

13. Mechanical equipment pad shall have roof structure shielding the mechanical equipment from view above.

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

Planner Kirsten Whetstone recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and discuss the revised site plan and overall mix of housing types. The applicant was also looking for direction on design guidelines for the neighborhood. The applicant was also prepared to present an update on the trails.

Planner Whetstone remarked that the proposed MPD consists of 239 residential dwelling units consisting of a mix of affordable or deed restricted units and market rate units. The Planning Commission has previously reviewed this MPD at several meetings. The objective for this meeting was to focus on the revisions to Phase 1, which is the northern area closest to Richardson Flat Road, trails and trail connections, design guidelines for the neighborhood, and review and discussion of the MPD criteria contained in the Staff report.

Spencer White, representing the applicant, presented the revised site plan and reviewed the changes since the last meeting. He noted that the previous meetings focused on Phase 1. This evening they were interested in discussing details for the entire site. Mr. White stated that at some point they would like to put the concept plan into Auto CAD for additional detail. The revisions to the site plan were based on comments from the Planning Commission and the direction that the applicant and the Commissioners hoped to achieve. Most of the concepts of the Phase 1 element were incorporated into the entire site. Mr. White pointed out that they were looking at incremental growth outward from the core, a real sense of community, varying widths and sizes, and streets that link together.

Mr. White recalled that previously the Commissioners expressed a desire to see a grid pattern. That grid pattern was done throughout the project, keeping in mind that there are topography issues. He showed how they stepped up the hill, trying to keep the grid pattern intact but still working with the topography. All the roads are 8% or less, which should avoid major issues for large retaining walls. Mr. White noted that Commissioner Luskin had requested that they address the edge along Highway 40. In response to his concern, they designed a meandering detention basin. As the water drains down to the low spots, the retention basin can be dug out and moved up to create berming with landscaping to form a meandering edge for the development as well as the detention basin.

Mr. White stated that in an effort to address a previous comment regarding noise, the development was moved off the highway corridor as much as possible. He remarked that throughout the entire project they tried to locate homes along green space. From the community park area a central trail corridor was created through the project with neighborhood greens such as native grasses and wildflowers. The landscaping would require minimal maintenance and water usage. Mr. White pointed out that the feel was more like open space rather than a manicured neighborhood green.

Mr. White reviewed the trail linkages. A project loop trail goes all the way around the project with trail connections to multiple trails. There was also trail access from the streets to the trail loop around the project. Mr. White noted that the applicants met with Matt Twombly and Heinrich Deters at the site and walked the project. One concern was the trail linkage to the existing pedestrian trail under Highway 248. The objective was to put the trail as far from Old Dump Road as possible. The engineer hired by Boyer Company and Park City has already started looking at that connection. There are also wetlands in that area where it connects to the Rail Trail and those issues will be addressed.

Mr. White remarked that on the south side of Old Dump Road, the previous plan showed the trail parallel to Old Dump Road. The revised plan pulls the trails away from Old Dump Road and brings it into the project. It is closer to the play area and has a good connection to the Rail Trail. That continues along the outside of the project and eventually goes down along the frontage road.

Mr. White stated that other items addressed included maintaining a sense of openness and de-emphasizing the impact of the automobile on the residential environment. Garage were moved to the rear with a large number of alley-loaded or skinny-street loaded residents. Front porches face the central trail corridor and the streets. This was also done with some of the multi-family units. Mr. White remarked that they tried to emphasize the community space by having social events. A small amphitheater was added for possible Friday night movies, etc. The tot lot/splash pad remained from the last version and the open space around the play field was enhanced. Mr. White referred to the entrance of the project and noted that they tried to pull some of the multi-family housing closer to the street to create a street edge building with porches fronting the street. Instead of providing a separate parking area for the clubhouse, they would use on-street parking on the main street and parallel parking on the multi-family side. There would still be a community garden, but it was moved away from the community park and would be placed in a different location.

Mr. White pointed out the different product types designed throughout the project and how they would be interspersed. The cluster concept enables residents to live near each other in a small village-like community. Mr. White presented photos of homes as a starting point for dialogue with the Commissioners.

