil would be in the details. Whenever something is done to a form there is a picture and people are supposed to build to a picture. It is difficult to tell people that their application does not look like the picture because it is a subjective determination. Commissioner Strachan was unsure how that could be worked out. Mr. Polikov remarked that it would be built to the standards rather than the picture. Commissioner Strachan asked if it could look like anything it wants to as long as it meets the standards. Mr. Polikov replied that there would be functional architectural standards. Commissioner Strachan stated that in order for the standards to work, there would have to be pictures. When those pictures come, someone will think their application looks like the picture and someone else will disagree because it is subjective. Ms. Narayana remarked that there would also be actual numbers and micro-values for things such as the minimum amount of windows and doors and articulation. Mr. Polikov stated that they would also propose a set of minimum quality requirements for materials. He understood that Commissioner Strachan was saying that the issue always goes back to appearance. Commissioner Strachan replied that this was correct and he wanted it clear that the code was not an anecdote for that issue.

Commissioner Thomas stated that to a great extent they were relying on experts to set up criteria and a matrix of ideas to result in a more aesthetically pleasing, broken down scale that is achievable. He thought it would be interesting to see a test of someone trying to do the worst with it and someone trying to do the best.

To answer the Staff's question regarding deed restrictions, Commissioner Strachan did not think they should deed restrict specific uses, but he thought they should set percentages on uses.

Council Member Butwinski asked if the design guidelines would be prescriptive enough to control the type of development. Mr. Polikov stated that most of the Form Base Codes they have developed do not have detailed architectural style guidelines. They allow for eclecticism because there tends to be more of an investment in the space around the buildings in the public realm. However, they have developed codes that do have a set of design standards that relate to architectural style and architectural families. The problem is that in developing 100 acres, is if something becomes passé, a whole section of Bonanza Park ten years from now could look like ten-year-old architecture. The City needs to decide how they want to encourage a certain level of quality. There was no right or wrong way, but there are consequences with both approaches. Mayor Williams thought this was a creative idea. However, he thought the idea of planning the community by figuring out the transportation first and then designing based on the transportation needed more discussion. Mayor Williams liked the separation of space and the different zones, realizing that Park Avenue or SR224 coming in will have relatively large setbacks. He needed to

learn more about the street types and how those interact. Mayor Williams liked the fact that this could become a system that is much easier and less onerous for everyone than what they have dealt with for the last 40 years. He also favored the incentive program. Mayor Williams loved the idea of finally trying to define urban open space. He noted that Park City typically thinks of open space as Round Valley or conservation easements. However, in his opinion the pedestrian space or internal open space was the most critical piece of the entire project. He recalled attending a design convention specifically focused on creating friendly pedestrian space, where he saw million dollar developments that were empty. That would be his fear for this project. In terms of a general concept he liked the Spur Park idea in the middle as a gathering area for the neighborhood. In general, he believed the proposal works.

Commissioner Worel liked how Form Based Code streamlines the process to make it easier for the applicant and the Staff. Regarding the different character zones, Commissioner Worel asked if work force housing could be placed on second floors in the Industrial Arts or neighborhood shopping zones. She understood that if there could be residential in all of the character zones, the difference between that and the mixed use was that it was the only place where there could be residential to be on the street.

Ms. Narayana replied that there were different nuances. For example the Industrial Arts zone is more metal and glass and a funky eclectic environment. It is a mix of materials, building frontage, mix of uses and scale of buildings.

Planner Cattan explained that each individual zone has certain criteria for commercial ready frontage. In those areas they were looking at something similar to Main Street with the vertical zoning and not having residential on the first story to make it more interactive. Mr. Polikov stated that another difference is that retail would be allowed in the Resort Gateway. They probably would not want large retail dominating the Gateway, but they should not precluding retail. The challenge is finding a way to define a collection of uses so the uses are not the same in all the character zones. In response to Commissioner Worel, Mr. Polikov replied that there can be residential and retail in all the character zones, but there will be limitations in the different zones. He believed the market would differentiate the type of use in one character zone versus another. Mr. Polikov would encourage a mix of housing throughout the entire 100 acres.

