

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
AUGUST 26, 2015

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair Adam Strachan, Melissa Band, Preston Campbell, Steve Joyce, John Phillips, Doug Thimm

EX OFFICIO:

Interim Planning Director, Bruce Erickson; Christy Alexander Planner; Kirsten Whetstone; Planner, Tom Daley, Deputy City Attorney

=====

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

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

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

August 12, 2015

Commissioner Phillips commented on the conditions of approval for 162 Ridge Avenue. He recalled that the Commissioners had discussed limiting the construction traffic to King Road only during excavation. He pointed out that Condition #16 as written limits all construction traffic for the entire project to King Road.

Chair Strachan recalled a comment by the project architect that the contractors had been using King Road for 166 Ridge Avenue and it was working fine. Jonathan DeGray agreed with Commissioner Phillips that the limitation only applied to the excavation phase.

Planner Alexander stated that the language in Condition #16 was taken from the conditions for 166 Ridge Avenue. Mr. DeGray pointed out that the condition as written would prevent light trucks from using Daly Avenue. He preferred to only limit the heavy construction vehicles to King Road during the excavation period. Chair Strachan asked Planner Alexander to revise Condition #16 per their initial discussion to specify that the access is limited to King Road during the excavation phase only.

Commissioner Phillips referred to page 7 of the Staff report, second paragraph, first sentence, "Planner Alexander stated that the Planning Commission could add a condition of approval requiring the Board to meet the 4' requirement." He replaced the word "Board"

with "Applicant" to correctly read, "....requiring the **Applicant** to meet the 4' requirement".

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to APPROVE the minutes of August 12, 2015 as corrected. Commissioner Band seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Commissioner Worel abstained since she was absent from the August 12th meeting.

PUBLIC INPUT

There were no comments.

STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Interim Planning Director, Bruce Erickson, updated the Planning Commission on the discussion with the City Council regarding Historic Preservation and the role of the Historic Preservation Board. Mr. Erickson stated that the City Council and the Historic Preservation Board would have a joint meeting the following week to discuss a number of agenda items. The City Council also directed Staff to do a number of things. Two new inventories were started on Mine sites that should be listed and protected. He expected to receive the Mine site report from Vail in September, at which time all three lists would be merged and prioritized and sent back to the City Council. The Staff was also looking at potential revisions to the Land Management Code. One revision is to strengthen the demolition by neglect section of the ordinance. The Staff was also working on ways to regulate structures in the historic districts that may not meet the designation of Landmark or Significant, but might be contributory to the neighborhood consistent with the introduction paragraphs of each historic zone.

Mr. Erickson reported that the Historic Preservation Board would have their regular meeting next week in addition to the joint meeting with the City Council.

Mr. Erickson noted that the work being done by the Staff and the HPB would result in additional work for the Planning Commission in terms of the LMC and the need to make difficult decisions for the Historic District zones.

Mr. Erickson announced that Christy Alexander would be leaving Park City to take an elevated planning position for the City of San Francisco. This was her last Planning Commission meeting in Park City and the Planning Department was both upset that she was leaving and very proud of her accomplishment. She will be missed. The Commissioners congratulated Planner Alexander and wished her the best in her new venture.

Chair Strachan noted that at the last meeting he had requested that Mr. Erickson try to schedule a joint meeting with the Snyderville Planning Commission. Mr. Erickson had contacted the County and Tuesday, September 22nd was given as a possible meeting date. Chair Strachan suggested that they schedule that date as long as the majority of the Commissioners could attend. He thought it would be too difficult to find a date where everyone from both Planning Commissions could attend. Most of the Commissioners were available to meet on September 22nd. Mr. Erickson would confirm that date with Pat Putt at Summit County. He anticipated a two hour meeting from 5:00-7:00. The issues for discussion would relate to transferable development rights; long term growth at Quinn's Junction; transportation and other issues. Chair Strachan encouraged the Commissioners to send Mr. Erickson any items they would like to have on the agenda.

CONTINUATIONS - (Public Hearing and Continue to date specified)

1. 2001 Park Avenue – Pre-Master Planned Development review for an amendment to the Hotel Park City MPD (aka Island Outpost MPD) (Application PL-15-02681)

Planner Kirsten Whetstone reported that notices were sent to the neighbors and she had received public input. She requested to do a short presentation and asked the Planning Commission to give the applicant the opportunity to make a brief statement. Planner Whetstone noted that this was a pre-MPD application and it would be back before the Planning Commission for a full review and discussion. However, taking public input this evening would help the Staff prioritize the issues moving forward.

Planner Whetstone reviewed the application for Hotel Park City located at 2001 Park Avenue, located in the Recreation Commercial Zone and subject to the MPD. In order to amend the Master Plan the applicant is required to submit a pre-MPD application first, where the Planning Commission reviews the general concept plans and makes a decision on consistency with the zone, the MPD and the General Plan.

Planner Whetstone noted that page 45 of the Staff report indicates that the Staff had provided findings. She corrected that to say that the Staff had not provided findings.

Planner Whetstone reported that the applicant was requesting 28 additional hotel suites, which would be approximately 56 to 60 keys with a lockout situation. An additional 4,000 to 5,000 square feet of conference space or meeting rooms was also being proposed. The underground parking structure would also be extended and 109 parking spaces would be added with improved circulation. Planner Whetstone remarked that the Staff was still trying to clarify the agreements with the City in terms of golf and maintenance of the parking

garage and the impacts on the golf course. They also needed to do a density analysis. The Staff was working on those and other issues.

