

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION NOTES
DECEMBER 8, 2010**

PRESENT: Chair Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Richard Luskin, Dick Peek, Julia Pettit, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Thomas Eddington, Kirsten Whetstone, Kayla Sintz, Polly Samuels McLean

Work Session Items

Park City Heights - Master Planned Development

Planner Kirsten Whetstone noted that the Staff report contained the concept plan for Park City Heights that was discussed at the last meeting. She stated that the plan proposes three types of homes: The Park Homes, which are multi-family; the Cottage Homes, which are a mix of market rate and deed restricted housing; and Homestead Homes, which are single family. She reviewed the architectural patterns for the three different housing types identified in the Staff report.

Spencer White, representing the applicant, stated that since the last meeting they continued meeting with Park City Public Works and other service providers with regard to typical street section standards, snow storage, sidewalks, and other issues. They also met with the Snyderville Basin Sewer District and discussed tying into their existing sewer main. They hired a wildlife study experts to update the wildlife study. Next Tuesday they have meetings scheduled with Rocky Mountain Power and Questar Gas, as well as another meeting with Public Works. Mr. White noted that the project is becoming more refined as they move forward to address any concerns and issues raised by the providers.

Mr. White explained how they tried to respond to questions and concerns raised at the last meeting. He noted that Commissioner Hontz had definite comments about what she did or did not like in other master planned communities in Summit County and the Salt Lake Valley. Based on her comments, they looked at Bear Hollow, Daybreak and the Harvard/Yale neighborhood in Salt Lake to see what elements they should or should not incorporate into their project. Mr. White commented on the large variety of style in the Harvard/Yale neighborhood. The similar elements are roof shapes, window patterns, porches, setbacks, garages, and other things that provide a positive neighborhood feel. Many of those elements were incorporated into the design guidelines for Park City Heights.

Eric Langvardt, representing the applicant, stated that one of the elements they tried to achieve was the intent to break the homes into three separate product types that they could generalize architecturally. They tried to create diversity within and between each of the product types through similarities that tie them together.

Mr. Langvardt reviewed the architectural patterns for the Park Homes, which are multi-family homes. He noted that each one was located on green space such as a City park, trail corridor, or a small pocket park. The characteristics of these buildings were driven by the size and the massing and possible repetition of the units. A key component is the "mining meets modern". Mr. Langvardt clarified that the product presented was not exactly what was being proposed. The sheet provided in the Staff report showed various elements of these products and what they may prefer as they move forward.

Mr. Langvardt recalled from the last meeting that the majority of the Commissioners talked about de-emphasizing the garage. In the Park product, each home is accessed from a covered garage, carport or rear parking. That de-emphasizes the garage and at the same time puts the emphasis on the front porches. Mr. Langvardt noted that every front door orients to a street or public open space. With the massing of these buildings, varied wall planes is important, particularly in this portion of the development. The design was a mountain contemporary look. Mr. Langvardt pointed out that not trying to be a resort mountain was an important direction. Part of that is to get away from basic earthtone colors and instead use colorful earthtones. He commented on the importance of balance to keep from being too colorful.

Mr. Langvardt pointed out that the roof lines on the buildings would be low sloping or possibly flat roofs with deeper overhangs to reduce the mass of the larger buildings. The materials being considered are wood, hardy board siding, possibly stone and stucco accents, and colorful earthtone colors.

Mr. White requested feedback from the Planning Commission on the design, materials, and colors proposed. He clarified that this was only part of the process for beginning the design guidelines. These were precedent images and the detail would be taken from the images. Mr. White noted that the design guideline pattern book would come back to the Planning Commission. He asked the Planning Commission to comment on anything they found distasteful or that would not fit within Park City or the CT zone.

Mr. Langvardt reviewed the Cottage homes and noted that this was the core of the development. He commented on the colors and explained that this was an opportunity to incorporate a little of historic Park City. The roof lines have a steeper pitch, creating interesting second floor or story-and-a-half elements. He stated that the front porch and the secondary garage elements in this scenario were very important. The majority of the cottage homes, with the exception of the 12 units within the Homestead area, are currently proposed to be served by an alley or the local road. The orientation of the front door to the street, both architecturally and from a site planning standpoint, is of utmost importance. Mr. Langvardt noted that the architecture has a Victorian feel with simple forms and porches to create a more complex shape. The homes are a story-and-a-half to two stories. The materials include classic elements of the hardy board siding and possibly board and batten shingle siding. There would be limited use of stone. Stucco is not being proposed for these structures.

Mr. White pointed out that there is no variation in the setbacks of those buildings as they go down the street. All the buildings are two-story. They are looking at varying from single story to story-and-a-half to two-story and how that would work on a block face. They are also looking at varying the front setbacks and adding the roof elements over the front porches.