Ron Moffat with the Boyer Company stated that Jonathan DeGray and Eric Lingbard would be creating the design guidelines and landscaping for the project. Both were in attendance this evening to hear comments and direction from the Planning Commission.

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing.

Brooks Robinson, representing Public Works, expressed concerns with the design related to snow plowing, water runoff and snow storage. He noted that a number of units on the plans that are accessed from alleys presents a problem in terms of emergency response. Mr. Robinson remarked that increasing the amount of hard surface by having additional alleys also increases the amount of runoff. Simple streets and cul-de-sacs with a driveway would provide parking for the residents and guests.

Chair Wintzer assumed all the roads and alleys would be public roads maintained by the City. Mr. White answered yes. He noted that they intend to speak with all the service providers, including Public Works, once the plans are more detailed. They received a list of items from the service providers that have been considered throughout the plan.

Commissioner Savage wanted to know the difference between an alley and a street. Mr. White replied that for purposes of this discussion the difference is road width. Some municipalities allow a narrower width; however, that discussion has not been started with Public Works. In addition to width, access is an issue, particularly with regard to emergency vehicles.

Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hontz felt the revised site plan indicated that the applicants heard their comments at the last meeting. She believed the trails and trails connectivity, circulation to avoid the feel of a drive-thru subdivision, resort character and other revisions were much better with the new plan. Commissioner Hontz remarked that the revised master plan respects the topography much better for both the layout of the units and the trails, as well as the utility corridor. She thought the mix of units and the integration were significantly better with the new plan. Commissioner Hontz believed the project was heading in the right direction.

Commissioner Hontz pulled up Daybreak, Redstone, and Park Meadows on Google Earth as examples of what she considers to be good and bad design. She explained why Daybreak and Park Meadows were examples of good design and Redstone was an example of bad design.

Mr. White was pleased that Commissioner Hontz had raised the topography issue. He noted that the Phase 1 area is relatively flat and there is more topo than what one would realize. He believed the revised plan takes into account more of the topography issues.

Commissioner Pettit agreed that the revised plan was a better design and more consistent with the feedback from the Planning Commission. She noted that there was no reference to potential support commercial and she highly encouraged the applicant to create a place for it. As the project builds out there may be opportunities to incorporate support commercial into the project. Mr. White replied that support commercial was discussed at a previous meeting when Commissioner Pettit was absent. They have had experience with other projects where support commercial did not work, but they are planning to provide enough space in the clubhouse area that could accommodate some type of commercial. Mr. White noted that the clubhouse would be small and the amount of commercial space has not been determined. He noted that Park City Municipal Corp. has not determined their units at this point and they are still talking about live/work spaces.

Commissioner Pettit asked if the problem with support commercial that has not worked in larger projects was due to the costs associated with renting the space. Mr. Moffat replied that it was mainly because they were not high marketing goods. With a limited number of people coming in, it is difficult to get enough volume to justify the cost. Commissioner Pettit remarked that this area is isolated from ready access to a convenience store or a suburban type environment. Adding the recreational component would also draw people outside of the project. In her opinion support commercial is an important element and she did not want to assume it would not work based on

other situations or examples. Commissioner Pettit wanted to make sure that support commercial continues to be considered as part of the plan.

Commissioner Pettit thanked the applicant for including the community garden concept. She believes it is a fantastic amenity for a community. She also suggested that they change the name "neighborhood green" to "neighborhood open space" to avoid the perception of lawns and high water consumption. Commissioner Pettit was pleased with the concept of native grasses. Mr. White remarked that landscape guidelines would be part of the design guidelines. He recalled previous discussions about transition zones where people can have small turf areas around their homes before moving into native grasses and plants. They would update the Planning Commission on landscape details at a later meeting.

Commissioner Pettit stated that snow storage would be critical for snow removal during the winter. She believed that snow removal in Old Town would be easier if there was adequate snow storage. Commissioner Pettit felt this project provided an opportunity to have narrow streets and alleyways with adequate snow storage. She encouraged the applicants to keep the narrow streets as proposed, but try to solve snow removal problems with adequate snow storage. She pointed out that narrow streets should meet the requirements for emergency vehicles and access.