Chris Jensen with THINK Architecture, representing the applicant, stated that the proposal was on the south lawn between the Hotel and the Cottages to construct a new conference facility and residential condominium units with underground parking underneath. Mr. Jensen noted that this development project began in 1987 between the Greater Park City Company and the Park City Municipal Corporation. In 1987 the development proposed was 272 hotel rooms, a total of 68 total UEs, 15 commercial UEs with 5% of the hotel support commercial. That agreement was under Ordinance 87-14. Mr. Jensen stated that in 1996 Island Outpost acquired the property and voluntarily changed that development to a smaller boutique style hotel with 100 rooms and 39 UEs. That proposal was more in line with what Hotel Park City is today. The proposal was put into the development agreement between Island Outpost and the City. Mr. Jensen stated that part of that development agreement outlined a shared parking with the City for the golf course, and a shared cost of construction between the City and the developer, with the City bearing 48% of the parking garage.

Mr. Jensen understood there were parking issues, and he expected to hear from the neighbors this evening about limited access up Thaynes Canyon and limited services due to parking on the road. They are very aware of those issues. Mr. Jensen noted that the original proposal in 1987 proposed less parking stalls than the Island Outpost proposal, and that fact is stated in the development agreement. He pointed out that there was a shared ordinance conversation with the development agreement of Island Outpost in 1996.

Mr. Jensen stated that the applicant was currently proposing 109 new underground parking stalls under the lawn area with a better circulation plan for the lower garage, which would benefit the south end. Mr. Jensen remarked that 109 new parking stalls provides the ability to help increase the parking for golf by parking the hotel on the south end, and allow the golfers to park in the parking garage on the north side. It would open up parking stalls during the day and create shared parking in the evening for Ruth's Chris and the Hotel.

Mr. Jensen stated that the applicant would like to open the MPD to talk about density, parking and potential benefits. He noted that as the number of units increase, the HOA fees are projected to decrease. The City participates in those fees and this proposal would hopefully reduce the City's involvement in some of the costs incurred, as well as helping to alleviate the parking issue. The hope was for everyone to work together on this approach to come up with a better situation that could benefit the City, the golf course, White Pine skiing, as well as Hotel Park City. Mr. Jensen looked forward to public comment this evening, and coming back to the Planning Commission at a future date.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

Pat Fortune, a resident at 2102 Webster Drive, spoke on behalf of his neighborhood. Mr. Fortune emphasized that there is a parking problem and the applicant's admission of their parking situation is a failure. He stated that 119 cars were parked in their neighborhood last week. They cannot get their mail delivered and a week ago the garbage truck only picked up half the garbage because the vehicles cannot access their neighborhood. Mr. Fortune stated that cars are parked on both sides of the road and the police have had to tow cars that blocked private driveways. Mr. Fortune stated that the golf course shares partial blame but they are not entirely to blame because parking is also an issue in the winter during cross country events. However, for cross country events the cars park diagonally on driving range which alleviates some of the problem. Mr. Fortune stated that his neighborhood is not a commercial parking lot for a commercial venture. They are currently working with the City to make their neighborhood permit parking only like Old Town. He noted that a project was approved in 1987 that created a burdensome situation, but they have no recourse until the Code is changed allowing the police to write tickets or remove cars. Mr. Fortune pointed out that in addition to being in the hotel and restaurant business, Hotel Park City is also in the swim club business, the health club business and the conference business, and there is not enough parking. He remarked that adding 109 spaces as a solution to the problem is ridiculous. Mr. Fortune noted that the hotel and the golf course have been very successful and the neighbors do not want to hinder that success, but the parking problem is becoming a health and safety issue and it needs to be addressed.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Thimm moved to CONTINUE 2001 Park Avenue – Pre-Master Planned Development review for an amendment to the Hotel Park City MPD to September 9, 2015. Commissioner Joyce seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

2. Land Management Code Amendments regarding vertical zoning storefront regulations in Chapter 15-2.5-2 Uses in Historic Recreation Commercial (HRC), Chapter 15-2.6-2 Uses in Historic Commercial Business (HCB), and associated Definitions in Chapter 15-15 Defined Terms. (Application PL-15-02800)

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

Mike Sweeney stated that he was representing all of the property owners below Heber Avenue, and also the Sky Lodge regarding this issue. The property owners took exception to increasing and changing the current vertical zoning, which they obtained under their MPDs and CUPs. Mr. Sweeney believed the HPCA shared their concern. Mr. Sweeney stated that if any of the Commissioners were interested in seeing and learning how they actually conduct business on Lower Main Street, he would be happy to walk them through it. He has had 20 years of experience on Lower Main and he welcomed the opportunity to speak with any of the Commissioners.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Worel moved to CONTINUE Land Management Code Amendments regarding vertical zoning storefront regulations in Chapter 15-2.5-2 Uses in Historic Recreation Commercial (HRC), Chapter 15-2.6-2 Uses in Historic Commercial Business (HCB), and associated Definitions in Chapter 15-15 Defined Terms to October 15, 2015. Commissioner Joyce seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. 281 & 283 Deer Valley Drive – Plat Amendment to combine four lots into two single lots of record. (Application PL-15-02808)
2. 415 Main Street Plat Amendment to combine all of Lots 3 and 4, and a portion of Lot 5 into one (1) lot of record located in Block 10 of the Amended Plat of the Park City Survey (Application PL-15-02851)

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing on the Consent Agenda items.

There were no comments or requests to remove an item from the Consent Agenda.

There was some confusion as to whether or not a public hearing was necessary for Consent Agenda items, as well as the process for removing items from the Consent Agenda. Chair Strachan and Mr. Erickson stated that they would research the proper procedure and report back to the Planning Commission. Planner Whetstone stated that the Staff should also research proper noticing procedures for Consent Agenda items

MOTION: Commissioner Phillips moved to APPROVE the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Thimm seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 281 283 Deer Valley Drive