Mr. Langvardt reviewed the Homestead structures. He noted that they were the most diverse primarily because they had more flexibility to work with and because of the varied terrain. Mr. Langvardt stated that many of the elements from the first two product types were integrated into these homes. Because of the flexibility, there was more opportunity for side loaded garages, garages that are built into the hillside with a porch over the top, and to take advantage of the terrain

in varied ways. He pointed out that the Homestead units have more emphasis on the mountain contemporary.

Mr. White stated that solar panels would be allowed in all three lot types and that would be evident in the design guidelines.

Chair Wintzer referred to all three areas and asked about development ownership. As an example, would one developer be doing all the Park Homes. Mr. White explained that the lot type does not separate the affordable from the market. The affordable units would be more interspersed with the market rate units. He was unsure about the builders, but assumed that multiple builders would be building one type. However, with the established the design guidelines, it would not have that look or feel of one builder if that were the case.

Commissioner Savage wanted to know the underlying concept that would integrate the zones together, and how much variety there would be in the design guidelines from one area of development to another area of development. He understood the objective for diversity, but he cautioned against having the diversity look too inconsistent. Mr. Langvardt replied that roof lines, materials, colors, massing, garages, front porches and front doors are consistent elements, with some variation between the product types.

Commissioner Savage asked if the idea was to establish a set of design guidelines and a plat map, and then sell individual properties to individual developers. Mr. White replied that this was correct. He asked if each individual square in the Park Home plats could be sold to a separate builder. Mr. White replied that the Park Homes consist of IHC affordable units and the Park City affordable attached units. He believed those would not be built by one builder. Mr. White explained that the design guidelines would be established so every builder would have specific parameters to follow.

Chair Wintzer expressed his preference for a mixture of homes. When several buildings are the same, the mass appears to be larger. He personally likes flat roofs because they work better in Park City's climate and they have less mass. He referred to a picture above the units with flat roofs and discouraged the applicants from going in that direction. Chair Wintzer did not believe they could successfully re-create Old Town in that area. The project needs its own identity and that identity could be a hundred different homes that blend together.

Commissioner Peek concurred. He remarked that mixing flat roofs is a great design option. He referred to the modern design shown in the Cottage homes and asked if windows that large could actually work in terms of energy conservation. Mr. White replied that this was one issue to consider with the design, as well as affordability. He stated that another part of the process is to set up a design review committee to enforce the design guidelines. Most of the issues would be worked out through that process.

Commissioner Peek indicated a repetition of driveways in a series of the Cottage homes. He noted that four examples of cottage homes were houses with garages, resulting in six homes at the end of the street with visible garages. He asked about the setbacks in the Cottage homes area and whether there would be snow shed issues. Commissioner Peek was concerned about repetitive design in the Cottage homes. He suggested that the applicants prepare a model showing the

roads, trails, the cuts and fills, and the massing of the elements, we well as the views from the identified vantage points. Chair Wintzer concurred that an actual model would be helpful. He clarified that it should be a physical model rather than a computerized visual.

Commissioner Peek noted that each example showed hardy board siding. He was resistant to that particular product because it is sold as maintenance free. He indicated a number of examples in town where people treat it as maintenance free, but the appearance over time shows that its not. Commissioner Peek suggested that they integrate other materials.

Mr. White asked if stucco was an issue. Chair Wintzer was not opposed to stucco as an accent material for this project. However, he did not want to see stucco mazes.

Commissioner Strachan thought the Park homes should be so unique that they stand out and make people want to live there. In his opinion, that is what an affordable housing project should be. Commissioner Strachan pointed out the picture he believed was the most unique. In contrast, he indicated the picture that would make people look for the nearest strip mall. Regarding the Cottage and Homestead homes, Commissioner Strachan felt it was important to accentuate the front porches. He did not favor drive-in garages and second story porches. People living in this project need to feel like they are invited into the Homestead area the same as they are to the Park homes and Cottage areas. He did not think garages and huge homes were inviting. Commissioner Strachan agreed with the importance of seeing a model.

Commissioner Hontz stated that her opinion was slightly different than her fellow Commissioners. She thought the tan and brown example in the Cottage homes looked like stucco and that the design went too far in using stucco. That example, as well as another sample in the Park homes, were considerably modern in design and she did not believe it integrated well with other the styles shown. Commissioner Hontz remarked that materials matter and a modern design can work with real wood, wood timber, natural rock, etc. Regarding the roof forms, Commissioner Hontz liked the flatter roofs and deeper porches, particular on the examples that appear to use natural materials. She believed the example showing two visible garages was going in the wrong direction, particularly based on their preference for subordinate garages.

Commissioner Hontz referred to the brown, white and tan brick example shown in the Park homes. She was not convinced that brick was an appropriate material for that area. However, she favored some of the elements shown on the multi-family units. She suggested that the design might work if they add a deeper entryway and porches. Commissioner Hontz did not like white and gray as the main color scheme for the homes in that area. She encouraged a more colorful pallet with white and gray as accent colors. Commissioner Hontz concurred with Commissioner Peek regarding hardy board. She reiterated her opposition to the example shown in the Park homes as "not resort mountain timber" because the roof lines, the massing and the materials were all wrong.

Mr. Langvardt pointed out that in many of the example they only tried to find elements that could be positive or negative.

Commissioner Luskin felt this was a real challenge. He remarked that Park City has a very unique character, but he is always disappointed coming in from Kimball Junction because it takes a long

time before you see the uniqueness. He still thinks it is difficult to get a real feel for Old Town. Commissioner Luskin believes the Park City Heights land is an important piece of property, and the first and most important step is to create a first impression. He noted that Commissioner Wintzer spoke about creating an identity, but he was unsure how that could be done. In his opinion, the identity needs to be something that is consistent or feeds into Old Town. Commissioner Luskin stressed the importance of creating the impression that people are going into a mining community. He thought the biggest challenge would be the Park homes because they are closest to the junction and typically have the least identity. Commissioner Luskin did not favor mountain contemporary design. In looking at the modern contemporary examples provided, he thought they looked like "Frank Lloyd Wright." Commissioner Luskin noted that the applicants had provided a number of examples, but now they need to take it to the next level and begin with the idea of what they are trying to create. If they are trying to create an identity, the components need to work individually and together. Commissioner Luskin pointed out that part of Park City's unique character is that it does not have a cookie cutter look. A key element for this project is substantial variation. Commissioner Luskin stated that the developer has a particular responsibility with this project because the property is highly visible.

Mr. Langvardt remarked that designing the project is half architectural style and the other half is about the site. He felt the challenge was building the units differently. Because the subdivision is being built in a shorter time period they need to control it in a way that makes it look like 25 different people built 25 different homes.

Commissioner Pettit remarked that her comments were more aligned with the specifics pointed out by Commissioner Hontz in terms of materials, colors, roof lines and elements that need to live beyond the current time. She felt they were on the right track with the garages, porches and window elements.

Chair Wintzer suggested that they look at variation in the buildings. He felt it was appropriate to look at flat roofs as they go higher up on the site to minimize the scale of the buildings. Chair Wintzer stated that the Planning Commission needs to begin talking about the size and footprints of these homes. He thought the model would be helpful in that discussion. Chair Wintzer suggested that the applicant review the Deer Valley Design Guidelines. He was not interested in copying those guidelines, but he thought the format was good. In order to look at this project in a larger scale, Chair Wintzer requested streetscapes where they could look at an entire block of buildings. He also wanted an idea of how often one design would be repeated. Chair Wintzer pointed out that landscaping needs to be included in the design guidelines. Mr. White remarked that landscaping and sustainability would have sections in the design guidelines.

Chair Wintzer referred to the example of six homes in a row and expressed his preference to see that repeated. It is important to integrate the community as much as possible and he liked that idea to create separate neighborhoods. Chair Wintzer applauded the applicants for their efforts in listening to the Planning Commission and responding with good ideas.

The Work Session was adjourned.

the variety of user groups. There are times during the year when it is necessary to have a monitor, particularly during Christmas and Sundance. During Christmas week they have an actual person monitoring the parking.

Chair Wintzer stated that he asked the question because the Planning Commission would be addressing parking requirements as they go through the General Plan. He noted that a general idea among the Planning Commission is to have less parking to reduce the number of cars. Based on Mr. Murphy's comments, he suggested that it may be possible to at least reduce the amount of underground parking. Mr. Murphy was unsure about other projects or future projects, but for Silver Star, the parking is not needed.

CONTINUATION(S) AND PUBLIC HEARING

3. **Park City Heights - Master Planned Development**
(Application PL-10-01028)

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing. There was no comment. Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Pettit moved to CONTINUE the Park City Heights - Master Planned to January 12, 2010. Commissioner Peek seconded the motion.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. 9100 Marsac Avenue - Amendment to Record of Survey
(Application PL-10-01082)

Chair Wintzer pointed out that it would be helpful on condominium plats if the Staff report would indicate that the plans are the same as what was approved. This would alleviate the concern of whether or not the plan had changed.

Commissioner Peek suggested having an issue statement in the Staff report for all matters briefly summarizing the issue for discussion. Planner Whetstone noted that many times the Staff report begins with a history and background of the application. However, this particular condominium plat for the Montage was an amendment to the one originally submitted. The Staff report outlined the specific amendments.

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing.

There was no comment.

Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Strachan moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the amendment to the record of survey at 9100 Marsac Avenue, based on the Findings