Council Member Simpson thought the proposal was fabulous and she was excited about the potential. She appreciated that the property owners were willing to wait while the City took the time to get this organized and done right. When Gateway Planning comes back with the discussion on retail, she assumed they would define large-scale retail. Council Member Simpson wanted to clearly understand the differentiations. In terms of housing variety, she understood that Mr. Polikov was talking about targeted incomes and style as opposed to single-family housing. Mr. Polikov clarified that he was referring to a different variety of non-single family housing in terms of type, size, multi-unit houses, apartments, etc.

Commissioner Wintzer felt it was important to have a model because once this is passed, most of it could be built without public input. This was the opportunity for the public and the City to see what could be done and lock into the idea that this was the best approach. This proposal takes away

most of the Planning Commission function and public notice functions. He understood the reason and he agreed with it, but this is a learning curve for the community and they need to understand it. Commissioner Wintzer suggested that the City hire someone to put together a massing model of a hypothetical project in this area so they could see the end result. Mayor Williams thought a model was a great idea. Everyone concurred.

Council Member Beerman liked where this proposal was headed. It is functional and universal and it will lend itself to the type of mixed-use they were looking towards. He felt they needed to be careful to get the complete streets right, particularly if they are removing the pathways. If they truly want residential it needs to be pedestrian friendly. He was concerned that if they do not continually emphasize the street and the walkways they would end up with through streets and a lot of traffic. Council Member Beerman thought it was important to talk about where the transit and potential aerial connections might be and build around those. Those will be huge attractors because people who live there need to know how they could get around town. Council Member Beerman liked the concept of the character zones. However, he would like to see them on a contrasting chart. As it appears now, if every envelope was maxed out, everything would end up looking similar. He understood they were aiming for diversity, but they were not there yet. Council Member Beerman requested more examples or contrast to better understand the concept.

Mr. Polikov noted that the City had made the decision for less height. However, he encouraged them to be open-minded and allow more height in some of the character zones. On a strategic basis they should decide why one part of a sub-portion of a character zone would be allowed to have more height. He believed the views would be generated more from the variety of heights in Bonanza Park than from view corridors. Secondly, the land value is high dollar per square foot. Lastly, there would be less land to develop on. Mr. Polikov thought Bonanza Park was the best place to have a variety of heights where it would not block anyone's view corridor. This was their opportunity to push the envelope.

Council Member Simpson asked how they would strategically look at height diversity. Mr. Polikov stated that Park City was not the only community afraid of height. It is a common problem. However, if they take the time to solve the problem and answer the question based on analysis versus emotion, they might come up with a solution that pleases both sides. Council Member Simpson noted that the City Council has had that discussion, but more in terms of "gives and gets". Mayor Williams pointed out that through experience they have come to realize that a one-story building can block views. Historically, most of the larger buildings are set up against the mountain because the mountain dwarfs the building and minimizes the scale. Mr. Polikov pointed out that in a build out condition, many people in Bonanza Park would not have views to the mountains. He clarified that he was not promoting that they encourage more height, but it would create more flexibility to get more "gets". He pointed out that there will be winners and losers from a development yield standpoint when they start deciding how to parcel out. There needs to be a reasonable basis to avoid an arbitrary decision. Mr. Polikov encouraged them to think it through a little more while they have this moment in time, and to ask the questions and consider the implications of the next generations of neighborhood development.

Commissioner Savage agreed that this was a great opportunity to build a super cool community and

he liked the direction it was taking. He was interested in seeing a budget estimation to see how they could finance this initiative. He wanted to know what would be necessary from a public funding perspective to get enough infrastructure in place to get people excited about developing Bonanza Park on a significant scale.

Council Member Butwinski concurred with Commissioner Wintzer. A key take-away is the fact that this would put a lot of development in the hands of the Planning Department because much of the process is administrative. Council Member Butwinski thought it was very important for the public to understand that. He read through the proposal several times and while it can be a good thing, it needs to be prescriptive enough because the Planning Commission is no longer in a regulatory role. They would not want that burden on Director Eddington or his successor. Council Member Butwinski asked if they should be prepared for the situation where someone with an existing use, such as a car wash, sells it to someone else who keeps the car wash, and 40 years from now they would still have a car wash in the middle of this development.

