

Chair Wintzer remarked that at one time a project was proposed with a road going all the way down the back. The Planning Commission rejected that plan because it was too great of an impact on the downhill neighbors to have a driveway in their backyard. Chair Wintzer agreed with the concept that putting houses on the flatter areas would be more buildable and create less impacts. However, the question is whether that could be done without putting a road in the backyards of existing residents. Chair Wintzer felt that six lots in general would generate too much traffic for a substandard road. It would require six cuts and that would be six less places to push snow. He favored the three lot plan, but with limits on size and footprint of the homes.

Commissioner Luskin echoed the comments of his fellow Commissioners. Currently, snow can be pushed off the steep side, however, if that corridor is blocked with houses, that would limit snow storage. Commissioner Luskin stated that he is familiar with the road because he rides his bike up there. He could not see that road being passable two-way in the winter. He preferred less density and orienting that density to minimize the impacts. Commissioner Luskin agreed that building on the flatter parts of Anchor Avenue is more appealing, but it also creates access issues. Commissioner Luskin asked if the excavation would require rock removal. He was told that it would, but that is typical for most excavation in Park City.

Planner Sintz summarized the direction. The Planning Commission preferred less density, primarily three lots. They were concerned about the capacity of Ridge Avenue and felt that six lots created too much impact for the road.

Jason Gyllenskog, representing the applicant, stated that he had included a cross section in his last submittal. He had a full-size scale of the cross section available this evening. Mr. Gyllenskog remarked that vacated Anchor is extremely steep. The flat area was an area of historic homes and Anchor was actually a walking path, not a street. He noted that the proposed houses would primarily be built in the flat area. He pointed out that there would be 30 feet from the back end of the lots on the downhill side before the houses even start into that flat area, and it would not encroach into the steep hill. There would be 15 foot setbacks from the existing road, which he believes is adequate snow storage.

In terms of building three levels, Mr. Gyllenskog presented a diagram showing three levels built in. The potential challenge for design professionals would be to get the steep pitch of 12/12 or 10/12 for the roof of the garage element. Mr. Gyllenskog stated that when the three lot plan was approved, the LMC was different and four levels were allowed. The house sizes proposed at that time were significantly larger. He anticipated negotiating reduced footprints and a total of three levels. Mr. Gyllenskog remarked that the excavation would not be dramatic into the hillside because it is set back.

Planner Sintz proposed that the Staff work with Mr. Gyllenskog and provide clear direction on what could be built on a proposed lot size based on the new ordinance. The Staff could provide that information at a future meeting. Mr. Gyllenskog stated that he would be prepared to address their concerns at the next meeting.

Planner Kirsten Whetstone reported that the Park City Heights Annexation was approved by the City Council on May 27, 2010 for 286 acres zoned CT, Community Transition. A pre-MPD meeting was held on August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2010 at which time the Planning Commission found initial compliance with the General Plan.

Planner Whetstone stated that the Master Plan Development proposes 239 residential dwellings on 239 acres. She presented slides of the zoning map, comparisons with other developments, and orientation of the Park City Heights projects with surrounding properties and highways. Planner Whetstone reviewed a color coded map showing the open spaces areas in green, city-owned properties in blue, the city limits and the annexation boundary in red.

Planner Whetstone remarked that the concept plan was reviewed in July and again in August. The minutes of those meetings were included in the Park City Heights binders provided to the Planning Commission by Staff. She referred to the bubble diagrams and previous comments for overlapping the bubbles. Planner Whetstone noted that the City Council had reviewed the concept plan as a co-owner.

Planner Whetstone reviewed the legend, noting that the pink was a combination of the Park City Heights affordable housing units and affordable obligations from Talisker. The 28 IHC units, which equate to 48 affordable housing unit equivalents, is an obligation from the IHC project that have not been constructed. Planner Whetstone remarked that the blue legend identified the 16 affordable housing units that would result if the 160 market rate units are approved.