1. The property is located at 281 & 283 Deer Valley Drive.
2. The property is in the Residential (R-1) District.
3. The subject property consists of Lots 3, 4, 26, and 27, Block 66, of the Amended Plat of Park City Survey.
4. In 1981 a duplex dwelling was constructed on Lots 3, 4, 26, and 27.
5. The proposed plat amendment creates two (2) lots of record from the existing four (4) lots. As proposed, Lot 1 contains 3,295 SF and Lot 2 contains 3,425 SF.
6. A duplex dwelling is an allowed use in the Residential (R-1) District.
7. The minimum lot area for a duplex dwelling is 3,750 square feet; Lot 1 and Lot 2 at 281 & 283 Deer Valley Drive will be a total of 6,720 square feet. The proposed lots meet the minimum lot area for a duplex dwelling.
8. The minimum lot width for a duplex in the district is thirty-seven and one-half feet (37.5'). The proposed lots are each twenty-five feet (25') wide. The proposed lots do not meet the minimum lot width requirement for a duplex dwelling.
9. The setback requirements for the lot are a minimum front yard setback of fifteen feet (15'), a minimum side yard setback of five feet (5'), and a minimum rear setback of fifteen feet (15').
10. The existing duplex dwelling does not meet the current LMC setback requirements for the front and side yard setbacks. The existing front yard setback is fourteen feet (14') and the existing side yard setbacks are four and one-half foot (4.5') setback on the east side and a five and one-half (5.5') setback on the west side.
11. There is a zero foot (0') side yard setback between each unit of the duplex dwelling. Per Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-2.12-3 (F)(2), the Residential (R-1) District does not require a side yard between connected structures where the structures are designed with a common wall on a Property Line and the Lots are burdened with a party wall agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney and Chief Building Official.
12. On July 16, 2015 the applicant submitted a Non-Complying Structure Determination application. The application was deemed complete on July 22, 2015.
13. On July 23, 2015 the Planning Director determined that the existing duplex dwelling is a legal non-complying structure due to non-complying side yard setbacks, non-complying lot widths, and therefore, the existing structure and existing lot width may be maintained as a part of the proposed plat amendment.

14. There is an existing rock retaining wall on the east property line of Lot 3. The rock retaining wall encroaches onto the property of 295 Deer Valley Drive. The rock retaining wall also extends into the Public Right-of-Way.
15. There is an existing rock retaining wall on the west property line of Lot 4. The rock retaining wall encroaches onto the property of 267 Deer Valley Drive. The rock retaining wall also extends into the Public Right-of-Way.
16. The proposed plat amendment will not cause undo harm to adjacent property owners.
17. The proposed lot area of 3,295 square feet (Lot 1) and 3,425 square feet (Lot 2) are compatible lot combinations as the entire Residential-D1is(tRri-c1t)has abundant sites with the same dimensions.
18. On October 9, 2014, an At-Risk Building Permit (BD-14-20000) was approved by the Planning Department and Building Department for the construction of an addition and remodel to the existing non-historic duplex dwelling.
19. The applicant applied for a Plat Amendment application on June 8, 2015. The Plat Amendment application was deemed complete on June 18, 2015.
20. All findings within the Analysis section and the recitals above are incorporated herein as findings of fact.

Conclusions of Law – 281 & 283 Deer Valley Drive

1. The Plat Amendment is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding lot combinations.
2. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed Plat Amendment.
3. Approval of the Plat Amendment, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.
4. There is good cause for this plat amendment in that it creates two legal lots of record and resolves existing non-complying issues.

Conditions of Approval 281 & 283 Deer Valley Drive

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant will record the plat at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one (1) years' time, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.

3. A ten feet (10') wide public snow storage easement will be required along the Deer Valley Drive frontage of the property and shall be shown on the plat prior to recordation.
4. The east rock retaining wall can either be removed, or the property owner must enter into an encroachment agreement with the owner(s) of 295 Deer Valley Drive and with the City for the Public Right-of-Way.
5. The west rock retaining wall can either be removed, or the property owner must enter into an encroachment agreement with the owner(s) of 267 Deer Valley Drive and with the City for the Public Right-of-Way.
6. The structures must be designed with a party wall agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney and Chief Building Official.
7. 13-D sprinklers are required for any new construction or significant renovation of existing.
8. Separate utility meters must be installed for each unit.
9. Easements for utilities must be determined and established.

Findings of Fact – 415 Main Street

1. The Miner's Plaza Plat Amendment is located at 415 Main Street within the Historic Commercial Business (HCB) District.
2. The Miner's Plaza Plat Amendment at 415 Main Street consists of Lots 3, 4, and a portion of Lot 5 of Block 10 of the Amended Plat of the Park City Survey.
3. On July 8, 2015, the applicants submitted an application for a plat amendment to combine Lots 3, 4, and a portion of Lot 5 containing a total of 4,500 square feet into one (1) lot of record.
4. The application was deemed complete on July 15, 2015.
5. The lots at 415 Main Street currently contain an existing restroom building and landscaping improvements.
6. The HCB zone requires a minimum lot size of 1,250 square feet. The proposed lot size is 4,500 square feet.
7. The maximum floor area ratio (FAR) allowed in the HCB zone is 4.0. Currently, the site has an FAR of 0.076.
8. The HCB zone does not have a minimum front, rear and side yard setbacks. The existing restrooms building has a front yard setback of 51 feet, rear yard setback of 9 feet, north (side) yard setback of 30 feet and south (side) yard of 0 feet. These comply with the LMC.
9. The current restroom building is 12.85' in height, and complies with the height requirements of the HCB zone.
10. No parking is required as this is a public plaza.

11. The parcel currently has improvements that extend beyond the interior property lines, including the existing public restrooms building, concrete pads, wood landing, retaining walls, planting beds, and other landscape features.
12. The house and deck at 416 Park Avenue encroach about six inches (6") for a length of six feet six inches (6'6") along the west property line of Lot 5.

Conclusions of Law – 415 Main Street

1. There is good cause for this plat amendment.
2. The plat amendment is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding subdivisions.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed plat amendment.
4. Approval of the plat amendment, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval – 415 Main Street

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat amendment for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant will record the plat amendment at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year's time, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a complete application requesting an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.
3. Recordation of this plat and completion and approval of a final Historic District Design Review (HDDR), applications are required prior to building permit issuance for any construction on the proposed lot.
4. The applicant shall provide a private sewer lateral easement for the benefit of 416 Park Avenue, 424 Park Avenue, and 419 Main Street.
5. The property owner must enter into an encroachment agreement with the owner(s) of 416 Park Avenue for the existing historic house and deck located on the west property line of lot 5.
6. Modified 13-D sprinklers will be required for new construction by the Chief Building Official at the time of review of the building permit submittal and shall be noted on the final mylar prior to recordation.

REGULAR AGENDA - DISCUSSION/PUBLIC HEARINGS/ POSSIBLE ACTION

1. **900 Round Valley Drive – Pre-Master Planned Development review for an amendment to the IHC Master Planned Development (Application PL-15-02695)**

Commissioner Worel disclosed that her office is located on the IHC Campus; however, that would not affect her ability to discuss and vote on this item.

Planner Whetstone reviewed the request for an amendment to the Intermountain Healthcare MPD. This was a MPD pre-application, which IHC is required to present to the Planning Commission and the public prior to submitting a formal Master Planned Development amendment application. Planner Whetstone explained that the Code tasks the Staff and the Planning Commission with finding that the requested concept is generally consistent with the zone, the existing Master Plan and Development Agreement, and with the General Plan. She noted that the IHC Campus is located in the Commercial Transition (CT) Zone. Planner Whetstone remarked that this pre-application request was being reviewed under the newly adopted General Plan. The Staff had conducted an analysis for compliance with the General Plan.

Planner Whetstone noted that the Staff report outlined five amendments; two of which the Staff was requesting to be continued. The three items for consideration this evening were 1) the Affordable Housing Plan and the question of locating the Peace House on Lot 8; 2) The subdivision of Lot 8 in to two lots; and 4) Administrative adjustments to conditions and the Development Agreement. The Staff report contained background information on the action the Housing Authority took in terms of the Peace House and how it could satisfy a portion of the remaining affordable housing obligation. Planner Whetstone commented on the request to subdivide Lot 8, which is where the Peace House is proposed to be located. It is a large lot and the request is to subdivide Lot 8 into one smaller parcel and one larger parcel; and to provide a lease on the smaller portion for the Peace House. The last item for discussion this evening related to the previous Master Planned Development approval amendment and the Conditional Use Permit that the Planning Commission recently approved. She noted that currently there is only an Annexation Agreement and they would like to turn that into a Development Agreement in order to address all of the issues on the campus.

Planner Whetstone stated that the Staff was requesting continuance on Item 3) a request for an additional 50,000 square feet of density for the Park City Medical Center for support medical uses; and 5) the appropriateness of a Park City Fire District station within the MPD. The Staff needed additional time to research these items and would bring them back to the Planning Commission on September 9th with Findings.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing on Items 1, 3 and 4 and discuss these items to determine whether or not there is consistency with the General Plan.

Morgan Bush, representing IHC, referred to page 101 of the Staff report regarding the Affordable Housing component. He stated that during a meeting last Fall the Planning Commission requested that IHC do more due diligence and talk about affordable housing for future phases of expansion on the hospital campus. Mr. Bush reported that since that meeting they have been working with Peace House to consider locating Peace House on a portion of the hospital campus. IHC has signed a lease with Peace House for Lot 8. It is a 40 year ground lease with a ten year extension for \$1 a year. He explained that the intent is to use 3.6 acres of Lot 8 on Round Valley Drive, the back loop road that is the fire road that should not be used by the public. They would like to eventually subdivide that portion and retain it as part of IHC property.

Mr. Bush stated that IHC went to the Park City Housing Authority to get questions clarified as to how much affordable housing credit IHC could get for the Peace House. He understood that because Peace House received \$980,000 funding from the County as part of the Tanger Outlet Mall, that portion of the project could not be used by IHC for affordable housing because it was already satisfying another affordable housing obligation. Mr. Bush stated that for the remainder of the project the Housing Authority determined that there were 12.5 affordable housing units that would be available for IHC to use as part of their additional affordable housing. Mr. Bush proposed that those 12.5 units be considered as the next phase of their Affordable Housing; and that it be the only affordable housing placed on this campus. He emphasized that IHC would not want to provide additional residential units on-site because it is not consistent with how the campus works.

Mr. Bush stated that the 12.5 units would meet all of the projected need. As the hospital plans for future expansion in the next three to ten years, they have identified up to 90,000 square feet of additional hospital expansion, and that density already exists under the annexation agreement. However, the affordable housing needs to be provided before IHC can proceed with that expansion. Mr. Bush remarked that IHC was proposing that Peace House be allowed to proceed and be the affordable housing component of the plan for Phase 2 of the hospital expansion projects. In terms of the remaining affordable obligations that would be required for full buildout after 2025, IHC has been talking with the City Sustainability Department regarding the possibility of either participating in an employee support program for affordable housing, or they would have to purchase units in another housing project to satisfy those requirements. Therefore, the intent would be that the remaining 10.8 units of affordable housing associated with the full buildout phase would be provided off campus. Mr. Bush remarked that this was the affordable housing concept

they were proposing in fulfillment of the request by the Planning Commission last fall.

Doug Clyde, representing Peace House, stated that he has been involved in developing the site plan for Peace House. He remarked that it has been a long and cooperative relationship with IHC that meets the needs of the future of the Peace House. Mr. Clyde explained that the mission of the Peace House was changing going forward. Peace house is currently a small 3,000 square foot facility at an undisclosed location. It has been there over 20 years and it works well for the current need of interrupting violence. Mr. Clyde stated that the future of organizations like the Peace House is to provide a more complete facility. The Peace House plan for the IHC campus is to provide a facility that provides not only a short-term interruption of violence, but to also provide a platform for a transition back to normal life. Mr. Clyde stated that in addition to the current short-term component where people stay two weeks to two months, there would also be a larger component of transitional housing in which they would stay one to two years. Transitional housing and the associated support elements do more than just interdict immediate violence. It enables people to put their lives back together.