Mr. Polikov stated that from personal experience, they should just allow the market and the owner to decide when the use should be terminated; otherwise, who would decide the matrix and would they want the advertising. He remarked that when the price per foot becomes more valuable to build that four-story mixed use condo building as opposed to collecting quarters for the car wash, the owner would decide to terminate the use. Mr. Polikov believed the City could figure out an amortization strategy, and he asked if they would be prepared to write checks as the implication for their decision to sunset particular types of uses. He would encourage the City to write checks more for infrastructure than for use. However, he personally believes some of the best places are the ones that have a car wash in the middle of a cool neighborhood or a cinder block bar that has been there for 50 years.

Council Member Butwinski commented on the deed restricted incentive and requested to see examples of economic development incentives for the meeting. Council Member Butwinski noted that the proposal showed a firmly defined residential in the Industrial Iron Horse Arts zone. He suggested changing that because of Fireside, which was lower down. Mr. Polikov explained that it was a last minute change because 20 years from now there may be a strategy where someone wants to redevelop. Instead of going through the process again, the policy decision would already be made. If they preferred to defer that policy decision, it could be changed back. Mr. Polikov believed it was consistent with its surroundings. Commissioner Thomas agreed. Planner Cattan stated that another reason was to make sure they did not zone out industrial.

Commissioner Savage remarked that this was an area that has a lot of property and could accommodate much more density. Affordable housing exists in that area and there could be a lot more.

Council Member Beerman agreed with Mr. Butwinski in terms of not being able to replace that niche of housing if they redevelop it, and that is critical for a segment of the workforce in town. It would definitely become higher-end housing if redeveloped and that needs to be considered. Mr. Polikov stated that it was a policy question and he encouraged that discussion. He pointed out that the regulating plan was only a draft and it could be changed. Commissioner Savage believed housing

was the primary reason to consider height.

Council Member Butwinski referred to the aerial transit and asked about air rights. He assumed it was a question for the Legal Department that he would like to have answered before they get too excited about aerial transit.

Commissioner Gross noted that at one point everything was to the west and now it is to the east and incorporates some of Prospector Square. He asked why it did not go the other way as well, in the direction of Snow Creek, because that is the basic main on main intersection. Director Eddington replied that Snow Creek was talked about earlier in the process when it was switched from the area to the west of Bonanza to pop over to the eastern side. However, at that time they decided to keep it primarily focused on the south side of Kearns. Director Eddington pointed out that Snow Creek already has a built out capacity. They are now looking at TDRs and that may be one reason to explore Snow Creek again. He explained that the reason for crossing over Bonanza was due to the redevelopment and pedestrianization of Bonanza Drive and the bicycle paths, and wanting to make sure both sides of the road connected. Commissioner Gross felt it was unfortunate that Park City did not control their own destiny on the State Highways because it would help them with planning.

Commissioner Gross understood that there were 2,000 residential unit equivalents left and 736 commercial, and he asked about the percentage of future growth. Director Eddington clarified that the numbers in the Bonanza Park Plan were based on existing subdivisions and existing vacant lots. It did not include potential redevelopment. A quick analysis showed cursory numbers up to 1700 units in the area if totally built out. Commissioner Gross remarked that if they were counting on the densities it needed to be done right.

Mr. Polikov stated that one of the factors they would come back with regarding the height issue is the impacts on the economics of being able to achieve structured parking. He noted that it is difficult to achieve structured parking capacity with three-story buildings.

Commissioner Gross thought it would be difficult in the future to get uses back, such as the old Albertson's and the Rite-Aid, in a revised neighborhood plan. He asked about alternatives, particularly if they are not able to divide up parking lots. Commissioner Gross pointed out that it could stay that way forever while they recreate the entire Bonanza Park because they do not have control over those properties. Director Eddington stated that if those in the Fresh Market area did not want to work with underground parking and/or shared parking, the City could possibly work with them to create liner shops that would keep the parking from being the first thing visible from the right-of-way. That has been done in other communities as an alternative solution. Director Eddington stated that the hope is to work with them and possibly offer incentives to make the offer attractive.

Council Member Simpson asked Director Eddington to identify the RDA border. She clarified that the area indicated as the possible transit hub is in the lower Park Avenue RDA. Director Eddington replied that this was correct.