Planner Whetstone noted that the entry had been revised and a garden feature was added.

Planner Whetstone explained that the Land Management Code requires a work session prior to public hearings. During the public hearing meeting, the Planning Commission would look for compliance with the MPD Sections of the Land Management Code, which includes compliance with the General Plan and the requirements of the zone. The MPD documents would be finalized following the public hearing and discussions. Following that process, the Development Agreement would be formally ratified by the Planning Commission.

Planner Whetstone reported that the Master Plan Development Review, Section 15-6-6, of the LMC, as well as the CT zone, are important to the review process. The Staff report outlined detailed items for the Planning Commission to consider in their review, such as density, setbacks, open space, off street parking, building height, site planning, landscape and streetscapes, sensitive lands, affordable housing and child care.

Planner Whetstone reviewed a timeline as outlined in the Staff report. The Planning Commission would discuss this MPD during the work session this evening. Public hearings would be scheduled in October, November and December. The October discussion would focus on transportation and traffic, trails, utilities, site plan overview, and environmental compliance. In November the issues for discussion would be neighborhood character, architectural design, recreation and amenities, and sustainable elements, including water. Another work session and public hearing would be held in December to ratify the draft development agreement. Final action would be requested in January 2011.

Planner Whetstone noted that the Planning Commission must also make findings A through H outlined in Section 15-6-6 of the LMC.

The objective of this work session was to allow the applicant the opportunity to respond to concerns raised at previous meetings, and for the Planning Commission to discuss the issues and provide direction. No action would be taken.

Commissioner Strachan read from LMC Section 15-6-6(J), "The MPD as conditioned meets the sensitive land requirements of the Land Management Code." He asked if that was only for MPD's that have parcels of land in SLO Districts. Planner Whetstone answered yes. Commissioner Strachan pointed out that 15-6-6(I) talks about sensitive lands compliance, but only in the SLO zones. He felt that (J) was more expansive and his interpretation of (J) was that all MPD's must meet the sensitive land requirements of the Land Management Code. Planner Whetstone remarked that the CT zone has its own review of the SLO.

Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean, understood that Commissioner Strachan was asking if the sensitive lands in (J) has to be part of the SLO, or if it just refers to sensitive lands in general. She noted that Sensitive Lands in 16-6-6(J) is capitalized. The definition of sensitive land reads, "Land designated as such by a sensitive lands analysis and as reflected on the official zoning map." Ms. McLean interpreted that to mean that the capitalized Sensitive Lands refers to the sensitive lands overlay.

Patrick Moffatt, representing the applicant, stated that they tried to incorporate the comments from the last meeting into their MPD proposal. Most of the issues related to the master plan layout and the land uses and he requested feedback from the Planning Commission to see if they were headed in the right direction.

Mr. Moffatt reported that their main focus in making revisions was integration of both market rate and affordable units. They also addressed integration between this project and Park City in general. He indicated a proposed park that could be used by the Park City population and the residents of Park City Heights. It can be the interface to make this project part of Park City and a fabric of the community.

Spencer White, representing the applicant, presented a slide of the master plan from the last meeting as a starting point to identify the revisions. Mr. White stated that for this meeting they focused on the entry area into the project and how to better integrate the affordable units with market rates units.

Mr. White reviewed the revised plan and stated that they looked at the entrance as a fresh approach. At the last meeting they talked about a sense of arrival and creating a neighborhood feel at the entrance. To accomplish that, they propose to put a park at the entrance. Coming into the project you will see a clubhouse with some type of commercial component. Mr. White stated that the park will have a grassy play area, community gardens, a splash pad, tot lots and a sitting area with stones to sit on. The intent is to make a connection between this park and the park in Prospect. A roundabout was added for traffic circulation.

