



# Main Street Area Plan Meeting

Wednesday August 14, 2024

9:00 AM

Park City Council Chambers

Present: Erik Daenitz Zion, Matt Dias PCMC, Ryan Dickey, Mayor Nann Worel, Brent Crowther, Kimley Horn, Jenny Diersen PCMC, Tim Sanderson PCMC, John Robertson, Ron Wedig, Heleena Sideris, Kathy Pederson, Maren Mullin, Jennifer Wesselhoff, and Mark Morris.

Absent: Emerson Olivera, Casey Crawford, Rob Sergent

Online: Tristan Cleveland, Alex Roy

Jenny Diersen began the meeting at 9:01 AM.

Ryan Dickey reiterated the three goals for the meeting:

- Getting consensus on what this committee recommends and wants to bring to the Council and public for the Open House in September.
- We should be as bold as we want to be because things will get chipped away in the process.
- The community is going to react with the question, “What is in it for me?” So, we need to have a community upside and think about how to sell this to our neighbors and how they will receive this.

Option 1 with more natural features weaved in was confirmed to be the preferred one. Also, pedestrianization was a separate phase. Everything above the zero on slide 13 is part of Option 1.

Discussion took place about redeveloping or keeping City Hall as is.

Daenitz clarified the distinction between parking capacity, which is how many people are parked in the spots at any point in time, and parking turnover, which is the number of transactions relative to the number of available spots. The most efficient visitor to your street is someone that comes either not in a car and spends a lot of money or comes in a car and stays for a long time. Therefore, they are proposing more high value uses and a proportion of the parking needs to be dedicated to those high value uses at the same time a shared parking scenario is needed to pull off that vision.

Wesselhoff asked if the Option 1 is conforming to the existing Land Management Code, and they are roughly in line with those codes. It is the intention that we stay within the parameters with some exceptions. It is expected that there will be variances and changes made along the way.

Pederson asked for an estimate of the economic impact on the Main Street merchants during the construction time. It will take a next phase to determine that.

Cleveland reminded the committee that their push and energy can help make things happen such as gondola connecting Deer Valley, etc.

The question was posed about what residents want to see on Main Street and what would bring them back.

Brent Crowther began his parking presentation presenting pros and cons of three options.

Ideas posed:

- Area east of Deer Valley drive with a pull out and a tunnel that takes you under Deer Valley Drive to get to the future transit center for the buses.
- Or putting a tunnel for buses to go from Marsac through the buildings onto Swede Alley.
- Finding out about that land on the east side of Deer Valley Drive, and its potential to be used for structured parking.
- Don't lose sight of employee parking and making it easy for them to travel to work.
- Please show renderings with snow/in winter.
- It was noted that there are a variety of timing options available with the pedestrian ideas. i.e. only on weekend, or evenings or just during festivals, etc.
- The topography of old town is a concern for potential pedestrian designs. It was noted that some may not want to walk all the way up the hill.
- It is requested for more car data on Swede Alley, and Main Street; how are you getting those numbers and how are they are coming to and leaving the area?
- Heated streets. According to city staff who have examined the issue, providing heated streets via a technology called an "ambient temperature loop" would be more sustainable than running diesel plows and trucks to remove snow in the winter. Vail is doing something similar.
- Committee members recommend replacing the trolley bus on Main Street with two to eight small circulators, such as a heated golf cart.
- Sidewalks should be the priority to make the area more accessible and what are we willing to give up to make that happen? We can't do nothing for Main Street if we want to compete with the Deer Valley East and Canyons.
- A member requested a distinct presentation for businesses, separate from the public presentations, which will allow the design team to better focus on the economic issues that matter to businesses. This is a focus of the PCMC Community Engagement team. Staff will raise the question with Jennifer W.

## **Main Street Redesign**

The design team presented a list of options:

- Option 1: The status quo.
- Option 2a: A curbless car-lite street, meaning a one-way street with more space for pedestrians and amenities, in which the pedestrian area is flat with the driving area. The design would allow the street to be easily closed to traffic during certain periods using bollards.
- Option 2b: A permanent pedestrian plaza. Such a plaza would be closed to normal traffic but would be open for emergency vehicles and deliveries at certain times of day. The primary difference between this design and a "curbless car-lite street" is that it would not have demarcated traffic lanes or parking, meaning there would be less flexibility to open the street to traffic.
- Option 3: A one-way street.
- Option 4: A one-way street with a transit lane.

