

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION NOTES  
SEPTEMBER 14, 2011**

PRESENT: Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Julia Pettit, Mick Savage, Jack Thomas, Nann Worel, Thomas Eddington, Polly Samuels McLean, Jonathan Weidenhamer

Commissioner Strachan was excused.

**WORK SESSION ITEMS**

**Park City Redevelopment Agency Update**

Commissioner Brooke Hontz disclosed that she was married to Jonathan Weidenhamer, who was giving the presentation this evening.

Jonathan Weidenhamer with the City Sustainability Department introduced Tim Brienholt and Mike Barille and provided a brief background of their involvement with the City.

Mr. Weidenhamer stated that from listening to comments during the joint meetings with the regarding Lower Park Avenue RDA and the Base of Park City Mountain Resort, the functions appeared to be in line between what is currently being done and what should be done in the future. It is resort oriented and there are good recreation and residential mixes.

Mr. Weidenhamer presented the results from the survey that was taken by the City Council and Planning Commission. In looking at the current character versus the future character, you begin to see gaps in diversity and whether or not the area is inviting. It was apparent from the survey that it may be time for Park City Mountain Resort to look at how they want to develop the base of the resort. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that the objective this evening was to talk about the Redevelopment Authority and how the City uses Redevelopment Authorities historically. Another issue for discussion was where the relationship between the City and the Resort may go. He noted that on September 29<sup>th</sup> the City Council and Planning Commission would hold another joint meeting regarding their role in redevelopment. After completing the redevelopment discussion on Bonanza Park, they would move directly into PCMR and the base of the Mountain Resort.

Mr. Weidenhamer provided an overview of the purpose of the RDA. The Redevelopment Authority sets the creation of an RDA and determines the property tax. In 1985 the RDA was created for Main Street. Incremental property tax is put back into the District and is continued to be reinvested. RDAs, by statute, were established by the Federal Government in the late 1950's as a way to redevelop downtown areas for the purpose of curing blight and to provide affordable housing projects. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that Park City created two RDAs. One is the Main Street RDA, which generates approximately \$1.3 annually. There is approximately \$920,000 in debt service which is used specifically for the China Bridge parking garage. He pointed out that Park City was the first city to use an RDA. The School District sued the City immediately because they thought the City was keeping property tax money. The City settled and made a \$400,000 mitigation payment to the School District. Understanding the purpose of the RDA, the School District continues to support the RDA because it provides cash settlements. Mr. Weidenhamer noted that the State continues to watch RDAs very carefully.

Commissioner Pettit clarified that the RDA was a federally created program. She was curious to

know whether or not RDA monies have been used in other resort communities similar to Park City. It would be helpful to see examples of how that money was utilized, and how Park City compares in terms of goals and objectives. She understood that there were serious strings attached to the ability to create an RDA District for certain purposes. When she thinks of RDAs on a national level, inner cities come to mind. Park City is different, but there are areas that warrant that type of investment and opportunity.

Mr. Weidenhamer replied that they already had a conversation on whether the RDA was curing blight in Park City or helping the resort economy. Michael Barille stated that he was aware of other resort communities that have used RDAs. Traditionally they are used for brown field sites, housing and neighborhood revitalization for low interest loan programs and public facilities. Mr. Barille believed he and Mr. Weidenhamer could do some research and provide the examples Commissioner Pettit requested. He recognized that Park City has a different economy than most places, and what they need to encourage in terms of redevelopment is also different. He agreed with some of the survey results, particularly that the key piece of the economy is starting to breakdown in terms of how it presents and competes against other similar position communities, particularly in the areas of bed base and retail. He believed those were the things they should be looking to support with RDA tools.

Mr. Weidenhamer noted that the Main Street RDA has committed \$1.7 million to a parking garage. Nearly \$1 million of that is dedicated to downtown stair improvements and other downtown projects. Approximately \$400,000 is earmarked in the fiscal year to work with Historical Park City Alliance on their prioritized list of projects.

Mr. Weidenhamer discussed the Lower Park Avenue RDA, which generates approximately \$1.2 million annually and is set to expire in 2015. He believed there were \$6-8 million in projects that could be done with that money. Part of the dialogue with the City Council and the Planning Commission would be whether or not to extend the RDA. It would require a vote of the Tax Entity committee. The problem is that different members have different concerns.

Chair Wintzer asked if the Tax Entity Committee were the stakeholders giving up the taxes. Mr. Weidenhamer replied that the committee is typically people who would be affected by it.

Commissioner Worel wanted to know when the extension would occur. Mr. Weidenhamer replied that they would ask the City Council for authority to begin the extension process. He hoped the conversation at the joint meeting would begin to show an outflow of support for partnering with the Mountain Resort. If they choose to partner on major projects beyond projects on City-owned property, it would be necessary to extend the RDA. Commissioner Worel asked if it was a one-time extension. Mr. Weidenhamer replied that there was the ability to ask for additional extensions. He noted that it was hard to forecast how much money could be generated through the extension process.

Mr. Weidenhamer remarked that it was clear from the joint meetings that redevelopment was going to occur regardless, and the City should take a pro-active role in redevelopment. If they could look at it on a neighborhood basis, they could balance the portfolio of the entire community and make favorable development decisions that would still support the resort economy.

Mr. Weidenhamer stated that in initial discussions with the City Council and looking at Visioning 2009 and 2010, the Council directed them see what a plan for redevelopment in the Lower Park RDA would look like. The City hired Michael Barille with Design Workshop and the Jack Johnson Company to define land use principles and goals for what could be accomplished. Mr. Weidenhamer reviewed a matrix prepared by Design Workshop. Mr. Barille stated that the consultant team tried to consider ways to maintain the livability standard enjoyed in Park City as growth occurs, and what type of projects dovetail those things together without creating significant impacts.

Mr. Weidenhamer stated that it was taken to the City Council on January 7, 2010 and received support as the basis for a conversation on whether or not to extend the RDA. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that as they were going through the process with the Design Workshop and Jack Johnson, Park City Mountain Resort was a key stakeholder, which resulted in a dialogue led by Mr. Breinholt and Jenny Smith regarding plans to develop the parking lot. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that discussions occurred with the Resort at a concept level in terms of what that would look like, how the City would participate, and the goals. They talked about transportation and transit hub goals, affordable and senior housing goals, neighborhood connectivity goals where people could connect all the way down from City Park and up through the Resort. They also talked about overall management of access, circulation and transportation. The City believes those are some of the benefits they could get from improving the base of the Mountain Resort. In return the City would work with the Resort to help develop the parking lot.

Mr. Weidenhamer stated that as Mr. Barille and Mr. Breinholt started working with the City to describe their concept for the parking lot redevelopment, he was presenting a broader plan to the City Council. The City Council thought it was great, but they wanted to know what could be done with the property that the City owns in the RDA, which includes the Senior Center, the old Fire Station, and a series of other small pieces of land in the area. Mr. Weidenhamer stated that the goal is to maintain all the existing open and green and unbuilt spaces. The historic neighborhood and its scale and fabric are very important and should not be overpowered. They should be sensitive in creating a transition between the base of the Mountain Resort into what is considered proper Old Town. Another goal was to create age-based housing different from the traditional single-family condo development. The Senior Center was another good choice for the RDA. They also needed to continue with the same sustainability goals.

Mr. Weidenhamer stated that Mr. Barille put together a four-phase plan, as described in the Staff report. They are currently in the process of developing phase I, which involves the re-creation of small historic homes and a senior community center.

Commissioner Savage asked someone to clarify the reference to dense and tall and the trade-off. Mr. Barille stated that if they want to leave space for pedestrian activity and public plaza spaces to occur, it makes sense to build higher rather than spread out. The second issue was the fact that the City has assembled a good piece of land in lower Park and they want a mix of private and public sector functions. They could sell off parcels and revenue from those sales could be put back into developing plazas or programming the area. Mr. Barille remarked that the City decided to revisit that idea at a later time and preferred to start with a smaller scale to see how much would fit.

Commissioner Savage understood that the consensus that emerged from City Council was to be cautious on dense and tall in that area because it was not their preference. Mr. Barille did not think it was that simple, and noted that the difference between the two plans was not that dramatic. The discussion recognized that the corridor from the old fire station working its way up to the Resort is a demarcation zone between very traditional homes, lots sizes and footprints to the south, and dramatically different structures to the north that were recently developed. Mr. Barille stated that the top of the corridor is like another Town Bridge, where it could be another connection into the City's transportation system and close to Lower Main. Without using a car, you could come down the grade and get on a trolley that would run up and down Park Avenue.

Commissioner Thomas noted that the areas in Phase 4 were over 30% and assumed it would be subject to the Steep Slope CUP process.

Mr. Weidenhamer stated that the intent this evening was to give the Planning Commission an idea of the planning that has been going on for two years. He looked forward to having a robust conversation at the joint meeting on September 29<sup>th</sup> in terms of the City Council's role in redevelopment, particularly as it affects the lower Park Avenue RDA. Regarding the role the Planning Commission has in the redevelopment process, Mr. Weidenhamer believed the tone would be set at the joint meeting on September 29<sup>th</sup>. Aside from that, the Planning Commission was already committed to being actively involved in neighborhood redevelopment planning and the General Plan.

Commissioner Pettit stated that in addition to looking at how ski resort communities utilize RDAs, she believed another important component would be how the RDA was utilized in other communities for historic preservation purposes. Mr. Weidenhamer referred to a matrix on page 9 of the Staff report, which was a staging project list. The City Council continues to say that the RDA should protect the fabric that exists and not just generate taxes. Commissioner Pettit suggested doing a combined historic preservation/affordable housing. Economic Impact is a theme they continue to hear for any changes to the LMC. She reiterated her support for finding ways to create financial incentives to maintain mass, size and scale and preserve historic structures, but using RDA monies versus relying on the market to dictate what might happen.

For the meeting on September 29<sup>th</sup>, Commissioner Savage asked if Mr. Weidenhamer or Mr. Barille would be able to provide them with indications as to how they could accommodate the growth projected to take place in lower Park Avenue. Mr. Weidenhamer pointed out that the PCMR parking lots are already approved and the density growth is already on the books. Commissioner Savage clarified that he was talking about the demand for growth. Chair Wintzer agreed that the question was whether there was a demand for what is entitled or a demand for more than what is entitled.

Chair Wintzer stated that one challenge is to find a way for the Planning Commission to be involved in a project and still be able to run the project through the regulatory process. Director Eddington remarked that the Planning Commission faces the same challenge with the General Plan. They are required to do the General Plan, but they are also required to be a regulatory body with regard to applications. He thought the joint meetings with the City Council was one way to keep the Planning Commission involved, as well as looking at sub area plans pursuant to the neighborhood approach

to the General Plan.

Mr. Barille thought it was important for the Planning Commission to discuss the issue with the Legal Staff. One process would be to use subcommittees to keep the Planning Commission involved, but without a quorum, to avoid the perception of having reached a pre-decision on a project.

Commissioner Thomas stated there is an advantage to seeing a project evolve from the conceptual stage to the schematic design stage. The Planning Commission typically sees the working drawings and does not have the advantage of seeing the process in its entirety.

Assistant City Attorney McLean recommended that the Planning Commission be very involved in the General Plan process because it is part of their jurisdiction and specifically authorized as one of their functions in the State Code. She thought their involvement with redevelopment should be more at the level of fitting into the General Plan and fitting into that neighborhood. Their involvement becomes problematic when it relates to an actual application.

Chair Wintzer suggested scheduling time during another work session to discuss appropriate ways for the Planning Commission to get involved. Commissioner Thomas asked if there was another way to format the approval process so plans could come forward in stages. Director Eddington thought they could better utilize the Planning Commission work sessions to provide updates and allow for interaction at different stages to give the Commissioners an idea of how the plan evolves. Assistant City Attorney McLean was certain they would be able to find a solution.

The Work Session adjourned.

### **Interactive charrette to define neighborhoods within Old Town**

Planner Katie Cattan explained the format for the interactive charrette. She stated that the purpose of the charrette was to help with the General Plan process. For the purpose of the exercise this evening, Old Town was divided into small planning areas to better define what goes on in each area. Ten tables were set up. Each table had a map for that specific planning area, as well as a piece of paper people could use to answer specific questions about that particular neighborhood.