Mr. White reviewed the mix of units identified by color. The bright green units were the IHC affordable units. Those will be a townhouse product with attached garages. The pink units were Park City Municipal Corp. affordable units, in both single family detached and some type of attached units. The orange color represented smaller market rate units. They worked with integrating product mix as well as affordable units. The market rate units would be smaller than cottages units and would mix well with the affordable units. Mr. White pointed out that the market rate units could be in the same price point as some of those affordable units. Chair Wintzer asked about the size of the units. Mr. White believed they were in the range of 1800 to 2500 square feet. He explained that the intent was to have the fronts face into green space and connect the units with sidewalks. Mr. White stated that visitor parking could be accommodated in the 50 foot power line corridor.

Mr. White remarked that the blue units shown on the slide were the CT zone affordable units that would meet the requirement of the CT zone. Those units were integrated throughout the project. Mr. White stated that because the purpose was to create a sense of neighborhood community at the entrance, it was important not to move the affordable units too far into the project. The applicants assumed that many of the larger homes would be second homes and may not be occupied as frequently as the cottages or other market rate units. Therefore, the density was concentrated towards the entrance.

Mr. White presented a rough sketch to show how they had incorporated the thoughts and ideas previously expressed by the Planning Commission, with the applicants' ideas for the project and unit mix. He had erred on the side of sketching units larger than they would probably be built. He assumed the footprints would be eliminated and/or buildings eliminated altogether. Mr. White stated that they were just beginning to focus on the size and types of units. The next phase would focus on a more specific site plan.

Mr. White recalled a previous consideration for a transit stop into the project. As an alternative, the drawings showed a transit stop on both sides of Old Dump Road close to the clubhouse. As the bus comes out from Park City going to the park and ride lot, it could drop people off and pick them up on the way back into town. A mail kiosk would be located by the clubhouse. Mr. White emphasized that they are trying to create a community gathering area with well-used and welcomed amenities.

Mr. White addressed Commissioner Strachan's comments regarding the SLO. He noted that the entire proposal, including roads, is outside of any sensitive lands. Commissioner Strachan asked how they determined which lands were sensitive. Mr. White replied that it goes back to the LMC, which identifies wetlands, flood plains, slopes over 30%, ridge lines and other issues outlined in the sensitive lands overlay section. Commissioner Strachan asked if the applicants or the Staff had made that determination. Mr. White stated and the applicants, the Staff and the Task Force were involved in making that determination.

Chair Wintzer assumed the green buildings would be duplexes and triplexes. Mr. White answered yes. Chair Wintzer asked for the size of the proposed play field. He was told that it would be close to the size of a soccer field. Mr. White explained that the smaller units would not have much yard

space and the intent for the field was to provide a place where people can play. Chair Wintzer agreed with the concept. Chair Wintzer asked if the "living room" area in the park would be a landscape feature where people could sit to relax. Mr. White replied that this was correct. He stated that it would be similar to the area behind Red Butte gardens where sitting on the stones is similar to sitting on a sofa. As the trails connection come down, it would provide a place where people can sit outside.

Chair Wintzer asked about the splash park. Mr. White stated that it would be a small outdoor fountain with the same idea as the larger fountain at Gateway or other malls. Chair Wintzer was not opposed, but he questioned the logic in Park City's climate. Mr. White stated that it could be used for ice skating in the winter. Chair Wintzer clarified that the tot park would be a normal playground.

Commissioner Luskin asked if Mr. White was serious when he mentioned ice skating. Mr. White explained that the east side of the entrance road is the low spot of the project where they will probably be doing storm detention. He noted that Willow Creek Park in the Basin has a small ice rink. The Snyderville Basin Recreation District has a small Zamboni and the rink is heavily used. As a preliminary idea, they may consider ice skating at Park City Heights for a winter activity. Commissioner Luskin favored the idea.

Chair Wintzer asked Mr. White to explain the community garden concept. Mr. White replied that it would be raised boxes where people could sign up for a specific area and maintain it as their garden through the summer months. Mr. Moffatt pointed out that the garden would be open to the community at large and not just residents of Park City Heights.