Mr. Clyde stated that under the proposed plan the emergency shelter portion would move out and expand, there would be twelve units of transitional housing, and a larger amount of support, which includes child care, counseling, recreation facilities, staff for the Peace House, as well as other uses. Mr. Clyde pointed out that it would be a different Peace House in a 40,000 square foot facility.

Mr. Clyde provided a handout outlining the Mission of Peace House, as well as the Overview of the Peace House Community Campus. The back page of the handout contained a site plan for the Peace House. Mr. Clyde explained the process up to this point. They were now selecting a final architect and getting ready to do hard architecture. They would be coming back to the Planning Commission with a conditional use permit application.

Mr. Clyde reviewed the site plan and noted that the space on Lot 8 would give Peace House a public face. People from the street can learn about who they are and it will be a place where their Boards could meet. It will be a place to educate the public as well as protect and transition the victims. Mr. Clyde stated that being in a location with public access is important, but it is also important to be in a location with safe surroundings. He noted that a potential fire station is under consideration, which would be another benefit in terms of safety and security.

Mr. Bush commented on the three conditions from the last MPD meeting. He noted that Condition #16 states that, "The Staff and the applicant shall verify that all items relating to the planned ballfield mitigation had been completed". Mr. Bush stated that it was noted

during the meeting that it had been completed; however, the Condition did not match what was discussed in the hearing. He requested that it be corrected for the record.

Mr. Bush noted that Condition #17 states, "The applicant shall conduct and present a parking study one year after occupancy of the north building". He recalled that it was recommended by Staff, but based on their discussion he understood that instead of doing the parking study now, it should be done in conjunction with the next hospital expansion. Mr. Bush requested that it be corrected for the record.

Mr. Bush stated that Condition #18 relates to a Development Agreement. IHC supports having a Development Agreement that incorporates the Annexation Agreement, the MPD and the two amendments so everything is in one document. It would make it easier for IHC and the Staff to monitor to make sure they were fulfilling all the obligations that were agreed to.

Mr. Bush summarized that the items for discussion this evening were the Peace House, Affordable Housing and the corrections to the Conditions of Approval from October 2014.

Commissioner Worel stated that in looking at the proposed site plan the campus appeared to be fenced. Mr. Clyde replied that there would be multiple layers of security but there would be no perimeter fencing.

Commissioner Joyce wanted to know what would happen with the building if for any reason the Peace House might go away in the future. Mr. Clyde stated that if Peace House were to fail the facility would default to the landlord, and they would be responsible to continue using it to fulfill their affordable housing obligation.

Commissioner Joyce questioned why Peace House had chosen this location for transitional housing when there were no support services in the area other than medical. Mr. Clyde stated that it was a complicated issue. They want a public face but it still needs to be sequestered from the general public. It would be impractical to implement the type of security that Peace House needs inside an urban environment. Transitional housing is a secure site and no outside visitors are allowed, except under special circumstances. In many respects they have to blend the need for different levels of security with how to interface with the public.

Chair Strachan understood that 40,000 square feet was the intended structure. He asked for the number of total AUs. Mr. Clyde replied that without having a hard number on the square footage he estimated approximately 20 AUs. There would be 12 transitional studio units with lockout bedrooms, which would be slightly over 1 UE; and eight emergency shelter units with lockouts as well. However, the emergency shelter units would not have

cooking facilities. Chair Strachan clarified that 12 units would go to the Hospital and 8 units would go to Summit County for a total of 20 AUs. Mr. Clyde answered yes.

Commissioner Joyce noted that the Hospital has been operational for quite a while and the second phase was fast approaching; however, they have not built any of the 28 affordable housing units that IHC was putting in Park City Heights to fulfill their obligation. He understood that part of the delay was tied to delays in Park City Heights. Commissioner Joyce remarked that a few months ago he heard that some of the Park City Heights units were starting to be sold, and that the affordable housing units would be sold over the next five to ten years. Commissioner Joyce found it unacceptable to have a hospital project with an affordable housing commitment that goes from being built and open for years to being expanded without seeing one unit of affordable housing. The Peace House would be the first affordable component primarily because Peace House has a deadline to meet.

Commissioner Joyce understood that the City was doing a lot of work with Affordable Housing, but he was frustrated with the process. Another example was the obligation for worker housing for PCMR that was never built. Commissioner Joyce suggested that the City should begin to require that the affordable housing be built and occupied before a certificate of occupancy is issued for the remainder of the project.

Mr. Bush recalled that Commissioner Joyce had made this same comment at the October meeting. He understood that moving forward IHC needs to have the affordable housing projects or programs in place before they bring plans for any future hospital expansion. Mr. Bush stated that IHC was committed to working with partners in the community to meet their affordable housing obligation.

Commissioner Joyce appreciated that Mr. Bush understood his concern. He emphasized that the problem was not just with the Hospital, and that it was important to establish a policy that would apply to every project with an affordable housing obligation.

Mr. Erickson reported that he and Planner Whetstone were already looking into the delays at Park City Heights. He asked Mr. Bush to explain IHC's agreement with Park City Heights on building the first set of affordable units. Mr. Morgan stated that it goes back to the Annexation Agreement and the agreement that was struck as part of the Annexation. He explained that the IHC Board has said that Intermountain Health Care is not in the housing business and they should partner with other entities to build the affordable housing units. Mr. Bush stated that Burbidge and Ivory Development took the responsibility for the required 44.78 affordable units as part of the Annexation and Sales Agreement for the land. Therefore, IHC has not been involved in the actual Park City Heights projects. He noted that Burbidge had to put up a bond as part of the Park City Heights project, and Lot 4

of the IHC campus was deeded to the City as part of the affordable housing contribution. That was the extent of what IHC was obligated to do under the Annexation.

Mr. Erickson stated that building the affordable housing required of this project was critical and it would be resolved before the City allows the next phase of this pre-master plan. He offered to come back with more specific information for the Planning Commission at the next meeting. In addition, the Commissioners were welcome to visit the Planning Department to discuss the matter. Mr. Erickson agreed with Commissioner Joyce's suggestion to amend the LMC to build the affordable housing units early in the project; and he was willing to have that discussion.

Planner Whetstone noted that the Annexation Agreement was included in the Staff report, and pages 130 and 131 contained a section on affordable housing. Planner Whetstone reported that she was currently working with Rhoda Stauffer, the City Affordable Housing Specialist, on a training program for the Planning Commission regarding the affordable housing resolutions and the program itself. She thought it would be helpful for the Planning Commission to understand the resolutions and all the amendments, and they would schedule that training as soon as possible. Chair Strachan thought it would be helpful if Ms. Stauffer could attend the next scheduled meeting with IHC.

Chair Strachan referred to Ms. Stauffer's report in the Staff report, and noted that the City Council, as the Housing Authority, was asked whether they supported granting the exemption of density for the Summit County units with the understanding that any future density granted would be reduced by those units. He wanted to know how the Housing Authority had responded. Planner Whetstone replied that the Housing Authority agreed that if IHC is successful in gaining density, the County units should be taken from that density. However, it was only their recommendation and the Planning Commission would make the final decision.

Mr. Clyde pointed out that money from Summit County was building some of the density. In looking at the global picture, he thought the City might want to take a more generous view on that issue. The County is spending money to put affordable housing in the City that would service the City and the County. He suggested that it may be unreasonable to tell the County that they need to spend money to buy units to transfer in to cover the affordable housing units the County was building for the City's benefit. He thought there might be a more cooperative way to handle the issue.

Mr. Erickson bifurcated the Lot 8 and Peace House issues this evening. The remaining items would be continued to a future meeting.

Chair Strachan thought the Lot 8 subdivision was tied to the Summit County units and the two could not be separated. Mr. Clyde stated that based on the nature of the lease, Peace House is not dependent on the subdivision of Lot 8. If the subdivision is not approved, Peace House has the entire lot. Mr. Bush remarked that the only entitlement that Peace House is required to get for the lease is the MPD amendment making it a permitted use for affordable housing, and approval of the CUP. Mr. Bush explained that IHC would like to subdivide Lot 8, but it would not affect the lease with Peace House.

Chair Strachan agreed with Mr. Clyde that the City needs to give a little as well. He was concerned about double-dipping where IHC would benefit from both the County and the City's affordable housing obligations. Chair Strachan was uncomfortable with the language in the Staff report stating, "Through agreements with other entities and transfer of development on certain parcels, the housing obligation was reduced by 22.37 AUEs." He thought it emphasized Commissioner Joyce's point about building the affordable units. Chair Strachan understood the give and take between the City and County, but at the same time IHC needed to understand that the Planning Commission expected to see built units. They cannot keep shifting things around and transferring parcels. Chair Strachan anticipated a problem with the subdivision because it could increase the density.

Mr. Bush clarified that the purpose of the subdivision was to enable them to keep the required 80% open space on site. It was not planned for development. Planner Whetstone pointed out that the parcel was mostly wetlands. Mr. Bush reminded the Commissioners that the density on Lot 8 was transferred last Fall; therefore, there is no density on Lot 8. The request for additional density for support medical was an item for a future conversation. Chair Strachan believed the two were intertwined. By giving the Peace House a generous lease of \$1 per year, he assumed that IHC would need to recoup the money somehow by finding additional square footage on a different piece of the campus.

Chair Strachan pointed out that this was a pre-MPD and there would be time to have the necessary in-depth discussions. At this point he could not find anything that would deny their request, but there was still a lot of work to resolve the issues.

Commissioner Thimm referred to a number of places in the report indicating that the Staff was seeking commentary. Mr. Erickson stated that if the Commissioners provided commentary this evening it should focus on Lot 8 and Peace House. He was also interested in hearing their comments regarding affordable housing. Planner Whetstone provided some background on deferments and transfers related to the affordable housing obligation.

Commissioner Band asked Planner Whetstone to walk through the site plan to orient the Commissioners to the entire site and the lots. Planner Whetstone did not have a site plan available, but she reviewed the plat and identified the specific lots and general layout of the site.

Per the questions on page 102 of the Staff reports, Chair Strachan asked if anyone had concerns regarding the location of the Peace House. The Commissioners had no issues. Chair Strachan asked if the Commissioners thought the Peace House was consistent with the General Plan. Commissioner Thimm supported the use. The Commissioners had no issues. Based on previous comments, Chair Strachan tabled the questions regarding the subdivision of Lot 8 to another meeting. The Commissioners concurred.

Chair Strachan reviewed the Conditions of Approval of the October 8th, 2014 approval. Condition #16 addressed the mitigation for the loss of use of the planned ballfield. The Staff report indicated that the Condition was a carryover from the MPD and that the applicant had satisfied the Condition as stated in Finding of Fact #21. The Commissioners were comfortable with the Staff's response.

Condition #17 related to the parking study. Commissioner Joyce recalled a lengthy discussion regarding the parking study. The question at that time was whether the applicant should come back in one year with a traffic study. During that discussion the Planning Commission determined that nothing would change in a year and a study would be pointless. He recalled that the Planning Commission decided not to require a parking study until IHC comes back with a relevant proposal to expand the hospital. IHC would be required to submit a parking study as part of the application for the next expansion. The Commissioners had the same recollection.

Mr. Erickson thought they should include a time threshold when they write the Master Planned Development Agreement and incorporate the Annexation. Mr. Bush suggested that they tie the parking study to the next Hospital CUP. Commissioner Joyce favored that approach because it was more in line with their previous decision. The Commissioners concurred.

Chair Strachan noted that Condition #18 was a Development Agreement question with affordable housing obligations. He suggested that they table the discussion until they have the affordable housing discussion at the next meeting. Mr. Bush was not opposed to tabling the discussion. He remarked that the intent is to have a Development Agreement at the conclusion of this MPD amendment process. He thought it was better to wait until they could have a more detailed discussion and talk about all the potential elements of amending the MPD.

Chair Strachan asked the Commissioners for their thoughts on the question about locating a Park City District fire station within the IHC MPD. Commissioner Band stated that she has been talking to Paul about this for over a year. As a real estate agent she was trying to help him find a parcel because the District is in desperate need of a fire station. They need a lot of space, but they also need to be close to roads and intersections. The Fire District found space on City property but she believed they would rather deal with a private entity if possible. Commissioner Band personally did not think the fire station should be counted as density because it is a public service.

Commissioner Thimm agreed that essential public services should be located when and where they are needed. He noted that part of the question is whether or not the CT zone allows for a fire station use. His reading of the zone is that it allows public and quasi-public, civic and municipal uses; and he believed that a fire station would fall somewhere within that category. Commissioner Thimm stated that it would be a conditional use that would come before the Planning Commission and he would support it. Commissioner Thimm did not think the area of the fire station should detract from the allowed density that was approved.

Mr. Erickson believed the density issue required cross discussion with other City departments and the people who crafted the density equation. The Staff would bring this back to the Planning Commission for further discussion. Commissioner Band wanted to know why the Annexation Agreement had a different density number than the MPD. Mr. Erickson stated that he and the Staff were looking into why that happened. He did not have an answer this evening, but he hoped to be able to answer that question at a later date. Another question he would like to be able to answer is how many unit equivalents are in the Quinn's Junction area total, and how many have been used up by the hospital in this particular development. Mr. Erickson remarked that the Staff would research the background on the UEs and report back to the Planning Commission.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

The Commissioners were prepared to make a motion but needed guidance on how to phrase it.

Based on their discussion, Mr. Erickson suggested that the Planning Commission motion should be to find that the Pre-MPD application was consistent with the General Plan and Zoning for the location and use of the Peace House on Lot 8; Administrative adjustments to

Conditions #16 and #17 in the Development Agreement, but not Condition #18; and for a Park City fire station generally within the MPD as discussed this evening.

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce made the motion as phrased by the Interim Planning Director Bruce Erickson, to find that the Pre-MPD application was consistent with the General Plan and Zoning for the location and use of the Peace House on Lot 8; Administrative adjustments to Conditions #16 and #17 in the Development Agreement, but not Condition #18; and for a Park City fire station generally within the MPD as discussed this evening. Commissioner Band seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – Items 1, 2 and 4

1. On February 18, 2015, the City received a completed application for a pre-Application for a Master Planned Development amendment located at 750 Round Valley Drive.
2. The proposed MPD Amendment includes the following main items:
 - Fulfillment and phasing of the IHC MPD Affordable Housing Obligation
 - Subdivision of Lot 8 into two lots
 - Additional 50 units of density to bring total density to 3 units/acre from the existing density of 2.64 units/acre (continue to Sept 9)
 - Corrections to conditions of the October 8, 2014 approvals (MPD Amendment)
 - Amendment to the Development Agreement
 - Consideration of inclusion of a Fire Station within the MPD (Continue to September 9)
3. A full MPD application, and a Conditional Use Permit for construction of the Peace House, will be required to include a site plan, landscaping plan, a phasing plan, utility and grading plans, traffic and parking study updates, open space calculations, architectural elevations, view shed studies, sensitive lands analysis, affordable housing mitigation plan, soils/mine hazard studies as applicable, density analysis, and other MPD requirements as outlined in LMC Chapter 6, including any additional items requested by the Planning Commission at the pre- MPD meeting.
4. The property is zoned Community Transition (CT).
5. There is no minimum lot size in the CT zone.
6. The base density in the CT Zone is 1 unit per 20 acres. Maximum density allowed in the Community Transition (CT) Zoning District for non-residential projects is 3 units per acre provided that all Density bonus requirements set forth in LMC Section 15-

- 2.23A are met and the additional standards are incorporated into the amended Master Planned Development.
7. The MPD Amendment includes a proposal to locate the Peace house, with transitional housing, shelter housing and support services, to the eastern 3.6 acres of Lot 8 to satisfy 12.5 AUEs of remaining 23.32 AUEs of housing obligation (not including any additional requirements associated with any approved additional density). IHC offers the lot for Peace House use at a nominal cost of \$1 per year as a “ground” lease.
 8. The above affordable housing strategy for the Peace House was approved by the Park City Housing Authority on June 4, 2015.
 9. Access to the property is from Round Valley Drive, a public street.
 10. The property is subject to the IHC/USSA/Burbidge Annexation plat and Annexation Agreement recorded at Summit County on January 23, 2007.
 11. On May 23, 2007, the Planning Commission approved a Master Planned Development for the IHC aka Park City Medical Center as well as a Conditional Use Permit for Phase One. Phase One included a 122,000 square foot hospital building (with an additional 13,000 square feet of constructed, unfinished shell space) with 50,000 square feet of medical offices. Two separate medical support buildings were proposed in the initial phase of development, including the Physician’s Holding building on Lot 7 and the People’s Health Center/ Summit County Health offices building on Lot 10 (25,000 sf each).
 12. On November 25, 2008, a final subdivision plat known as the Subdivision Plat (Amended) for the Intermountain Healthcare Park City Medical Campus/USSA Headquarters and Training Facility was approved and recorded at Summit County
 13. On October 8, 2014 the Planning Commission approved MPD amendments for Phase 2 construction. These MPD Amendments transferred 50,000 sf of support medical clinic uses to Lot 1 from Lots 6 and 8 (25,000 sf each).
 14. A requirement for any Master Planned Development (MPD) (or amendment to an MPD) is a pre-application public meeting and determination of compliance with the Park City General Plan and the purpose and uses of the zoning district (CT) in this case.
 15. The CT zone per LMC Section 15-2.23-2 allows for a variety of uses including conservation and agriculture activities; different types of housing and alternative living situations and quarters; trails and trailhead improvements; recreation and outdoor related uses; public, quasi public, civic, municipal and institutional uses; hospital and other health related services; athlete training, testing, and related programs; group care facilities, ancillary support commercial uses; transit facilities and park and ride lots; small wind energy systems; etc.
 16. It was determined at the time of the annexation and approval of the MPD that the Intermountain Healthcare Hospital (aka Park City Medical Center) and associated support medical offices are consistent with the purpose and uses of the zone.

17. The proposed Peace House use is consistent with existing uses and is consistent with the CT Zone and Goals of the General Plan for the Quinn's Junction Neighborhood.
18. The Land Management Code (LMC 15-6-4(B)) describes the pre- Application process for MPDs and MPD amendments.
19. The purpose of the pre-application public meeting is to have the applicant present preliminary concepts and give the public an opportunity to respond to those concepts prior to submittal of the MPD amendment application.
20. IHC is located in the Quinn's Junction neighborhood, as described in the new Park City General Plan.
21. The Joint Planning Principles for the Quinn's Junction area recommend development patterns of clustered development balanced with preservation of open space. Public preserved open space and recreation is the predominant existing land use. Clustered development should be designed to enhance public access through interconnection of trails, preserve public use and enjoyment of these areas, and continue to advance these goals along with the preservation of identified view sheds and passive open space areas. New development should be set back in compliance with the Entry Corridor Protection Overlay. Sensitive Lands should be considered in design and protected. Uses contemplated for this neighborhood include institutional development limited to hospital, educational facilities, recreation, sports training, arts, cultural heritage, etc.
22. The proposed MPD amendments are consistent with the intent of the Joint Planning Principles for the Quinn's Junction area.
23. Amendments to the IHC MPD are a compatible use in this neighborhood. Development is setback from the Entry Corridor to preserve the open view from SR 248. Sensitive wetland areas should be protected and taken into consideration in design of driveways, parking lots, and buildings, as well as protected from impacts of proposed uses.
24. Small Town Goals of the General Plan include protection of undeveloped land; discourage sprawl, and direct growth inward to strengthen existing neighborhoods. Alternative modes of transportation are encouraged and the MPD/CUP for the Peace House will need to describe alternative transportation related to the Peace House operations and residents.
25. Quinn's Junction is identified as a Development Node. The proposed MPD amendments include uses to provide a public location for the Peace House and support the existing IHC uses and mission. The housing proposed is short term transitional housing and emergency shelter housing in support of the Peace House mission.
26. There is existing City bus service to the area on an as needed basis and additional uses will help to validate additional services. Studies of transit and transportation in

- the Quinn's area will be important in evaluating the merits of the MPD amendments and considerations for permanent bus routes in the area.
27. The IHC and proposed Peace House Lot 8 are located on the City's trail system and adjacent to Round Valley open space and medical services.
 28. Natural Setting Goals of the General Plan include conserve a healthy network of open space for continued access to and respect for the natural setting. Goals also include energy efficiency and conservation of natural resources.
 29. With the proposed changes the MPD would require a minimum of 80% open space, excluding all hard surface areas, parking, driveways, and buildings.
 30. The proposed MPD amendments include relocating the existing Peace House to a location where the mission can be expanded and enhanced.
 31. Green building requirements are part of the existing Annexation Agreement and would continue to apply to the Peace House facility.
 32. Sense of Community Goals of the General Plan include creation of diversity of housing, including affordable housing; provision of parks and recreation opportunities; and provision of world class recreation and infrastructure to host local, regional, national, and international events while maintaining a balance with the sense of community.
 33. A primary reason for the proposed MPD amendments is to provide improvements and enhancements to allow the Peace House to relocate to a public location to continue to be successful and to carry out their mission. The proposed transitional housing will complement the shelter.
 34. On April 8, 2015, the Planning Commission opened a public hearing and continued the item to a date uncertain to allow City Staff to work out issues related to the affordable housing obligation. No public input was provided at the meeting.
 35. On August 12, 2015 the property was re-posted and letters were mailed to neighboring property owners per requirements of the Land Management Code.
 36. On August 8, 2015 a legal notice of the public hearing was published in the Park Record and placed on the Utah public meeting website.
 37. On August 26, 2015, the Planning Commission conducted a public hearing and discussed the pre-MPD for the IHC MPD amendment.
 38. At the pre-Application public meeting, the Applicant presented the preliminary concepts for the proposed Master Planned Development. This preliminary review focused on identifying issues of compliance with the General Plan and zoning compliance for the proposed MPD.

Conclusions of Law – Items 1, 2 and 4

1. The proposed MPD Amendments to the Intermountain Healthcare Hospital MPD initially comply with the intent of the Park City General Plan and general purposes of the Community Transition (CT) zone.

2. A full MPD application is required to be submitted and reviewed by City Staff with a recommendation provided to the Planning Commission prior to issuance of any building permits for construction related to these amendments.
3. The full MPD application will include typical MPD studies such as an updated traffic/intersection study, updated utility capacity study (including water, sewer, gas/electric, communications, etc.), a revised phasing plan, an affordable housing plan for remaining and new obligation, reports on any additional mine hazard or soils issues for revised building footprints, open space calculations, updated sensitive lands and wildlife reports, Frontage Protection Zone setback exhibit, parking analysis, and public benefits analysis.
4. A Conditional Use Permit application for construction of any phase of development within the MPD will be required prior to issuance of a building permit.
5. Typical CUP requirements include site plan, landscaping plan, phasing of construction, utility and grading plans, storm water plans, parking and circulation plans, open space calculations, architectural elevations and visual studies, materials and colors, specific geotechnical studies, etc.).
6. The MPD will be reviewed for compliance with the MPD requirements as outlined in LMC Chapter 6, the Annexation Agreement, the CT zone requirements, as well as any additional items requested by the Planning Commission at the pre-MPD meeting.
7. Finding a Pre-MPD application consistent with the General Plan and general purposes of the zone, does not indicate approval of the full MPD or subsequent Conditional Use Permits.
8. These findings are made prior to the Applicant filing a formal MPD Application.

The Park City Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:10 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: _____