Council Member Peek asked if there was a phasing plan that would get the critical mass going,

similar to what was done in Roanoke, Texas. Mr. Polikov stated that he could come up with recommendations for discussion at the next meeting.

Planner Cattan noted that the transportation study has some discussion about phasing and which roads should be prioritized. Council Member Peek remarked that an important piece is connectivity to the rest of the community, including Prospector and Snow Creek. When he was on the Planning Commission they talked about taking this out to the toe of the slopes, which would be Snow Creek. Council Member Peek liked the plan overall; however, he shared the same concerns about turning the public process into an administrative process for decades to come. He noted that Prospector has some old style trails across the parking lot but there is no connectivity. He felt that connectivity into Prospector was critical. Council Member Peek stated that view corridors are important. The residents will get used to looking at great architecture but visitors coming into town are interested in the views. He was unsure how that could be balanced and whether there were ways to work the view corridors into the tiers of five-story structures. They should identify the view corridors and give incentives to keep the view corridor open. In terms of connectivity, Council Member Peek stated that a viable project was great, but he would not want to cause a recession to occur in other business areas in town. He was unsure how to address the deed restriction issue. He recalled a previous discussion that if a restriction was placed on the use of water on a property, the subsequent owner could buy that out. He suggested a similar approach where the subsequent owner could buy back the deed restriction.

Commissioner Hontz was concerned that everyone would be reading Form Based Code for the first time this evening and be upset. She has always been a proponent of Form Based Code and she was glad to see that others were open to it. Commissioner Hontz agreed with Commissioner Strachan that illustrations are incredibly important. She referred to the numerous photos of other cities on pages 75-88 of the Staff report and felt those photos were not relevant to Park City. She travels to resort communities and find pockets of things that she likes, but it is hard to find things that Park City wants to aspire to. She requested that the plan includes photos of snow and other elements that were reflective of the community. Commissioner Hontz liked the idea of more roads, but she did not think the Spur and the park should be the dumping grounds for snow. She felt it was important to know how they would manage snow removal and roads with snow that are actively used by pedestrians, bikes and vehicles.

Mr. Polikov pointed out that Durango had done a fantastic job figuring out how to coordinate snow management with walkability. Commissioner Hontz stated that Park City wants the snow and they would not want to melt it or pretend it did not exist. Regarding deed restrictions, Commissioner Hontz believed it was an economic development issue and they should find other ways to handle without deed restrictions.

Mayor Williams stated that for nearly 35 years Park City has been strongly committed to being a resort town. Many residents who came to Park City in the 1960's and 1970's raised their families here. Those children went away to college are now returning with degrees. Mayor Williams remarked that this younger generation of residents wants to live in the town they grew up in, but their job expertise is beyond what Park City has to offer. He believed some were looking at this plan for that potential. Mayor Williams pointed out that for the first time ever, tech companies are coming to

Park City because the quality of life is better for their employees. Mayor Williams believed they were starting to realize that trends would not destroy tourism. He commented on how Mark Fischer, an owner in Bonanza Park, has been very open-minded in looking at different possibilities. Mayor Williams also did not think they should negate the potential university connection as a satellite campus.

Mr. Polikov suggested that this was also a good time to rethink retail. He understood the concern about this development being a threat to Main Street. However, an interest was expressed for bringing back some of the more neighborhood oriented and convenience retail, but they were afraid of what threat could mean. Mr. Polikov stated that the retailers want the opportunity to figure out how to make their business a smaller format and neighborhood friendly. The timing was good to think outside the box. He pointed out that the code would always be tweaked. He wanted to clear up any misconception that once the code is adopted it would be the same forever.

Commissioner Thomas echoed all the comments this evening. He agreed with Commissioner Strachan in terms of the deed restriction. He believed they could successfully have verticality and noted that it has been done in other towns relative to scale. Commissioner Thomas commented on the seasonal factor and the idea of how to live and cope in the winter. A major question is how Bonanza Park could anchor itself as a hub for the community. He also believed a key element would be the visual experience moving through the corridors.

Mr. Polikov stated that they would continue working with the Staff to address some of the questions and concerns for the next presentation.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

---