Commissioner Luskin recalled a previous discussion about possible commercial space. Mr. White replied that the only space for commercial would be in the clubhouse itself. He sees the clubhouse as a gathering spot, with the possibility of an attached commercial component. He suggested that the commercial may only be open in the summer months, such as an ice-cream shop. The developer could build the commercial space and then lease it for the summer at no charge. The space could also be used as office space. Mr. White commented on a number of local developments that tried a commercial component and failed. Commissioner Luskin envisioned something more like a mini-mart. Mr. Moffatt stated that Boyer Company does a lot of retail and in their experience, 239 units is not enough to entice an operator to that location.

Chair Wintzer asked if they expected people to drive into town to purchase a quart of milk. Mr. White stated that typically people will stop on their way home to buy items such as milk. In those types of developments, people rarely run to the store for a simple item. They will first ask their neighbors. In their experience, mini-marts do not function economically.

Chair Wintzer wanted to know the size of the smallest affordable housing unit. Mr. White stated that it would depend on the type of unit. Chair Wintzer assumed the units in the project could range from 1,000 square feet and go up to 6,000 square feet for the houses at the top. Mr. White replied that this was correct. There would be a significant range in both affordable and market units. Chair Wintzer believed that the smaller units could use all the amenities.

Mr. White explained the reason for going to an alley-loaded product. He pointed out that the first

visible garage would be on the units that were not color-coded on the slide. Some of those units would have shared driveways with side entrance garages. You would go a significant distance after the entering the project before you would see be a garage. He believed that responded to Commissioner Peek's concern about having "a garage in your face". Chair Wintzer stated that it was two issues. One was the "garage in your face" and the other was the issue of forcing all activity to the back side of the house if the garage fronts a busy road. Putting the garages in the alley allows people to sit on their front porch and interact with their neighbors. Chair Wintzer believed this was a much better plan than what was originally proposed.

Chair Wintzer liked how they had removed the units off of the Dump Road. He expected the Dump Road would eventually become busier as a back road into Park City. Chair Wintzer referred to the green and orange units and wanted to know who would own the pale green grass. Mr. White stated that it would be a combination of community property and lot property. Mr. Moffatt remarked that the majority of the space would be a common area for maintenance purposes. Each house would have a small patch for private ownership. Chair Wintzer preferred more common space to insure that the area is maintained.

Commissioner Peek asked if the multi-family affordable units would have primarily surface parking. Mr. White believed that IHC plans on having garages for their units. Phyllis Robinson noted that the City is also looking at garages for the City's affordable units. Commissioner Peek wanted to know if the public had expressed any concern for living adjacent to high voltage power lines. Mr. White was unsure. Mr. Moffatt stated that Boyer Company has another project in the valley where there are both steel poles and wooden poles. There has been no resistance to the brown wooden poles in terms of marketing and sales. However, the lines from steel towers do impact the values. Planner Whetstone offered to research that question with the Power Company. Mr. White clarified that market units, as well as affordable units, were located in close proximity to the power corridor.

Chair Wintzer referred to the blue units on the slide and assumed they were approximately the same size as the units next to them. Mr. White answered yes, and clarified that there would be no visible indication as to which units are affordable. Chair Wintzer remarked that all the affordable units back up against Highway 40 and he preferred to see them interspersed a little more. Mr. White was willing to re-arrange the mix of units.

Commissioner Luskin complimented the applicants on a good plan; however, he was not convinced that the development carries out the resort character of Park City. He believes that a priority for the Planning Commission is to preserve the character and resort aspect of Park City. He asked Mr. White for his viewpoint on how this ties in and if it could be improved.

Mr. White acknowledged his own confusion because everyone has their own idea of what "resort" means. It is unclear if it is Old Town, Park Meadows, Silver Star, or affordable housing. In his personal opinion, it is a combination of all of them. Commissioner Luskin suggested that it may be defined architecturally. Mr. White agreed that architecture is a large part of it, primarily in terms of materials and colors. Chair Wintzer believed that another major component is how people interact within a neighborhood.