The focus of conversation was on Option 2b: a curbless car-lite street. Committee members expressed appreciation that it offers flexibility to retain parking and traffic, and the ability to open the streets to pedestrians at certain times if the community chooses. They offered the following feedback.

- Some worry about the impact of lost parking on visitors.
- Two members emphasizes the need to design the street to protect Park City's authenticity and charm. They do not want a street that feels like it could be in any city anywhere.
- Members expressed appreciation for the ability to change between traffic flow and pedestrianization between seasons, or different times of the week or month.

- One member asked if it would be viable to have a two-way curbless street. The design team explained this would either require eliminating on-street parking or the extra amenity space for pedestrians. On-street parking also helps to slow traffic and make the street safer. A curbless two-way street may be dangerous if it fails to sufficiently slow traffic.

The group reached consensus on the higher economic impact development scenario associated with Swede Alley but spent more time discussing which roadway scenario for Main St. and Swede Alley this group can support.

Daenitz offered that a benefit of Option 2a is that it would offer the flexibility to retain on-street parking and traffic, or to implement the maximum no-car state, depending on what the community chooses.

The group reached a consensus for a pedestrian focused scenario that includes:

- A curbless street.
- The option to retain on-street parking, including accessible spaces.
- The option to retain traffic.
- A design that would always be accessible for deliveries and emergency vehicles.

Members requested the following renderings and concept designs:

- A few versions of Option 2a with:
  - One way traffic pattern with parking and wider sidewalks.
  - One way traffic pattern but with somewhat more parking and somewhat less space for sidewalks.
  - Microtransit/golf cart circulators to take people up and down Main Street
- Snow and winter conditions
- Seasonality or Flexibility
- Protecting community character and authenticity
- A Gondola from to Deer Valley via Royal Street.

Next Step: One more stakeholder meeting to get a clear recommendation on September 9<sup>th</sup> in the morning before the public meetings start

# Summary Notes

## Park City Advisory Committee Meeting

August 14, 2024

### Meeting purpose

The Advisory Committee has held two previous meetings:

- **May 20, 2024.** The committee identified Old Town's strengths and challenges, and ideas for how to tackle its challenges. ([Slides, minutes and summary](#)).
- **July 15, 2024.** The design team presented a set of concepts and recommendations for how to tackle the challenges, and implement the ideas, that the committee identified at the previous meeting. ([Slides, minutes and summary](#)).

At the July 15 meeting, the committee requested an additional follow-up meeting to:

- Review the proposals in greater detail.
- Ask questions about the data used to design the proposals.
- Better understand implications of the proposals for traffic and transportation.

The August meeting was also an opportunity for the design team to adjust its proposals based on committee feedback.

### Development Options

In the July 15 meeting, the design team proposed two scenarios to develop the underused land around City Hall:

- Option 1 had greater density (up to six stories) and prioritized filling in gaps to improve Main Street's economy, including: high-end housing, workforce housing, hotels, a grocery store, underground parking, and more.
- Option 2 had lower density (up to four stories) and focused on providing more public space and greenery, while still filling in many of these gaps.

At that meeting, the committee expressed stronger support for Option 1, because the design team's economic analysis suggested it would have a much stronger economic impact. However, the committee wanted to better understand the basis for this economic analysis.

#### August 14 Discussion

The design team explained in greater detail its methodology for identifying economic impact. The committee continued to support Option 1.

#### Feedback and requests

The committee requested the following analysis and changes:

- Provide an estimate of the economic consequences for existing businesses during construction.

- Outline strategies for mitigating construction disruptions.
- Ensure the majority of renderings are set in winter.
- Incorporate some design features from Option 2 into Option 1, including more greenery, water, and softer surfaces.

## Main Street Redesign

In the July meeting, the design team had proposed to permanently pedestrianize Main Street. Some in the committee opposed this proposal while others supported it. The design team therefore reworked the proposal to offer a more flexible “car-lite” option. This approach has the following features:

- It would be “curbless,” meaning the street is flat with the sidewalk. This would make it easy to pedestrianize the street during events, on weekends, or certain times of the year.
- The street would still have a driving lane and on-street parking, demarcated with color, garden boxes, and bollards. This would ensure the community retains the option to provide car access to the street whenever it desires.



Example of a flexible “car-lite” street. Bell Street Park, Seattle.

This approach would create more space for street life and amenities, and would retain greater flexibility, offering the option to pedestrianize the street or retain traffic, depending on the community’s preferences or evolving needs.

### **August 14 Discussion: Parking Concerns**

The committee had the following primary concern about the car-lite option: will the reduction in parking spaces undermine visitorship?

The team explained that the outcome depends on whether the impact of losing parking will outweigh the impact of creating a more desirable destination. The team described research on the conditions for success for car-lite and pedestrianized streets, and expressed that Main Street is well-positioned thanks

to its pedestrian-friendly block design, and its status as a tourist destination. Certain actions will improve its chances of success, including:

- Building more development near City Hall to provide a greater critical mass of destinations and visitors.
- Providing better transportation options to help people reach there by other means. (See next section).
- Establishing an organization to make ongoing investments in the street.

### **August 14 Discussion: Two-Way Option**

A committee member asked for clarification on whether it might be possible to create a two-way curbless street. The design team recommended against this, because:

- A two-way street would provide little additional space for street life or amenities.
- A two-way curbless street may be dangerous, because the space for driving would be less constrained, leading to higher speeds.

### **Feedback and requests**

The committee broadly supported the car-lite option, and preferred it over permanent pedestrianization. They made the following requests for the design team:

- Outline various scenarios for a curbless streets, including:
  - One with more on-street parking.
  - One with more green space and amenities.
- Provide a concept for 4-to-8 transit circulators that would provide consistent free transportation up-and-down Main Street. The committee recommends acquiring small, attractive vehicles to replace the bus.
- Provide evidence on whether curbless streets are more dangerous, and how to make them safe.
- Outline how the design will manage snow shedding and drainage.
- Examine whether it might be possible to add heated sidewalks to the street and whether this can be financially and environmentally sustainable.
- Ensure the designs reflect Park City's heritage aesthetic, and do not feel like something from another city.

### **Swede Alley**

The Design team also outlined a redesign of Swede Alley that would widen sidewalks for pedestrians. The committee did not request changes.

## **Transportation**

In the July 15 meeting, the design team acknowledged that the proposals would lead to an overall reduction in parking in Old Town, and proposed a mix of transportation options to ensure people can easily reach Main Street, including:

- A park-and-ride facility somewhere near highways 80 and 40, which would include worker housing and public space.

- Bus lanes, a gondola, or some other transit solution to connect these highways to Old Town. (The precise solution will be decided by a separate Park City project).
- Valet parking in Old Town.
- Improvements to sidewalks and bike lanes.

The committee requested more information on traffic flow and how people would reach Main Street, because they are concerned about the impact of parking reductions.

In the August meeting, the design team offered more details on:

- Traffic flows and challenges in Park City.
- How the proposed design changes would impact traffic.
- How to mitigate traffic impacts with transit improvements and a park-n-ride facility.
- An overview of transportation recommendations from previous Park City projects.

### **August 14 Discussion: Gondola**

Previous transportation projects had rejected the idea of building a gondola from Park City to Deer Valley on Deer Valley Drive due to a lack of space in the right-of-way. The committee wondered whether it might be possible to connect to Deer Valley via a different route over Royal Street and city-owned greenspace. This would help high-value customers travel from Deer Valley to Main Street, and could connect with the new Gondola to Deer Valley East Village.

### **Feedback and requests**

The committee was largely supportive of the transportation proposals, but wanted more information on options to ensure people can easily access Main Street. They requested further analysis of the following:

- The number of parking spaces that can be maintained if not all on-street parking is removed from Main Street, and if structured parking is added under the new Brew Pub public space.
- The potential to build a gondola from the Sandridge parking lots to Deer Valley over green space and Royal Street, including a concept for how to connect the station to Main Street.
- The potential to add parking to city-owned land on the other side of Deer Valley Drive, and whether access standards would allow this.
- Whether it may be possible to enter an agreement with Hebert to provide better bus service between the two communities, as many Park City employees live in Hebert.
- Whether a tunnel under the roundabout may be feasible, and whether it could improve traffic flow for cars and transit.
- Data on how many days Park City streets are in a congested state.

### **Other next steps**

- The committee requested one more follow-up meeting to receive an update on the above requests — scheduled September 9th — before holding a public engagement.
- The committee requested separate engagement sessions with businesses during public engagement.