

Planning Commission Staff Report



PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Subject: Park City Heights MPD
Author: Kirsten A. Whetstone, AICP
Date: November 10, 2010
Project Number: PL-10- 01028
Type of Item: Work Session and Public Hearing

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Planning Commission continue to discuss at the work session the revised site plan and provide input regarding the second phase area and overall mix of housing types. The applicants are also seeking direction on design guidelines for the neighborhood and will present an update on trails. Staff recommends the Commission conduct a public hearing and continue the hearing to December 8, 2010.

Description

Project Name: Park City Heights Master Planned Development
Applicants: The Boyer Company and Park City Municipal Corporation
Location: Southwest corner of the intersection of SR248 and US40
Zoning: Community Transition (CT)
Adjacent Land Uses: Municipal open space; single family residential; vacant parcel to the north zoned County- RR; vacant parcel to the south zoned County- MR; Park City Medical Center (IHC) and the Park City Ice Arena/Quinn's Fields Complex northwest of the intersection.

Reason for Review: Applications for Master Planned Developments require Planning Commission review and approval

Owner: Park City Municipal Corporation is 50% owner with The Boyer Co. of the larger parcel to the south and 24 acres of the front open space. Park City owns approximately 40 acres, 20 within the open space on north and 20 at the north end of the development parcel, outright.

The MPD currently consists of 239 residential dwelling units, including:

- 160 market rate units in a mix of cottage units on smaller (6,000 to 8,000 sf lots) and single family detached units on 9,000 to 10,000 sf lots,
- 44.78 Affordable Unit Equivalentents configured in approximately 28 deed restricted affordable units to satisfy the IHC MPD affordable housing requirement,
- 32 Affordable Unit Equivalentents configured as approximately 16 deed restricted affordable units to meet the CT zone affordable housing requirement, and
- 35 deed restricted affordable units that Park City Municipal proposes to build consistent with one of its stated public purposes in the acquisition of an ownership interest in the land.

The plan includes approximately 175 acres of open space (73% open space), a community park with a splash pad play feature and active and passive park uses, neighborhood club house, bus shelters on both sides of Richardson's Flat Road, and trails throughout the development with connections to the city-wide trail system, including improved connections to the Rail Trail and to the Quinn's Recreation Complex via the SR 248 underpass.

Background

On October 13th the Commission conducted a public hearing and discussed the revised site plan. The Commission focused most of the discussion on the layout of Phase One closest to Richardson's Flat Road. The Commission requested the applicant consider impacts of US 40 on the units and vice versa, and explain the reasoning for orientation of units and the way various unit types are integrated.

An updated traffic letter was also reviewed. Traffic mitigation as required by the annexation agreement was presented. Due to the reduction in total units and UDOT findings that average traffic counts had not changed significantly since the traffic study counts were conducted, the proposed mitigation measures are still recommended as described in the annexation agreement.

The Commission requested additional information to better understand impacts on queuing at the intersections with SR 248. The applicants will provide additional traffic information at the December 8 meeting. Additionally, the City is currently working on a transportation plan, including modeling to understand impacts of traffic from beyond the city limits on the SR 248 corridor. This transportation plan information will be presented to the Commission at future meetings.

There was public input regarding the importance of getting the trails and trail connections right and considering the different users, such as pedestrians, cyclists, mountain bikers, Nordic skiers, etc. There was also input regarding consideration of the future use of the Rail Trail from the Park and Ride to the Park Bonanza area in design of the trails and transit system.

On October 26th City Staff and the applicants visited the site to better understand challenges and opportunities for trails, trail connections, and road crossings in the area. The applicant is working on revising the site plan to incorporate these trail improvements and will present an update on the trails at the work session.

Staff and the applicants continue to consider the following concerns as the MPD concept plan is finalized into a site plan from which a subdivision plat, utility plans, open space layout and trail system can be drafted:

- Affordable housing integration in the neighborhood;
- Traffic mitigation, transit options, trails and connections for alternative modes of transportation;
- Support commercial opportunities;
- Environmental, wildlife and sensitive lands considerations- preserving sensitive lands, protecting wetlands, keeping development off of ridgelines

and steeper slopes, understanding wildlife issues, and being sensitive to the uniqueness of the existing site;

- Site planning details that are not typical of suburban development;
- Architectural and landscape design guidelines to guide building design that consider energy efficiency, water conservation, solar access, building materials, architectural character and massing, impacts of garages and driveways, encourage pedestrian access and neighborhood interaction, porch elements, etc; and
- Creation of a neighborhood that reflects Park City's natural environment and resort character and that creates a sense of place as a neighborhood while at the same time provides community amenities or attractions that connect it to other Park City neighborhoods.

Work session

The following items will be presented for discussion at the work session:

- Phase 1 site plan revisions
- Phase 2 site plan revisions- methodology and objectives for a revised layout
- Architectural guidelines concepts and request for direction
- Update on trails and trail connections
- Site plan examples/visuals from other resort towns

MPD Requirements

Master Planned Development review criteria (LMC Section 15-6-5) relevant to the work session discussion items include density, setbacks, open space, off-street parking, building height, site planning, landscape/streetscaping, sensitive lands, affordable housing, and child care.

Density- does the proposed density comply with LMC Section 15-6-6 (A)?

The Park City Heights Annexation Agreement set the density at 0.8 units per acre (excluding affordable units) or 1 unit per acre (with all units included). The MPD requires density of a site to be looked at in its entirety and requires the Density to be located in the most appropriate locations. A site suitability analysis was used during the annexation process that looked at Sensitive Lands, open space, utilities, transportation, and community objectives as stated in the General Plan to make a density determination consistent with the CT zoning district.

The LMC allows the Planning Commission to increase the density 10% over the zone based on compliance with certain criteria related to open space, affordable housing, and protection of significant environmentally or visually sensitive lands.

The Park City Heights Annexation Agreement decreased the density allowed by the zone (from 1 unit per acre to 0.8 units per acres (excluding affordable units).

Setbacks- do the proposed setbacks comply with requirements of LMC Section 15-6-6 (C)?

Proposed perimeter setbacks exceed the 25' and are in the range of (150' to 270') with a minimum of 200' from Frontage Protection Zones. The applicants are requesting reduced interior setbacks consistent with setbacks within a residential neighborhood (such as the RD zone) similar to other residential zoning districts, however not less than the setbacks required by the International Building Code (minimum of 6').

The minimum setbacks around the exterior boundary of an MPD shall be 25' or greater. The Planning Commission may decrease the required perimeter setback with an MPD. The Planning Commission may also decrease setbacks within the MPD provided the project meets Building Code minimums.

The applicants are not seeking a reduction in the perimeter setbacks and are requesting interior setbacks that are consistent with setbacks in the RD zoning district to a minimum of 6'.

Open Space- does the proposed open space comply with open space requirements of LMC Section 15-6-6(D)?

The current plan provides approximately 175 acres of open space (74%) for the 239 acre site.

The LMC requires a minimum of 60% open space for MPDs. MPDs within the CT zone are required to provide a minimum of 70% for a residential density of 1 unit per acre.

The Planning Commission shall designate the preferable type and mix of open space for each MPD base on guidance from the General Plan. Landscaped open space may be utilized for project amenities such as gardens, greenways, pathways, plaza, and similar Uses. Open space may not be utilized for streets, parking, commercial uses, or buildings that require a building permit.

Off-Street parking- is the proposed parking in compliance with the off-street parking requirements of LMC Section 15-6-6 (E)?

The LMC allows the Planning Commission to increase or decrease parking requirements within an MPD based on a parking analysis. The applicants are providing 2 parking spaces per dwelling unit and are not requesting a decrease in the required space.

Building Height- are the proposed building heights in compliance with the Building Height requirements of LMC Section 15-6-6 (F)?

The LMC allows the Planning Commission to increase or decrease height limits within an MPD. The applicants are not requesting additional building height. The Commission should consider whether height reductions would further mitigate impacts on visually sensitive areas. Additional visual analysis can be provided to assist in making this recommendation once a final site plan has been determined.

Site Planning- does the proposed site plan comply with the site planning criteria of LMC Section 15-6-6 (G)?

MPD shall take into consideration the characteristics of the Site. The following shall be addressed in the Site planning:

- Clustered units
- Open space corridors and protection of existing Significant Vegetation
- Minimize grading
- Minimize large retaining structures
- Roads, utility lines, and buildings need to be designed to work with the grade not opposed to it.
- Minimize cuts and fills
- Incorporate existing trails into open space elements
- Dedicate easements for new trails
- Trails shall be constructed to standards consistent with the Trails Master Plan
- Adequate internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall be provided
- Private internal streets may be considered if emergency and safety requirements are met
- Adequate areas for snow storage shall be provided on site
- Refuse storage and collection, including recycling shall be addressed on the site plan that are convenient to the residents
- Include transportation amenities, such as drop-off areas, bus stops, bike racks, etc.
- Service and delivery access, loading and unloading areas shall be incorporated into the site plan and kept separate from pedestrian areas.

The applicants will review the site plan for these elements. The Planning Commission should provide input and direction during the work session.

Landscape and Streetscape- does the proposed landscape and streetscape comply with the requirements of LMC Section 15-6-6 (H)?

