



Blue Ribbon Housing Commission Agenda
November 2, 2015
Park City Library, Room 201
4:30pm

Mark Harrington presented background on Affordable Housing policy and program over the years.

Working for the City since 1991 and has been City Attorney since the late 90s.

Governance and organization of a Blue Ribbon Commission

These types of commissions are what Mark calls the “low end of the totem pole in terms of public bodies” for the following reasons:

- Can make up own rules about how to meet and how much to involve the public;
- Not created by resolution or specifically enabled with any powers by ordinance; and
- Input device to draw additional expertise and viewpoints into a process.

There is flexibility in the give and take in interaction with staff. Group can appoint leadership and just request information from staff. BRHC meetings will be publicly noticed and open to public input. The group can decide how to organize that. The charter, structural outline, and staff report to City Council recommending establishment of the BRHC are the only binding documents. Group can agree to operate on formal or informal basis, such as election or chair and formal meeting minutes.

Mark used Olaf from “Frozen” as the metaphor for affordable housing work in Park City.

- Building a snowman: Utah State legislative authority:
 - a. Prohibition against rent control; and
 - b. Compliance with long-standing common law practice of “Mt Laurel Doctrine” to plan for housing so that all members of the community are able to afford homes (required element of an area’s General Plan).
- Utilizing “carrots”: Local incentives for development of affordable housing:
 - a. Starting in the late 80s – fee waivers were offered for partnership development agreements such as Iron Horse and Fireside projects.
 - b. Also, as per LMC, density bonuses are provided for 100% affordable (20 units/acre).
 - c. City Council has authority to waive impact fees.
- Establishing sticks: Obligations that are triggered by certain types of development:
 - a. MPDs trigger housing obligation and

- b. Annexations – viewed by most as the easiest areas to extract concession because we have a discretionary decision as to whether bring them into the limits. We’ve always been willing to entertain high density and partnerships.
- Magic: Any successful program needs some community magic – over past 20 years, the Council and Mayoral elections have changed from negative to positive. Instead of “all for themselves” attitudes, there was a movement from the top down (City Council/Mayor and down) that all who contribute to the community must have opportunity to live here as well – the Magic! Technical recommendations must be combined with magic. If there isn’t community support, no matter how right it is, there won’t be effectuate long term change.

Discussion:

- Negative Pushback from Legislature? Some philosophical differences such as leg trying to ban inclusionary zoning. Simultaneously, new allies are arising in response to communities that are going large lot single family zoning only or zoning out high density. Allies are building from advocates for higher density.
- HOA and sub HOAs can have hidden fees and special assessments that render units unaffordable in the future.
- Transfer taxes – something used by other jurisdictions is not possible in Utah and not likely to change anytime soon.
- The pendulum is swinging back as higher tolerance for higher density is seen in other locations in Utah and the desire of younger people for convenience of commute and access to amenities.

Some ideas for future discussion:

- Structure a meeting to dispel myths and disseminate housing information (the real issues and checking assumptions at the door)
- Potential guest editorial written by the Blue Ribbon Commission
- More discussion of EPS’s work
- Disposition list of city-owned property