Commissioner Peek was not willing to give up on the neighborhood commercial aspect at this point.

Mr. White clarified that the applicants were trying not giving up on some type of commercial that may work; however, from their experience, commercial in other projects have failed. Commissioner Peek suggested that connectivity to the tunnel and over to the sports complex may create activity for the commercial.

Commissioner Peek recalled his comment from the last meeting regarding the suburban feel of the project and how it did not comply with the General Plan. He felt they were still seeing the same arrangement. Chair Wintzer pointed out that most of the effort was concentrated on the lower park of the project. Mr. White believed this was an issue that caused confusion between resort, suburban and urban. He asked if they were thinking of a smaller replication of Old Town. Chair Wintzer believed that people see Old Town as the character of Park City. He understood that they could not repeat Old Town in this area, but he suggested something similar, as opposed to an apartment complex in Salt Lake. If possible, he would prefer something that looks and feels less like a subdivision.

Commissioner Strachan noted that one of the findings the Planning Commission must make is that it promotes the use of non-vehicular forms of transportation. He did not think the trails connection into the rail trail was enough to make that finding. Commissioner Strachan felt the applicants should re-assess the use of roads and try to minimize them as much as possible. Trails and sidewalks should be interwoven throughout the entire development to give people an incentive to walk rather than drive. Mr. White pointed out that they have not yet reached that level. He tried to show as many trails as possible and there would be sidewalks in front of the houses.

Commissioner Strachan questioned how they could integrate the entry area with the rest of the project community without adding some type of commercial. Mr. White clarified that the developer did not intend to make money from the commercial component and they would try everything possible to make it work. Planner Whetstone pointed out that the successful mini-marts in Jeremy Ranch and other communities are inside a gas station.

Planner Whetstone noted that the previous plan had proposed more trails. However, the Staff had recommended more open space in the center to create an open area where the trails could connect people to the transit area and bike racks at the entrance. Chair Wintzer recommended that the Staff and the applicant contact the Recreation Department for their input on types of commercial that may meet their needs. He agreed with Commissioner Peek that they should continue to pursue the commercial at this point.

Commissioner Strachan asked whether anyone knew if clubhouses work in other communities such as Overlook and Daybreak. Commissioner Wintzer stated that Sun Peak has a clubhouse that works. He has personally attended functions where private individuals have reserved the clubhouse for parties or other functions. Mr. White clarified that Park City Heights would definitely have a clubhouse. The issue is whether or not it would have a commercial component.

Phyllis Robinson recalled conversations about possible live/work space such as a small commercial with residential above it. For example, an artisan baker could link the commercial with the residential.

Commissioner Hontz asked if the Planning Commission would be seeing an affordable housing

needs assessment. Ms. Robinson stated that the Eccles Business School had prepared that assessment and it would be presented to the Planning Commission on October 13<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Luskin stated that a continuous wrap around subdivision eliminates access to the trails. He suggested that they provide access points to trails where people could exit the fort of homes.

Director Eddington summarized the direction from the Planning Commission. He believed there was general consensus that the applicant was heading in the right direction with the newly proposed design. The Planning Commission would like the applicant to continue exploring neighborhood commercial development and explore a better mix and integration of market and affordable units. The Planning Commission favors the green space towards Richardson Flats Road because it creates a good entry feature. As the applicants look at the overall design, the Planning Commission would like them to consider something more compact or less suburban. They encouraged the applicant to focus on non-vehicular opportunities and to integrate that into all the neighborhoods in an effort to bring the second market for estate homes into the more dense neighborhoods. The Planning Commission would like the applicant to provide access points to trails and green space. They would like the Staff and the applicant to provide additional information on the sensitive lands and the power lines.