

**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY HALL, COUNCIL CHAMBERS
DECEMBER 11, 2012**



AGENDA

| | |
|--|----|
| MEETING CALLED TO ORDER - 5:30 PM | pg |
| ROLL CALL | |
| ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 27, 2012 | 5 |
| PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS – <i>Items not scheduled on the regular agenda</i> | |
| STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS/DISCLOSURES | |
| WORK SESSION – <i>Discussion items only. No action taken</i> | |
| General Plan – Discussion and review of draft Core Values for General Plan including; Sense of Community and Historic Character | 19 |
| Annual Training - Open Public and Meetings Act | |
| ADJOURN | |

A majority of Planning Commission members may meet socially after the meeting. If so, the location will be announced by the Chair person. City business will not be conducted.

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the Park City Planning Department at (435) 615-5060 24 hours prior to the meeting.
Planning Commission - December 11, 2012

MINUTES – NOVEMBER 27, 2012

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
SPECIAL WORK SESSION – GENERAL PLAN
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
November 27, 2012

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Brooke Hontz, Stewart Gross, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Charlie Wintzer

EX OFFICIO:

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington; Katie Cattan, Planner; Anya Grahn, Planner; Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney

=====

SPECIAL WORK SESSION – GENERAL PLAN

ROLL CALL

Chair Pro Tem Hontz called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present except Commissioners Thomas and Worel who were excused.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 16, 2012

MOTION: Commissioner Wintzer moved to APPROVE the minutes of October 16, 2012 as written. Commissioner Gross seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously by all Commissioners present.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Commissioner Wintzer recalled conversations with Director Eddington and Commissioner Thomas on whether they should wait until the power station was done before meeting again with Gateway Planning. Director Eddington stated that representatives from Gateway Planning are scheduled to come back to Park City on December 12th ; however, depending on how things work out with Rocky Mountain Power on the substation, the Staff may re-schedule Gateway Planning for January.

WORK SESSION – GENERAL PLAN – Review of draft core Values for General Plan including Natural Setting and Sense of Community.

Planner Cattan noted that the Planning Commission previously reviewed Small Town and Natural setting. Sense of Community was a new topic for discussion this evening. Based on comments from the last meeting, they would also revisit Natural Setting.

Planner Cattan introduced a concept of the HERS Index, which is the Resnet Homes Energy Rater. Energy performance testing is done on new homes to determine the efficiency rate. A lower index score indicates a more energy efficient home. An existing home that was built until the old standards rated at 130 on the HERS Index. A standard home under the new energy Code rated at 100. The best scale rating was zero carbon footprint. Planner Cattan remarked that the HERS Index compares to how cars are rated for vehicle miles traveled for gasoline. She expected to see HERS ratings more and more in the future. Many communities are adopting regulations based on the HERS Index.

Planner Cattan stated that throughout the General Plan process there has been considerable discussion regarding energy efficiency and the best way to achieve it. The conversation has evolved from considering a housing maximum to conversations about purchasing TDR credits as a trade-off for a larger home. The credits would allow bonus space for the size of the home and offset carbon through open space.

Planner Cattan pointed out that Park City is a resort town and there are many large homes. If they continue with the same model and look into responsible homes such as adopting the HERS Index, the home would have to meet a certain reading to demonstrate that it would not create environmental impacts in terms of greenhouse gas emissions.

Planner Cattan stated that one of the strategies besides looking strictly at maximum house size or buying TDR credits would be to allow owners to exceed a maximum homes size with no limit, but through voluntary compliance with home efficiency standards.

A question for the Planning Commission was whether they agreed with the direction this has evolved.

Commissioner Wintzer stated that as he was walking to the meeting this evening, he questioned whether they were headed in the right direction based on the number of outside fire pits, heated driveways, etc. He felt the picture was bigger than just energy efficient homes.

Commissioner Gross referred to the question and asked if they would be setting a maximum and then allowing someone to exceed the maximum; or whether the maximum would be based on what was currently available and they could go beyond that.

Planner Cattan suggested that they look at the question as more of a concept of whether or not they agree with the direction. It could either be a maximum homes size based on a healthy output of a typical home or another efficiency standard. Director Eddington stated that the Commissioners should think of it as a concept for setting a maximum house size, but then allowing for incentivizing depending on the energy rating.

Commissioner Savage clarified that the standard would eventually find its way into the Land Management Code. By the time it reaches the LMC, the threshold to invest for additional density would be compared to the previous zoning eligibility for a particular area. Planner Cattan stated that there would not be a comparison in this case because Park City has never zoned for efficiency.

Commissioner Savage presented an example that if he currently owned a lot in Old Town he has a mechanism to determine the size of home he could built on the lot. Under the new implementation, he could build a house on the same lot of a certain size but if he wanted a larger home, he would have to adhere to the HERS efficiency rating. Director Eddington replied that this was correct. Commissioner Savage asked if the house size he would be allowed to build would be smaller under the new standards than it would be under the current Code, or would it allow him the same rights.

Planner Cattan stated that a better example would be a home in the Park Meadows neighborhood rather than Old Town because Old Town has different rules associated with size. In Park Meadows you would be allowed to build out to your setbacks. As an example, if every home was maximized home at 2,500 square feet, they would set an energy standard to allow square footage beyond 2,500 square feet. As one scenario, in order to get a 3500 square foot home, the HERS Index would have to have an 80 rating. To increase the square footage to 4500 square feet the HERS index would have to be 70. Planner Cattan pointed out that the HERS Index rating would have to improve as the house size gets larger.

Commissioner Hontz understood that someone could never build to their setbacks unless they built appropriately or purchased credits.

The Commissioners voted with their clickers and the result was 100% yes.

Planner Cattan stated that at the last General Plan meeting they talked about having flexibility built into open space; therefore, protecting open space through zoning and natural resources management while providing flexibility for low impact adaptation to meet the needs of future generations. It would also include future renewable resource, technology site, agriculture and water storage. Planner Cattan remarked that based on their comments, the Planning Commission did not want flexibility built into the open space for renewable resources. She had amended the language to reflect their decision.

The amended language read, "Utilize restrictive covenants such as deed restrictions and conservation easements to aid in the establishment of open space values ensuring future conservation." Planner Cattan noted that the option was not completely gone because renewable resources could be built into a possible future bond.

The Planning Commission discussed Sense of Community. According to visioning, the elements that make up sense of community are the people, the shared common ground, the shared responsibility for the public good and it is inclusive not exclusive. A huge point made at visioning was that Park City is an inclusive town.

Sense of Community manifests itself in the community and the built environment through housing options, non-profits, public places where people meet, public facilities, venues and events, everyday places where people go, a shared quality of life and a shared environment. Planner Cattan noted that it focuses on public realm and public places, as well as job opportunities.

During the last meeting Commissioner Thomas wanted to know when they would begin talking about beauty and aesthetics. Planner Cattan stated that the Staff has talked about adding another

goal within this section to address beauty and aesthetics and adopting city-wide neighborhood design standards for preservation of the beauty and aesthetic experience.

The Planning Commission voted on the question of whether or not to adopt city-wide design standards for preservation of the beauty and aesthetic experience within Park City. The vote tally was 100% yes.