Chair Wintzer clarified that all the roads would be 8% or less in grade. Mr. White answered yes, noting that a small percentage of the roads were 8%. Chair Wintzer asked about the dirt road shown at the bottom of the site plan. Mr. White replied that it was an existing road that would be improved up to the entrance to the project. Chair Wintzer liked the new design, however, he believed there was more square footage of asphalt than in previous designs. He pointed out that in some places there are roads on two sides of the house. Mr. White stated that the square footage was approximately the same as previous designs. Once he puts everything into the CAD, he should know the exact lengths of road, etc. Chair Wintzer was cautious about designing a subdivision off of engineering and preferred a project that balances efficiency with personality.

Chair Wintzer referred to a node of houses on the plan and he encouraged the applicant to repeat that node in another location because it creates a neighborhood within a neighborhood. Chair Wintzer thanked the applicants for listening to their comments and direction.

Commissioner Peek appreciated all the revisions and believed it vastly improved the concept. He concurred with Commissioner Pettit regarding support commercial. Commissioner Peek suggested that they stagger driveways down the alleys to create an opportunity for snow removal. He recommended that they look for shared driveway opportunities on the Estate lots. Commissioner Peek commented on the possibility of creating permanent easements with a landscaping restriction where snow could be pushed directly across from a driveway. He favored the detached tunnel trail and believed it was better to make that connection to the Rail Trail and ease the crossing to the Rail Trail. Commissioner Peek suggested locating the clubhouse commercial in that area to draw business from the sports fields.

Mr. White indicated a trail connection on the north side of Old Dump Road that goes all the way to Highway 40. That connection would eventually go to the Park and Ride lot and the City wanted to

maintain a trail corridor through there. At this point the trail would not be built but the applicants would provide a trail easement along there.

Commissioner Savage asked if the Park and Ride lot is accessed off of Old Dump Road. Mr. White answered yes. He stated that they have also proposed a bus stop along Old Dump Road. The transit will go out to the Park and Ride lot, turn around and come back. Commissioner Savage asked about changing the name of the road. Brooks Robinson remarked that with the improvements and the Park and Ride, the County was calling it Richardson Flats Road. The City is using that name with the intersection improvements currently being designed.

Commissioner Savage noted that the Park and Ride facility is in close proximity to the project and the buses come by the project on their way into Park City. He believed there was an opportunity to create a significant child care center with an associated convenience store that could service the development and possibly families outside of the development. Mr. Moffat was willing to provide land for a day care use. Mr. White noted that a day care had been discussed in the past.

Commissioner Peek referred to the architectural examples at the top of the concept plan. He stated that generally garages are subservient to the architecture of the structure, with the exception of the Old Miners Lodge Cottage House. Commissioner Peek favored varied architecture and hidden garages.

Commissioner Strachan felt the revised plan was a step in the right direction. He still thought the multi-family housing should be interspersed throughout the entire site plan. He concurred with his fellow Commissioners regarding the support commercial. Without the commercial the project would be an island to itself. If people have to drive whenever they need something, it defeats the objective they are trying to reach.

Commissioner Strachan stated that the trail adjacent to the Dump Road was great on the concept plan, but he was unsure if it was feasible. If they are able to do the trail as proposed, it would alleviate the concerns he raised at the last meeting. In terms of the architectural examples shown, he was not convinced they were to that point. Commissioner Strachan thought the site plan needed more fine tuning before they could start talking about the architecture of the structures. He noted that there were no examples of the multi-family housing. Mr. White remarked that the pictures furthest to the right were the IHC units. The structures are four two-story units. Commissioner Strachan stated that the picture of the IHC units reinforced his opinion that the multi-family houses could be interspersed throughout the entire site. Planner Whetstone pointed out that the multi-family houses have a larger footprint and would require significant excavation in some areas. Mr. White stated that another issue is trying to keep the IHC units close and on board for the first phase. He noted that IHC is beyond the time frame for building and they are anxious to have their units built. Mr. White offered to look at interspersing as many of the units as possible. Chair Wintzer remarked that the IHC units have very little outside space and did not belong on the hill. He believed the very dense units would fit better around the park where people would have a place to recreate and use the amenities.