- MPDs shall, to the extent possible, maintain existing Significant Vegetation on site and shall protect such vegetation during construction.
- Where landscaping does occur, it shall be primarily of appropriate drought tolerant species.
- Lawn or turf areas need to be limited to 50% of the area of a lot not covered by buildings (the Annexation Agreement further limits irrigated areas and requires water conservation measures throughout the MPD).
- Landscape and Streetscape shall use native rock and boulders.
- Lighting must meet the requirements of LMC Chapter 15-5.

Sensitive Lands Compliance- does the proposed MPD comply with the requirements of LMC Section 15-6-6 (I)?

The LMC requires MPDs to comply with the Sensitive Lands Provisions as outlined in LMC Section 15-2.21. A site suitability analysis was used during the annexation

process that looked at Sensitive Lands, open space, utilities, transportation, and community objectives as stated in the General Plan to make a density determination consistent with the CT zoning district and the Sensitive Lands provisions of the code. Once there is a final site plan, Staff will provide further analysis regarding Sensitive Lands Compliance, concerning steep slopes, ridgelines, wetlands, frontage protection, wildlife, and streams.

Employee/Affordable Housing- does the MPD comply with the requirements of LMC Section 15-6-6 (J)?

MPD applications shall include a housing mitigation plan. The Park City Heights MPD proposes to meet the required 15% affordable housing requirement per the City's affordable housing resolution plus an additional 5% affordable housing as required by the CT zone.

Child Care- does the MPD comply with requirements of LMC Section 15-6-6 (K)?

The MPD has not addressed this issue. The LMC states that a site for a Child Care center may be required for all new single family and multi-family housing projects if the Planning Commission determines that the project will create additional demands for Child Care. Staff will provide additional information regarding this criterion at the December 8th meeting in order for the Commission to make this determination.

Notice

This item is scheduled as a work session and public hearing. Notice of the public hearing was published in the Park Record and posted according to requirements of the LMC. Courtesy notice letters were sent to affected property owners according to requirements of the LMC.

Public Input

Staff received 2 letters from near-by property owners expressing 1) concern that an access road from Park City Heights to Hidden Oaks and Morning Star subdivisions not be considered and 2) loss of open space and concern about wildlife and environmental impacts of the development. The letters are attached as Exhibits to this report.

Recommendation

Staff requests the Commission provide direction regarding the revised plan and continue the public hearing to December 8, 2010.

Exhibits

- Exhibit A- Park City Heights Binder/Tool Kit (handed out at the September 22nd work session and posted on the City's web site as a pdf)
- Exhibit B- Revised MPD site plan (under separate cover)
- Exhibit C- Letters from near-by property owners

October 12, 2010

Mr. Thomas Eddington
Park City Municipal Corporation
Planning Department
445 Marsac Avenue
P.O. Box 1485
Park City, UT 84060

RE: Park City Heights Project

Dear Mr. Eddington:

I am President of the Morning Star Estates Homeowners Association ("MSEHA"). In connection with the planning approval process for the development of the Park City Heights Project ("the Project"), MSEHA is concerned with the access routes that will be approved by the City for the Project. Specifically, in connection with any Master Plan Development Agreement approved for the Project, MSEHA advocates that the Master Development Agreement specify that the Fire Escape Road to Morning Star Estates cannot be used for any access or egress to the Project and that the Master Plan Development Agreement include language clearly limiting the access routes available for use with land included in the Project to Richardson Flats.

We appreciate your consideration of our views. MSEHA is extremely concerned about access decisions having potentially adverse impacts on its homeowners. We request that you inform us of any decisions made about access for the Project and inform us of all opportunities to have input before any decisions are made with regard to access for the Project.

Very truly yours,

Sally Fuegi

3742 Rising Star Ln
Park City, UT 84060
sallyfuegi@hotmail.com

From: Patricia Abdullah
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2010 9:18 AM
To: Kirsten Whetstone
Subject: FW: Boyer and 239 new units



Patricia Abdullah
Park City Municipal Planning Department
445 Marsac Avenue, PO Box 1480
(435) 615-5060

From: jennifer seabury [mailto:jenandpaul55@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, October 13, 2010 08:24 AM
To: Patricia Abdullah
Subject: Boyer and 239 new units

Dear Planning Commission:

Just concerned about the Boyer/Park City deal for 239 units. Don't we have enough empty, undervalued condos in this town now? And is just this another let Boyer get rich deal? And what about wildlife and environmental impact studies? The last low income housing was pushed in on wetlands behind the new post office and police station. And now another huge project on our open space we paid for?

And what's going on with the asphalt garbage dump by the ball fields under PC hill? That was our open space also, and now it looks like a NJ dump. Thank you for all your very hard work. We appreciate it.

Best wishes,
Jen Seabury