Commissioner Strachan thought the ideas sounded great on the surface, but he was unsure how they could codify beauty and aesthetics because people have different opinions. Commissioner Wintzer agreed, however, he felt it was a place to start talking about what they would and would not like to see. Commissioner Strachan believed the start was worthwhile, but he assumed everyone in City government hopes to do things that are aesthetically pleasing and beautiful. Commissioner Savage agreed that it would be a challenge but beauty and aesthetics could be controlled through guidelines.

Director Eddington commented on the best management practices for design standards that could be applied in different areas. He believed they could set a basic standard to address materials, articulation, fenestration that most people could agree with.

The next question was whether the City has an obligation to the residents to require developers to consider sense of community within the design of future projects (e.g. incorporate criteria within the LMC or MPD process to address these issues. The Commissioners voted with their clickers and the tally was 80% yes and 20% no.

Director Eddington felt the issue was challenging because they now have to incorporate the criteria and deal with the challenges of subjective design. Commissioner Savage felt these issues were more important than the questions related to energy efficiency, square foot limitations and other quantitative rules they impose. If they set quality standards related to the objective of what they have in terms of look and feel, the quality of work follows naturally to achieve an end product.

The next question for the Planning Commission was what should the City prioritize to support Sense of Community. The four choices were: 1) Housing, 2) Cultural Amenities, 3) Improvements to public realm, 4) Job creation. The Commissioners voted and the result was 1) 40% 2) 20% 3) 40% 4) 0%.

Ruth Meintsma, a member of the public, remarked that housing was more important than the other three. She asked if the reference to housing was affordable housing.

Planner Cattan answered yes. Ms. Meintsma thought a level of housing in between Affordable Housing and nightly rentals has been overlooked and those are the houses that are rented out yearly. It is not included as Affordable Housing; but it is affordable housing when compared to nightly rentals. Ms. Meintsma pointed out that when these rented houses brings in a genre under sense of community that talks about how the work force is being pushed out in favor of the wealthy and class boundaries. She stated that the people who rent those houses are usually post-college or pre-family residents who live and work in Park City. That level of housing has been overlooked,

but in fact, it provides a sense of community within an area that is largely a ghost town of nightly rentals.

Planner Cattan noted that the Staff was looking at eliminating nightly rental in the primary residential neighbors for that specific reason. Director Eddington stated that the Staff has struggled with housing that is valued between \$300,000 and \$500,000. It is remotely affordable but the City only accommodates approximately 4% of that value, which means they are missing recent graduates and/or starter families. He agreed with Ms. Meintsma that they were missing that same group who were renting.

Ms. Meintsma pointed out that when that group moves out after they have a larger family they cannot afford to live in Park City and they move away. However, they still add to the sense of community when they are there.

Director Eddington reviewed a chart of showing the area median income, which are those who live in Park City but can work anyway; the median work force wage, which are those who live and work in Park City; and the median home price in Park City, based on a combination of condo and single family housing. The next chart compared the Median Value to Median Income Ratios for Park City and Salt Lake from 1990-2010. He noted that the ratio is typically three times the value of the mortgage. For the median workforce it was approximately \$200,000 for Salt Lake or 3.75 times the value. For Park City the numbers were nearly 12 times the value. Director Eddington pointed out that it was impossible for someone at that income level to afford an average house in Park City. The numbers support the comments that Park City is missing a segment of residents who are forced to live in Summit County, Heber or Salt Lake. Planner Cattan stated that housing in Park City is unattainable for the median workforce.

Director Eddington reviewed a color coded Housing Ladder to showing the distribution of homes in different price ranges between Park City, Snyderville and Northern Wasatch County and Heber based on an inventory of the Region. He noted that Park City had a very low percentage; however, it provided a baseline to understand where they need start and move forward.

Planner Cattan moved to Housing Strategies. The Planning Commission was asked to choose their most preferred strategy for promoting housing affordability. The strategies were; 1) to require a range of unit types and sizes; 2) deed restrict units to set caps on pricing; 3) create a mortgage assistance program; and 4) Land Trusts, where the land beneath the home is owned by a housing trust.

Commissioner Strachan did not believe Land Trust was a workable strategy because the trust uses the same tools as the City. The Trust would say that the homes are deed restricted or set at a maximum price.

Commissioner Wintzer felt the real problem is that there was nowhere to step up after a unit is deed restricted.

Commissioner Savage thought they should include language that says to find ways to collaborate on the development of large affordable housing projects that are designed to be affordable. He felt

that was a better approach than false ways to create affordability. Commissioner Strachan replied that the market would not support it. Director Eddington concurred. He was unsure what incentive would make a developer follow that direction. Commissioner Savage stated that the incentive would be to allow the developer to have the necessary density associated with a project to put the cost per square footage in a range that makes affordability of the units more attractive. Commissioner Strachan believed the density would have to be set too high for that to work. He was not opposed to the idea of collaboration as long as the units could be deed restricted later. Commissioner Savage felt strongly that the City should look at affordable housing as a principle focal point because it could fundamentally change the longer term viability and stability of Old Town and create a vibrant community that addresses many of the issues in the General Plan. They need to think big because it could not be accomplished in small pieces.

Commissioner Wintzer stated that in his six years on the Planning Commission, one of the major arguments was when someone wanted to put affordable housing next to someone else. The problem is that everyone supports affordable housing but not in their neighborhood. Commissioner Wintzer agreed with Commissioner Savage's concept, but it would be difficult to accomplish.

The Commissioners discussed existing affordable housing developments.

Planner Cattan stated that one of the principles within Goal 8 – Affordable Housing, is to provide increased housing opportunities that are affordable to a wide range of income levels within all Park City neighborhoods. Other principles are to increase the rental opportunities within the resort neighborhoods and mixed use district; and to increase ownership opportunities within primary residential. She asked if the Planning Commission agreed with any or all of the principles.

Commissioner Savage answered no. Commissioner Wintzer reiterated his agreement with the concept proposed by Commissioner Savage, but the uncertainty of how it could be accomplished. Commissioner Wintzer stated that putting affordable housing units at the top of Empire Pass puts a financial burden on people because they would have to drive everywhere; and there is no sense of community to make it desirable to raise a family. Commissioner Wintzer believed there are neighborhoods where affordable housing is not appropriate.

Commissioner Hontz believes that affordable housing is appropriate everywhere but it takes a lot of thought and good planning to make it work in a specific area or neighborhood.

Commissioner Hontz stated that developers get creative if the burden is on them to create the unit versus pay a fee-in-lieu, and there is a good likelihood that it would happen in a timely manner. She believed that was a better approach than waiting to see what happens in the future as they run out of land or fight the fight to get affordable housing. She was not convinced that condos and 500 square foot units for all was the answer. Commissioner Hontz thought it would be necessary to have more single family developments like Snow Creek to meet the affordable housing needs. She emphasized that the issue requires a variety of answers and it has to be able to change over time. Commissioner Hontz felt strongly that postponing affordable housing now in exchange for fee in-lieu was not the answer.

Commissioners Hontz and Savage argued the pros and cons of single-family versus condo affordable housing.

Commissioner Strachan agreed that affordable housing needed to be everywhere. If they assume that everyone in a certain price range wants a certain living experience, they are making an assumption about a perspective buyer. He knows several people with kids who would love to live in Empire and would not care about being isolated. Commissioner Strachan did not think they should assume what a buyer would want.

Commissioner Savage felt it was important to find a solution that would not create artificial pricing processes. Commissioner Strachan remarked that the issue is location. Developers like to develop in Empire Pass and the reason land is so expensive is because it is a desirable location. However, it is not just desirable to people with high incomes. People with middle to lower incomes would also like to live there. The developer understands that, which is why he would prefer to build something that only the highest incomes would pay the maximum market rate. Having the ability to put affordable housing elsewhere is a huge benefit for the developer and they would take every opportunity to do it. If the developer pays the fee in-lieu the City loses the ability to have an affordable unit in a desirable location, and a newcomer to Park City loses the opportunity to enter a lottery to live in Empire Pass. That value is lost to the City.

Director Eddington stated that a solution might be to strongly encourage the developer to build affordable housing on-site and double or triple the fee in-lieu to make building on-site more attractive. Commissioner Strachan agreed, but they still need to look at the motivation of the incoming buyer and where they would want to live. Commissioner Strachan stated that the demand will always outstrip the supply of affordable housing because the market is unbalanced. People with lower incomes cannot afford to live in Park City and there will always be that demand.

Commissioner Savage suggested that if someone put together a pro forma as a business project that would find ways to create significant amounts of affordable housing density that could be either rented at market rates or sold with a cap on appreciation rates, it would address this problem in a significant way. However, it would require the City to find a way to facilitate putting the land to the developer and it would require the City to accept the concept of density. That would be the only way they could come up with a pro forma that would pencil out in a way that would attract developers. Commissioner Savage believed it would change the face of how Park City is perceived within its own community as well as the overall resort development community in terms of embracing the idea of people living and working in Park City.

Planner Cattan stated that two added strategies to the General Plan could be; 1) to review the existing affordable housing MPD through true economics by doing a pro forma to make sure it works and that there is an incentive to do an Affordable MPD; and; 2) base the in-lieu fee on land values instead of square footage.

Planner Cattan understood that there was still disagreement among the Planning Commission that affordable housing should only be in primary residential neighborhoods

The Commissioners voted on their preferred strategies that were outlined earlier in the discussion. The tally was: 1) 40% 2) 20% 3) 20% 4) 20%.

Planner Cattan reported that the Task Force was asked the same question. They supported all the strategies but they preferred to create more variety through limiting size and type.

Commissioner Gross stated that if the objective is to bring in people at the \$55,000 income level, they needed to set the price; otherwise the market would drive the price.

Planner Cattan stated that where they were heading on market rate affordability was identify sites within primary residential neighborhoods in which one or more of the following could be accommodated or encouraged. 1) Decrease minimum lot size requirements; 2) increased density; 3) smaller residential units to create market rate attainable, or move-down housing options for seniors in the community.

The Commissioners were asked to vote yes or no on whether they agree. Director Eddington clarified that the question was focused on primary residences. Commissioner Hontz thought it was possible to agree, but also say secondary homes.

The Commissioners voted and the tally was 100% yes. Planner Cattan asked if the Planning Commission would want to include areas such as Thaynes or Solamere. Commissioner Hontz noted that there were only a few places where land was available and she thought some locations would be good and others would not. She was not opposed to locating affordable housing in secondary neighborhoods.

Director Eddington asked for a show of hands as to how many Commissioners were interested in exploring specific sites in secondary neighborhoods. Commissioner Strachan asked if cost was the reason the City would not consider purchasing existing privately owned property and converting it to deed restricted affordable housing. Commissioner Hontz pointed out that the City is not a development company.

Commissioner Savage felt that he did not have a clear understanding of their real goals for affordable housing. Director Eddington noted that his comment would be addressed later in the presentation. Commissioner Savage thought they should start with the big picture of what they hope to ultimately attain and then work backwards into the details.

Planner Cattan stated that currently 20% of the workforce lives within the City limits, and the City's goal is to house a minimum of 35% of Park City's workforce in Park City in the next 10 years.

She asked what the Planning Commission would see as a healthy percentage over the next 20 years. The choice was 1) whether to maintain 35%; 2) 40%; 3) 45% 4) 50% or 5) above 50%.

The Commissioners voted and the tally was 1) 40% 2) 20% 3) 40% 4) 0% 5) 0%.

Commissioner Savage believed that affordable housing could be the single most important way to mitigate traffic issues as long as they get it right.

Commissioner Strachan wanted to know the criteria the City Council used to establish 35% as the minimum in ten years. Director Eddington replied that it was based on the current affordable housing study and the prior housing study from 2007 and 2011. He was unsure why the City Council chose 35%, and he offered to research why they came up with that number. He assumed that due to the demographics of Park City a higher number may be unattainable. Council Member Butwinski stated that it was also based on projected demands because the County currently has a surplus of affordable housing.

Commissioner Gross pointed out that the City was currently 50% under where they should be for affordable housing in terms of numbers.

Ms. Meintsma asked if work force and affordable housing is always related to \$55,000 a year and under. Planner Cattan noted that the wage is reassessed each year. Ms. Meintsma could not understand why there was not Affordable Work force A and B. Affordable Work Force A could be \$55,000 per year and at one level of affordable housing; and B could be \$100,000 to accommodate a second work force.

Planner Cattan explained that a range of affordable housing is used when a development is created. Ms. Meintsma thought there should be different labels because they are not the same genre of people. In her opinion, affordable housing would be easier to work with if it was categorized as A and B. Planner Cattan stated that affordable and attainable were the two terms they try to use. Attainable would be those earning a higher wage.

Director Eddington stated that the Staff was trying to create a tiered approach to affordable housing.

Planner Cattan reviewed a graph showing the average sale prices of single family homes by Park City neighborhood from 1998 to 2011. Lower Deer Valley, Aerie and Sunny Slopes were the highest and the lowest was Bonanza Park and Prospector. A second graph showed the average sale price by condos by location. Upper Deer Valley was the highest followed by a mix in the other neighborhoods.

Planner Cattan presented a slide showing the breakdown of units by occupancy for Park City neighborhoods. Green represented owner-occupied units, the light green represented renters and the pink and blue colors represented vacant units and seasonal units. Director Eddington noted that Thaynes, Park Meadows, the Aerie and Bonanza Park were the only ones who hit 50% in terms of owner-occupied or renter-occupied. Commissioner Savage asked if upper Deer Valley included Empire. Planner Cattan answered yes.

Planner Cattan provided a breakdown of the different neighborhoods.

A question for the Planning Commission was whether they should only allow visitor oriented developments such as hotels and nightly-rental within existing resort neighborhoods. She noted that areas with nightly rentals typically have less primary homeownership.

The Commissioners voted on the question and the result was 80% yes and 20% no.

Goal 7 was to create a diversity of housing opportunities to accommodate the changing needs of residents. Planner Cattan stated that this was an opportunity for the Planning Commission to comment on the principles and strategies of Goal 7. Director Eddington stated that the Commissioners could make their comments this evening or provide it to Planning Department via email. Commissioner Hontz had written comments that she submitted.

Commissioner Hontz asked for an explanation of the last bullet item on the strategies, "Support start-up of a scattered site land trust". Planner Cattan used Snow Creek as an example. If the City purchased the land under Snow Creek and a developer developed it, the land would be kept in a land trust. It would keep the price of future housing lower because the land is owned by a separate entity. She explained that having scattered land trusts is a new in housing. The idea is to purchase properties within Old Town at the lowest value. If the City owned the land underneath the structures it would keep the pricing down over time. A scattered land trust means that several unrelated properties are held in a land trust by one entity.

Planner Cattan called for comments on Goal 8 - Provide affordable housing opportunities for the residents and workforce of Park City. She noted that when they initially started this process the Planning Commission requested more specific detail. The Planning Commission was satisfied with the additional detail provided.

Goal 9 - Park City shall continue to provide unparalleled parks and recreation opportunities for residents. Commissioner Strachan and Gross strongly agreed. Commissioner Wintzer pointed out that it would raise the values of land and homes in Park City, which conflicts with the goal for affordable housing.

Goal 10: Park City shall provide world-class recreation infrastructure to host local, regional, national and international events, thus furthering Park City's role as a world-class, multi-seasonal destination resort community. Planner Cattan asked if this would compliment sense of community or threaten sense of community. She noted that there were good discussions with the Task Force on this question.

Commissioner Wintzer could see how it would compliment and threaten. Planner Cattan remarked that the Task Force felt it was important to mitigate the impacts of traffic, timing, parking, spacing between events, etc.

Goal 11- Support the continued success of the tourism economy while preserving the community character that adds to the visitor experience. Planner Cattan remarked that this goal was an effort to balance the two. She noted that the action strategy is to protect the unique attributes of the City that makes Park City unique. Director Eddington pointed out that there are costs associated with being unique.

Goal 12 - Foster diversity of jobs to provide greater economic stability and new opportunities for employment in Park City. Planner Cattan stated that in looking at Park City's current economy, they are very resort oriented and not diverse. This goal would encourage creating greater economic

stability through diversity. Director Eddington remarked that there was also a cost associated with fostering that kind of growth.

The Planning Commission voted on whether they agreed or disagreed with Goal 12. The vote tally was 60% yes and 40% no.

Commissioner Savage asked if the Planning Commission would have the opportunity to discuss timing and prioritize the goals.

Planner Cattan asked if there was any discussion against diversity of jobs. Commissioner Savage believed there should be a certain amount of resource to do a certain number of things. If there is too much diversity nothing gets done right. He recommended that they prioritize the single most important element to achieve the objective of keeping Park City Park City. They need to focus on one goal and get it right. Planner Cattan stated that within a General Plan you must plan for land use, housing, etc. Commissioner Savage understood, which is why he had suggested prioritization and timing.

A member of the public thought they should think about what Park City would be like if it did have diversified economy and other high paying jobs. They would have to think about the kind of industries that would support those jobs and whether that would keep Park City, Park City. She believed job diversity would probably change who they are.

Goal 13 - The future of the City should be planned to include limits (including ecological, qualitative, and economic) to foster innovative sustainable development, protect the community vision, and negatively impacts the region. Planner Cattan stated that this goal talks about natural resource planning within the open space. It also starts to quantify natural limits for things such as water and air quality. Those are things that can be quantified for the future make sure they do not exceed the limits and push the boundaries.

The Commissioners voted on whether they agreed or disagreed with Goal 13. The vote was 100% agreed.

Commissioner Savage noted that the goal talks about limits to foster sustainable development, but it does not address the objective. They cannot limit something without knowing what it is they are limiting. Commissioner Savage stated that they need to quantify the definition of sustainable development with the definition of protecting the community vision and set that as an objective.

Planner Cattan stated that another General Plan meeting was scheduled for Tuesday, December 11th at 5:30 p.m., followed by the Planning Commission holiday party. The regular Planning Commission meeting would be Wednesday, December 12th. Director Eddington announced that due to the Thanksgiving holiday the second regular meeting was cancelled.

The Work Session was adjourned.

KCF? G9GG-CB

Planning Commission Staff Report



Subject: General Plan
Author: Katie Cattan, AICP
Date: December 11, 2012
Type of Item: Work Session

Below is the layout for the new General Plan. The elements within the new General Plan will be focused around the specific core values identified during the community visioning. The Core Values are those values identified by the community that must be preserved to maintain the Park City experience. The Core Values include: Small Town, Natural Setting, Sense of Community, and Historic Character.

Layout of the New General Plan

1. Park City Visioning Outcome
2. Park City Demographics
3. Small Town PC reviewed on 10.8.2012 and 10.16.2012
 - a. Land Use
 - b. Regional Land Use Planning
 - c. Transportation
4. Natural Setting PC reviewed on 10.16.2012 and 11.27.2012
 - a. Open Space
 - b. Resource Conservation
 - c. Climate adaptation
5. Sense of Community PC reviewed on 11.27.2012 and 12.11.2012
 - a. Housing
 - b. Parks and Recreation
 - c. Special Events
 - d. Economy
 - e. Community Facility
6. Historic Character PC review on 12.11.2012
 - a. Historic Preservation
7. The PC Neighborhoods
 - a. 1 – 9
 - b. Implementation Strategies
8. Indicators

During the November 27th, 2012 Planning Commission work session, the Commission reviewed a draft of the goals, objectives and strategies for Sense of Community. The Planning Commission provided direction to staff on draft goals, principles, and strategies. Staff has revised the 1st draft of Sense of Community incorporating the general direction of the Planning Commission. The second draft of Sense of Community is included as Exhibit 1.

During the first half of the December 11th work session, staff is requesting further direction regarding the second draft of Sense of Community, specifically principles within Goal 8. Location of affordable housing was debated during the previous meeting. Staff would like further direction on distribution and type of affordable housing relative to Park City neighborhoods.

The second half of the work session will focus on the draft goals, principles, and strategies for Historic Character. (Exhibit B) Staff will begin the discussion with an interactive presentation on Historic Character. Staff requests that Commissioners highlight areas of concern within the draft of Historic Character for further discussion during the work session.

The full version of the General Plan will include write-ups on trends, demographics, and full explanation of specific strategies. The first complete draft will be completed by staff and circulated to the Planning Commission by January 31st, 2013.

Exhibits

Exhibit A: Sense of Community draft #2

Exhibit B: Historic Character draft #1

Sense of Community^(revised 12.04.2012)

The third of the four core values identified by residents during the 2009 Community Visioning is *Sense of Community*. *Sense of Community* is what unites Parkites - a common ground - despite diverse social, economic and cultural backgrounds. Park City is a community of involved citizens from many walks of life. While our natural setting and recreational opportunities brought many people to Park City, it is the strong sense of community that keeps people here. This sentiment was echoed frequently throughout the 2009 community visioning process. It is essential to residents that the *Sense of Community* they know remains intact and retains its funkiness, diversity, and playfulness. In the community interview conducted during the 2009 Visioning, nearly 1 in two responses said the community and its people are what keep them here.

Sense of Community is experienced through the people that choose to live and/or work in Park City. Not only is it common to run into acquaintances at the grocery store, in the lift lines, and on the trails, it is desirable. There are a number of events, from the 4th of July and Miners Day parades, to the many organized athletic competitions, and free events such as Wednesday night concerts at Deer Valley, that many Parkites attend and enjoy. When residents were asked what made them proud of Park City, second to the Olympics, the community answered “When we rise to a challenge and do the right thing for the community and its people.” Community involvement is strong in Park City, evidenced through the eighty-five (85) non-profits in existence in 2012¹.

Despite our strengths, we still face our fair share of challenges. Nearly one in two respondents to the community interviews felt that our community was splitting apart along class boundaries, with

¹ 2012 Park City Foundation

the workforce being pushed out in favor of the wealthy. Nearly 15 percent felt that there is now a social separation between long-time Park City residents and newcomers. Housing affordability, social equity, and economic opportunities are three (3) of the main challenges Parkites must confront in the coming years. If we do not, we will jeopardize our strong *Sense of Community*.

Home prices in Park City are very high, and despite the recent economic decline, have remained stable.² The workforce and many community members find themselves in a sort of community limbo. They feel they are a part of the Park City community, but cannot actually live here because they cannot afford to buy or rent a place to call home. As affordable housing becomes ever more challenging, many residents are wondering, “For whom are we preserving Park City?” In the last decade, the number of homes occupied by full time residents decreased from 41% of all housing units in 2000 to 30% in 2010. The number of second homes increased by 66% during that same period, while primary homes grew by only 7%.³ Although these numbers may seem threatening to the core value *Sense of Community*, they are simultaneously responsible for many of the unparalleled community assets that are the lure of the small town.

Currently our residents enjoy a quality of life that is unprecedented for a town of 7,500 persons. The quality of education, recreation, and infrastructure services is due mostly in part to our tourism economy and second home owners. Tourists, attracted to the skiing and natural setting, bring substantial visitor and tax dollars into our town every year. Continued support of the tourism economy is essential to maintain the lifestyle and economic benefits that Parkites enjoy. Balance between sense of community and the

² ADD

³ Census 2010

function of national and international host must continue to be a focus as the City evolves.

It is essential that Park City does not lose its character in order to remain competitive in the tourism industry. It is also essential that the resorts evolve with the tourism industry. Thoughtful planning can lead to balance between the two, ensuring a place desirable for locals and tourist alike, resulting in friendly service from locals, inclusivity from the resorts, and elevated *Sense of Community*.

Our *Sense of Community* is supported also through creating a variety of local business and job opportunities for residents. The largest employment sector in Park City during 2010 was the leisure and hospitality industry, which includes jobs in the arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services sectors. Around 5,682 people had jobs in this industry, accounting for nearly 45 percent of all employment in Park City. In addition to being the largest employment industry in Park City, workers in the leisure and hospitality sectors are also the lowest paid, receiving an average income of \$2,063 per month. Supporting policies to attract a mix of businesses can result in greater opportunities for Park City residents to work locally. Diversifying our economy can also provide the opportunity for higher wage jobs and overall greater stability. In theory, if higher paying jobs were created that increase the median workforce wage, there would be an increase in the number of employees that could afford to live within Park City. This would strengthen the *Sense of Community*.

Goal 7 Create a diversity of housing opportunities to accommodate the changing needs of residents. (revised 11.15.12)

“Life-cycle” housing is housing stock that meets the needs of residents throughout their life providing opportunities to age in place rather than move between towns during the different stages of life to meet their needs at the time. By creating a mix of housing stock at varying price ranges, size, and design, residents will have local options whether they are seasonal workers, young professionals, families, empty nesters, or retirees. Having options on all rungs of the housing ladder ensures opportunities within the community throughout residents’ entire lives. This translates directly into neighborhood, community, and regional stability. A community that can rely upon access to adequate housing choices near employment centers and services spends less time commuting and has the opportunity for greater involvement and participation within their community. Life-cycle housing is essential to preserving the core value *Sense of Community*.

Principles

- Increase diversity of housing stock to fill voids within housing inventory (including price, type, and size) to create a variety of context sensitive appropriate housing opportunities within all neighborhoods.
- Focus efforts for diversity of housing stock within primary residential neighborhoods to maintain majority occupancy by full time residents within these neighborhoods.

Action Strategies

- Identify sites within primary residential neighborhoods in which one or more of the following could be accommodated and/or encouraged:

- Decreased minimum lot size requirements.
- Increased density.
- Smaller residential units to create market rate attainable housing in Park City and/or “move down” housing options for seniors in the community.
- Revise zoning codes to permit a wider variety of compatible housing types within each Park City neighborhood.
- Explore new and emerging trends for non-traditional housing developments, such as co-housing, congregate housing or limited equity co-ops, within primary residential neighborhoods. Create of specific review standards to ensure compatibility and mitigation of impacts is necessary.
- Focus nightly rental within resort neighborhoods.
- Support start-up of a scattered site land trust.

Operational Strategies

- Update residential housing inventory analysis every 5 years with analysis on for purchase and rental price, type, and size of units. Subsequently, update affordable housing policy and general plan to guide new strategies to be implemented within the Land Management Code.
- Utilize RDA funding to retrofit existing, aging residential housing stock within close proximity to resorts and mixed use centers.
- Leverage the state required 20 percent of RDA funds for affordable housing to secure greater resources for housing needs city-wide.

Goal 8 Provide affordable housing opportunities for the residents and workforce of Park City. (revised 11.15.2012)

There is a broad spectrum of affordable housing needs in Park City due to the desirability and high cost of living within a resort community. The gap between housing prices and area median income has continued to grow with the median home price rising dramatically and household income increasing only marginally. The 2010 median real estate value to median income ratio was 12.14. This means that the median home price is 12.14 times the median household income. Typically, housing is within reach for purchase if it is priced at three (3) times the household income. In the past decade, there were very few opportunities for ownership for moderate-income household (80% of AMI) - zero opportunity for single-family homes and only 16.8% of condos within their buying power. This results in few housing opportunities for future residents.

The lack of housing opportunities has a negative impact upon our *Sense of Community*. In the 2011 National Citizens Survey, availability of affordable quality housing and variety of housing options were ranked “much worse” in Park City in comparison to 237 other jurisdiction through-out the United States. When a community no longer has housing options for its core workforce – which in Park City’s case is everyone from police officers, teachers, electricians, laborers, restaurant workers and beyond, the vibrancy and diversity of a community are threatened.

Protecting *Sense of Community* requires government officials to make difficult policy decisions. The costs associated with preserving the core values of *Natural Setting*, *Historic Character*, and *Small Town*, are often placed on the developer and/or the residents. As these three core values are protected, living in Park City becomes more desirable and less affordable, threatening *Sense of*

Community. This unintended consequence must be countered through difficult policy decisions regarding negative impacts of success. Reinvestment in workforce and affordable housing is essential to protect *Sense of Community*.

Principles

- Provide increased housing opportunities that are affordable to a wide range of income levels within all Park City neighborhoods.
- Increase rental housing opportunities for seasonal workers in close proximity to resorts and mixed use centers.
- Increase housing ownership opportunities within primary residential neighborhoods.

Action Strategies

- Increased affordable housing opportunities through implementation of strategies within the housing toolbox. (Page _)
- Broaden income qualifications for housing programs (% of AMI) to reflect wide-range of housing needs.
- Actively monitor the type, condition, and tenure of affordable housing options in Park City.
- Update incentives for density bonuses for affordable housing developments to include moderate and mixed income housing.
- Adopt streamline review process for projects that are at least 80 percent affordable housing projects.
- Evaluate the Land Management Code to remove unnecessary barriers to affordable housing.
- Amend In Lieu fee to consider value of land of proposed development in fee.
- Economic review of Affordable Housing Master Planned Development to amend according to existing economics. This review should be completed in conjunction with the housing needs assessment during the regular five year review.

Operational Strategies

- Implement a regional housing approach identifying opportunities to collaborate with Summit and Wasatch County to address the region's housing challenges.
- Update the Park City housing resolution every five years at a minimum to comply with State and Federal regulations and continue to meet housing needs in Park City.
- Dedicate funding stream from recognized influences on housing affordability, such as RDA funds, second homeowner taxes and/or resort sales tax, into an affordable housing fund. Utilize fund to implement strategies within the affordable housing tool box.
- Prevent loss of existing affordable housing through retrofitting existing stock with necessary repairs, energy efficiency upgrades, and extending deed restrictions.
- Support cost savings policies for affordable housing including fee waivers, rebates, and grants for low-income and mixed-income developments.
- Provide best practices for employer-assisted housing to encourage large employers to provide housing assistance for employees.
- Identify and acquire property for the future development of affordable housing.
- Continue to act as a community resource, providing information and education of available diversity of innovative housing structures and lending options.
- Prioritize housing acquisitions that support multiple City goals, such as historic preservation and/or carbon reduction.

Goal 9 Park City shall continue to provide unparalleled parks and recreation opportunities for residents. (revised 11.15.12)

Park City is a lifestyle community and a community of choice. Year round residents that relocated to Park City, most likely did so to fulfill a lifestyle choice. Parkites were asked “what brought you here?” in the 2009 Visioning. The most common response (31%) was skiing and the snow. When asked “what keeps you here?” respondents expressed the community and people (55%) as the foremost appeal, followed by mountain lifestyle and quality of life (53%), and recreation was the fifth most popular response (24%); although one can assume that recreation is also included in mountain lifestyle (e.g. skiing, mountain biking, hiking). The results are telling—Parkites love to recreate.

Park City has done an exceptional job at providing unparalleled parks and recreation opportunities for residents and visitors. In its 2011 National Citizen Survey, residents responded with overwhelming satisfaction for the recreational opportunities in Park City. Out of 239 communities that have been surveyed, Parkites were the most satisfied (Ranked #1) out of all the communities with the recreational opportunities available. The City received a 2012 Voice of the People Award from the International City/County Management Association in recognition of this rating.

Principles

- Maintain local recreation opportunities with high quality of service, exceptional facilities, and variety of options.
- Locate recreation options within close vicinity to existing neighborhoods and transit for accessibility and to decrease vehicle miles traveled. Grouping facilities within recreational campuses is desired to decrease trips.

Action Strategies

- Adopt design standards for sports facilities that require complimentary architectural design, local materials, and natural screening within existing neighborhoods.
- When identifying future locations for recreation the following should be prioritized:
 - Accessibility by public transportation, trail system, and/or walkability.
 - Proximity to end user and neighborhood needs.
 - Providing facilities for underserved areas within primary residential neighborhoods.
 - Impact assessment (light, noise, parking) of facilities on neighborhoods quality of life.
- Continue long-range planning efforts to anticipate recreation needs of future generation.

Operational Strategies

- Create Custom Level Of Service (LOS) based on user feedback. Park City will monitor the needs of the community through demand surveys and citizen satisfaction surveys and adapt facilities and service levels accordingly.
- Continue to work collaboratively with Snyderville Basin Special Recreation District (SBSRD) and the Park City School District (PCSD) to manage and plan facilities on a region scale.
- Update recreation master plan to reflect regional management and long range planning effort to maintain high level of service.

Goal 10 Park City shall provide world-class recreation and public infrastructure to host local, regional, national, and international events thus furthering Park City's role as a world-class, multi-seasonal destination resort community. (revised 12.4.2012)

Park City's economy is dependent on recreation tourism. The City should continue to improve recreational infrastructure as an economic development tool to remain competitive as a world-class multi-season destination resort community. Professional fields, ice rinks, and recreation courts enable Park City to host large professional level events. Implementing current industry standards permits the Park City facilities can be utilized for regional, national, and international competitions. This can improve the economic health of the City year-round and especially during the shoulder session by populating hotels, restaurants, and shops. The larger events also help to subsidize local recreation programs. As Park City continues to prioritize recreation tourism with infrastructure improvements, hosting another winter Olympics may become a reality.

Principles

- Maintain competitive as a world-class, multi-season, destination resort community by increasing year round recreation events and demand on resort support services, such as hotels and restaurants.
- Balance increased tourism attractions with preservation of small town character and quality of life. Locate larger tourist attractions close to resorts and/or existing facilities. Locate community facilities close to primary residential areas.
- Public infrastructure improvements and programming should consider the visitor experience to Park City during large events and master festivals.

Action Strategies

- Adopt City policy to include consideration of current industry standards for new recreation facilities and remodels to enable hosting world class events while benefiting the local's quality of life.
- Support opportunities for high altitude training centers. Allow short term housing opportunities for visiting teams and athletes.
- Research opportunities for the location of a high altitude training center.
- Maintain policies within each public recreation facility to manage local use and non-resident use.
- Allow cutting edge, green technology in appropriate areas to visually represent Park City's commitment to sustainable tourism.

Operational Strategies

- Collaborate with local hosts to attract additional national and international sporting events year round.
- Fund a study to research benefits and impacts of a connected regional ski lift system.
- Support future efforts to host a second Winter Olympics.
- Public infrastructure policy should provide visitors with the Park City experience, including cutting edge technology which exhibits Park City's commitment to the visitor experience and environment.

Goal 11 Support the continued success of the tourism economy while preserving the community character that adds to the visitor experience. (revised 11.15.12)

The resort economy is the primary economic engine for Park City and Summit County. Park City's resorts captured an average of 40 percent of total Utah skier days between 1996 and 2010. Since 1995, total taxable sales in Park City have more than doubled, rising from \$289,806,859 to \$605,997,311 in 2010.⁴ Many business owners have chosen to invest within Park City due to the high demand by visiting tourists for retail, accommodations, and resort support. As Park City continues to grow and redevelop, it is essential that the City provides support to its resort economy and assist in the effort toward a year-round resort community.

Another key component to economic success is maintaining a distinct *Park City Experience*. The strategy of "Keep Park City, Park City" goes beyond the necessity to protect the core values identified in the community vision. It is a strong marketing tool in an age when many resort towns have become overrun by national chains and have lost their unique identity and visitor experience. Achieving balance between resort-oriented development and a strong sense of place is an essential strategy to protect the *Park City Experience*.

Principles

- The vibrancy of Park City's resorts is essential to the success of resort support businesses. The City must provide flexibility to allow the primary resorts to evolve with the tourism industry, increase occupancy rates year round, and create more demand for the resort support industries throughout the City.

- Preservation of our community core values of *Small Town, Natural Setting, Sense of Community, and Historic Character* is essential to maintaining the unique *Park City Experience* for visitors and residents. Regulate design of new development to compliment the Community's core values and protect the *Park City Experience*.

Action Strategies

- Provide flexibility to the two primary resorts in town within Master Planned Development amendments to allow the primary resorts to evolve with the tourism industry and increase occupancy rates year round.
- Protect the unique attributes of the City that make Park City unique. (Placeholder: MAKE A LIST OF UNIQUE ATTRIBUTES)
- Facilitate the establishment of more year-round visitor attractions within the resort neighborhoods and commercial districts.
- Limit visitor-oriented development and nightly rental to existing resort neighborhoods. Restrict nightly rental from primary residential neighborhoods.
- Adopt city-wide design standards to maintain the aesthetic experience of Park City.

Operational Strategies

- Implement redevelopment projects within the Lower Park Avenue RDA to allow the tourism industry to evolve while contributing positively to the residents' quality of life.
- Acquire open space recognizing that protection of the *Natural Setting* is essential to the distinct *Park City Experience* for tourism.
- Promote Main Street as a primary attraction within the City.
- Support local-owned, independent businesses that reflect the core values of Park City and add to the Park City experience.

- Research creative adaptation strategies for the ski industry to attract customers year-round, thus increasing demand on local resort support industries.
- Promote the Olympics as a living legacy through the continued adaptation of Olympic Facilities for training, hosting world class events, and as a visitor attraction.
- Conduct a lodging study to determine the amount of hotel, condo, and other nightly rental accommodations to meet visitors' needs, prevent oversaturation of the market, support existing investments in local lodging, and increase occupancy rates.
- Encourage more frequent visitation by second homeowners.
- Improve and standardize Park City's way finding and signage system.

Goal 12 Foster diversity of jobs to provide greater economic stability and new opportunities for employment in Park City. (revised 11.15.12)

The largest employment sector in Park City during 2010 was the leisure and hospitality industry, which includes jobs in the arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation, and food services sectors. Around 5,682 people had jobs in this industry, accounting for nearly 45 percent of all employment in Park City. In addition to being the largest employment industry in Park City, workers in the leisure and hospitality sectors are also the lowest paid, receiving an average income of \$2,063 per month. Over the past decade, wages in this industry have remained roughly the same, increasing only 1%, in real terms.⁵ Park City's high real-estate costs combined with low paying jobs results in spatial mismatch (separating where people live from where they work), for both residents of Park City and employees within the City limits. By diversifying the local job market, more opportunities will be created for residents of Park City to make a living locally.

Principles

- Retain and expand existing Park City businesses.
- Improve the balance of jobs to housing ratio in Park City through efforts to attract higher paying jobs and workforce housing strategies.
- Support local owned, independent businesses that reflect the core values of Park City and add to the Park City experience.
- Discourage national commercial retail chains on Main Street and the negative impacts of big box and nation chains on the unique *Park City experience*.

⁵ ADD

Action Strategies

- Support and attract businesses through implementation of the economic development toolbox. (Page _)
- Utilize economic development tools to support start-up opportunities for local businesses that augment the *Unique Park City Experience*. Public investment in a Park City business incubator center should be considered.
- Attract businesses focused on High Altitude training, goods, and/or services that complement Park City's sustainability initiative to relocate to Park City.
- Maintain commercial and light industrial uses within the City limits to meet the needs of residents and visitors. Develop and monitor an inventory of commercial and industrial space to support local businesses, prevent economic leakage, and decrease vehicle miles travelled.
- Foster live-work opportunities in commercial area.
- Establish a neighborhood economic development tool for the Bonanza Park District to recycle increased tax revenues into the redevelopment area, thus creating a funding source for infrastructure, public/private partnerships, and improvement to the public realm.
- Identify and implement opportunities for public-private partnership opportunities to diversify employment opportunities in Park City and increase workforce wages.

Operational Strategies

- Provide competitive, cutting-edge technology infrastructure in areas targeting business growth.
- Continue regional coordination with economic development partners to develop programs and support services to attract new business to the region. Inform businesses of current opportunities and advantages of the region such as site location savings, labor force, infrastructure, cost of business, portfolio of

available properties, quality of life, and economic development incentives.

- Research possibility of creating a revolving loan fund to provide gap financing for new and expanding local businesses. Criteria should be created to ensure funding only be considered for businesses that complement the community vision and goals of the City.
- Promote Park City's exceptional quality of life to attract workforce of virtual workforce businesses.
- Support educational opportunities for the workforce of targeted employment sectors

Goal 13: The future of the City should be planned to include limits (including ecological, qualitative, and economic) to foster innovative sustainable development, protect the community vision, or prevent negative impacts to the region. (revised 12.04.2012)

Park City is a dynamic system that continues to evolve and be defined by its community values, natural resources, existing topography, property rights, public and private investment, politics, history and external pressures. The system is flexible; able to adjust to fluctuations and external pressures. As Park City continues to mature, the system should strengthen by adopting policies that protect the community vision and core values. A healthy system requires limits to run efficiently and not overwhelm the interconnected parts. This is true of Park City. As the City has grown outward through annexations, the system reacted with expansion of infrastructure (e.g. roads, public utilities, public transportation) and increased demand on existing resources (e.g. water, air, public facilities, fire and rescue, schools, etc.), creating ongoing costs to residents and tax payers and pressure on limited natural resources. Adopting policies to grow within set limits is imperative to maintaining the economic, environmental, and social equity balance of the City and strengthen the City's existing neighborhoods.

Principles

- Provide reliable public resources to ensure the health, welfare, and safety for residents and visitors.
- Manage growth to protect the quality of life and preserve the unique *Park City Experience* by recognizing limits to growth and adopting responsible policies that are consistent with those limits.
- Provide safe drinking water to residents and visitors. Set limits to future demand based on available sources and expense of available source.

- Prevent degradation of air quality through implementation of land use, clean energy policy, and regional transportation and growth management.

Action Strategies

- Identify, monitor and plan for growth based on availability of natural resources (e.g. water availability, air quality) while enhancing ecosystem health.
- Quantify the impacts of different land uses on consumption of natural resources and energy. Dominant land-uses specific to Park City should be considered including single-family homes, multi-family residential, hotel, nightly rental, and commercial. Implement land use policy that utilizes best practices to minimize negative impacts on natural resources.
- During Planning Commission review of annexations, an assessment of the impacts of additional development on public services should be required, including: emergency response (e.g. fire, police, and ambulance), transportation, educational facilities, and parks and recreation.
- Require developers to bear the costs of adding their development to Park City's infrastructure within future development consistent with Utah impact fee statutes.
- Locate future schools, libraries and other community facilities within, or in close proximity to, primary residential neighborhoods.
- Research the creation of growth boundaries or other tools to prevent excessive development that stresses the natural system and creates unsustainable infrastructure and environmental costs.

Organizational Strategies

- Estimate carrying capacity limits (qualitative and quantitative) to preserve the *Park City Experience* and preservation of the core values.

- Work with the Park City School District to guarantee the ability to expand educational services and facilities within the School District as needed.
- Coordinate with Summit County to avoid unnecessary duplication of services and to eliminate redundancies.
- Coordinate with communities in the region to implement transportation, growth management, and clean energy policy in an effort to maintain the clean air of the Wasatch Back.
- Work with public utility companies to create projects consistent with the goals and objectives of the General Plan and the Community Vision.

Historic Character (revised 11.30.12)

During the 2009 Community Visioning process, the community identified “*Historic Character*” as one of four core values of Park City, emphasizing the importance of our rich mining history. The goal “Preserve a strong sense of place, character and heritage” was shaped during the 2009 Visioning process. Parkites have a great sense of pride for the *Historic Character* of the City.

Park City was established as a mining camp with the discovery of a large ore claim in 1872, the Ontario Lode. This claim drew miners to the small western town we now call Park City. As more large mining claims during the 1880’s, the area flourished with a thriving commercial district and a dense village mixed with miner’s homes, dormitories, and larger residences for the more prominent residents. Park City was incorporated as a municipality in 1884. In 1898, a devastating fire swept through the city destroying nearly 200 businesses and homes; nevertheless, residents diligently rebuilt, leaving a treasure of historic resources for future generations.

Park City is home to more than 400 historic sites, including two National Register Historic Districts. The Main Street Historic District was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1979. The Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District, comprised of historically significant residential structures built during the mining boom period (1872-1929), was listed in 1984.

The City has taken great measures to protect its more than 400 historic resources through local designation on Park City’s Historic Sites inventory. It is the City’s official list of historic resources deserving of preservation and protection. The inventory is made up of Landmark Sites and Significant Sites.

The City adopted its first Historic District Design Guidelines in 1983 to preserve the *Historic Character* of individual historic resources and the local districts for future generations. With the announcement of a successful Salt Lake City Olympic bid came escalating values and increased development pressure on the historic districts. This required refinements to the Land Management Code and Historic District Guidelines to ensure further the protection of Park City’s *Historic Character* while balancing its livability and the contribution of the historic districts to the economic viability of town. In 2009, the City funded a complete overhaul of the regulating documents for the historic district including an updated Historic Sites Inventory, new design guidelines, and changes to the Land Management Code. These documents are meant to be living documents in which timely updates are encouraged. The goal was to maintain the integrity of the historic resources and allow for economic development that complements its *Historic Character*.

Protecting the rich history of place while allowing continued reinvestment into the districts is a balancing act; one that is an ongoing challenge for residents and City leaders. During the 2009 Community Visioning process, participants were asked to place photos under specific categories. Photos of historic structures were placed under the categories “most treasured”, “most illustrative”, and “most at risk”. Under the category “eyesore” were photos of incompatible development within the historic district and incomplete construction projects. The community visioning document summarized well the ongoing conflict between historic and new infill:

“The implication for the planning process and for public institutions addressing the issue of the town is to find the right balance between retaining the qualities that make the

town unique and permitting those activities that leverage Park City's uniqueness economically."

Goal 14 Preserve the integrity, scale, and historic fabric of the locally designated historic resources and districts for future generations. (Revised 11.30.12)

With building styles reflective of a time and place in American history, it is imperative that the cultural resources within the Park City locally designated historic districts be protected for future generations to experience. While the uses within these districts may evolve over time, the built environment of the local historic districts should stay true to its architectural roots, maintaining the mass, scale and historic fabric of the mining boom era (1872-1929). As a highly desirable place to own residential and commercial real estate, pressures to expand the small commercial properties and mining residences are tremendous. These pressures must be balanced with accepted preservation practices to maintain the integrity of Park City's historic resources.

Principles

- Maintain the integrity of historic resources within Park City as a community asset for future generations, including historic resources locally designated on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory and its two National Register Historic Districts – the Main Street Historic District and the Mining Boom Era Residences Thematic District.
- Maintain context and scale of local historic districts with compatible infill development.
- Increase local knowledge of historic preservation including historic preservation principles and accepted standards.

Action Strategies

- Increase the City's documentation of historic sites by conducting Intensive Level Surveys of all historic sites included in the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.

- Biennial review of the Park City's Historic Sites Inventory and update as necessary.
- Create a voluntary mechanism by which property owners of historic resources may request City staff for analysis identify steps that could be taken to improve the historic integrity of a site listed on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
- Review annually the Land Management Code (LMC) and Park City's Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites in order to maintain regulatory consistency.
- Expand the Park City Historic Sites Inventory to include historic resources that were built during the onset of the ski industry in Park City in an effort to preserve the unique built structures representative of this era.
- Encourage pedestrian-oriented development to minimize the visual impacts of automobiles and parking on Historic Buildings and Streetscapes.
- Periodically review newly constructed infill projects for suitability and compatibility of infill development within the Districts. Identify issues that threaten the aesthetic experience of the district and refine the Design Guidelines and/or LMC based on findings. The aesthetic experience should be measured from the pedestrian experience at street frontage. The influence of site design and architecture should be analyzed in the review.
- Continue to update review criteria for development on steep slope to prevent incompatible mass and scale within the historic districts based on findings of periodic reviews.

Organizational Strategies

- Identify an ongoing funding source to maintain the historic matching grant program through continued funding.
- Implement a historic district public outreach program to promote available incentives (local, state, and federal) for owners of historic resources.

- Conduct annual training related to historic preservation and design regulations for staff, boards, design professionals, commissions, and the public.
- Create a self-guided walking tour of Landmark Structures within the local historic districts.
- Restrict parking passes within the historic districts to limit the amount of on-street parking. Consider incentivizing parking in public parking garages for full-time residents occupying historic structures with no on-site parking.
- Require Park City Municipal Corporation to adopt a standard to consider adaptive reuse of historic resources prior to acquisition of new construction within the City.
- Continue Historic Preservation Board annual award for exemplary historic preservation.

Integrity can be defined as “the authenticity of a property’s historic identity evidenced by the survival of physical characteristics that existed during the property’s historic period.”

National Parks Service

Goal 15 Maintain Main Street as the heart of the City for cultural tourism for visitors and residents alike. (revised 11.30.12)

Historic Main Street is the pride of Park City representing a rich history tied to the early 1900's mining influence. The City has taken a series of proactive historic preservation measures and strategies to capitalize on its cultural tourism. Over the past two decades, the economic success of the street combined with shop owners' desire to upgrade structures, has created unintended consequences of jeopardizing the integrity of Main Street's historic resources. Park City should implement incentives in concert with regulations to maintain and enhance the integrity of the Main Street National Register District and maintain its cultural tourism appeal.

Another important role for Main Street is to maintain a presence by local residents. Although Main Street has evolved into an arts, culture, and entertainment district supported by the tourism industry, there are still businesses and services attractive to local Parkites. Local destinations such as the US Post Office, City Hall, the Egyptian Theatre, the Kimball Arts Center and a handful of coffee/sandwich shops are local haunts. The restaurants along Main Street do a great job of attracting locals during the tourist off-season with special marketing. If Main Street is to remain the heart of Park City, it is important that public facilities and local-oriented businesses remain in the Main Street historic district. This is important to maintain the local pride in the District, continue reinvestment in the historic resources, as well as to enhance the long term economic viability of the area. Where the locals go, the tourists will follow.

Objectives

- Improve the integrity of the historic resources within the Main Street National Register Historic District to exemplify historic preservation efforts in a highly visible cultural tourism center.
- Maintain uses within Main Street that appeal to locals.

Action Strategies

- Support "adaptive re-use" of buildings along Main Street through incentives to property owners and businesses.
- Limit uses within the first story of building along the frontage of the commercial district that engage visitors and are inviting to the passing pedestrian.

Organizational Strategies

- Maintain and enhance the long term viability of the Historic District as a destination for residents and tourists by providing necessary public facilities, businesses with a diverse mixture of goods and services, comfortable public access, opportunities to linger, activated gathering areas, and cultural tourism attractions.
- Support new services, attractions, and businesses along Main Street attract locals.
- Identify funding options to mitigate intrusions within the Main Street Historic District. Intrusions are components that do not contribute to the district's significance and because of their scale, size, design, and location they impact the integrity of the district as a whole.