Planner Whetstone stated that the concept for the affordable or deed restricted housing was in different phases and the units could transfer from one phase to another. Mr. White remarked that the market units would definitely be mixed with the affordable units and there would be very little difference architecturally. The IHC units would be the first affordable units to be completed.

Commissioner Strachan acknowledged that the applicants had done their best with what they had to work with. Ideally he would like something different but accepted the fact that it could not be done. Mr. White stated that they would continue to look at interspersing as much as possible.

Chair Wintzer supported the idea of having a day care with a commercial component to service the project.

Chair Wintzer called for comments on the architecture. Commissioner Peek reiterated his previous comment about the garages being subservient. He thought it was too soon to comment on the specifics of the architecture. Mr. White remarked that the intent is to incorporate historic details from Old Town Park City into the architecture. Chair Wintzer preferred to have more porches because porches help create a neighborhood. He personally did not want a reproduction of Old Town because it would look out of place in that area. Chair Wintzer was not opposed to incorporating some historic into the project if it can relate to the type of project being proposed.

Mr. White remarked that during the pre-MPD application, many of the Commissioners made comments about making the project look more like the resort center and core of Park City. Chair Wintzer stated that he was one who made that comment; however, he was talking about the grid system in Park City rather than architectural design. Commissioner Peek used the condos on Deer Valley Drive as an example where the architecture is not the most pleasing, but parking is behind the structure and people congregate on their front porches. Commissioner Pettit thought Commissioner Peek had described the experience that occurs in the Harvard/Yale area in Salt Lake. It is more historic in terms of many garages being on the side and the back and accessed by alleyways. The elements are at street level and people can walk the neighborhoods and feel a sense of connection. She had the same experience walking through the historic parts of Cresta Butte and Telluride.

Commissioner Hontz liked the idea of more porches and enhancing the size of the porches to make them more usable. However, she was concerned about the location being too windy to make the porches usable. Commissioner Hontz commented on Dutch Fields development in Midway that she finds offensive. Even though the houses have great design elements it is not authentic. She suggested that if the applicants could use that same concept with more authenticity, it would be the right balance. Commissioner Hontz concurred with the comments of her fellow Commissioners regarding architecture and garages.

Commissioner Savage suggested that if the applicant wanted serious input related to architectural styles, they should provide a more creative presentation of alternative formats. It would help the Planning Commission see what the applicant would propose in terms of architecture.

Planner Whetstone noted that the Staff had questions regarding setbacks as outlined in the Staff report. She pointed out that the Planning Commission has the ability to reduce setbacks within an MPD. Chair Wintzer asked for clarification on some of the houses shown in yellow and asked if there would be common area between the houses. Mr. White replied that all the houses shown in yellow would be lots. He felt the next step would be the CAD level so the Commissioners would have a better idea of the lots and setbacks. He noted that with the design guidelines, they will break down the mix of housing types and identify heights, setbacks, details, colors, etc. Planner Whetstone stated that the information would be helpful for the Staff when determining compliance with the Master Plan.

Planner Whetstone remarked that another issue was height. The Planning Commission has the ability to increase heights, however, she understood that all heights would be within the requirements. Mr. White did not anticipate any height concerns and offered to take a second look. Planner Whetstone commented on a list of site planning issues that would be addressed in future meetings.

Commissioner Savage pointed out that the development has Park City in its name and it is partially owned by Park City. It is a big initiative that compliments Park City's objectives and ideals as it relates to affordable housing, and it should be something the City can be proud of and people can be excited about. Commissioner Savage remarked that because Park City is a co-applicant, they need to be part of the solution and not part of the problem, which may require creativity with the CT zone.

Commissioner Peek addressed the concern regarding wind and suggested that creativity in the design may help mitigate that concern.

Commissioner Pettit requested that the applicants consider whether the current site plan would help facilitate solar installation on roof tops. With respect to the design guidelines and the CC&R's, she asked that they think about solar access and easement issues to allow the community the opportunity to take full advantage of renewable energy resources. She suggested that wind may be another option.

MOTION: Commissioner Strachan moved to CONTINUE Park City Heights discussion to December 8th. Commissioner Pettit seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Park City Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 9:15 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission _____