

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES
March 27, 2013**

PRESENT: Nann Worel, Brooke Hontz, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Jack Thomas, Charlie Wintzer, Thomas Eddington, Katie Cattan, Francisco Astorga, Polly Samuels McLean

WORK SESSION ITEMS

General Plan – Discussion and Overview of Neighborhood Plans for Lower and Upper Deer Valley, Masonic Hill and Quinn’s Junction.

Director Eddington noted that these were the last neighborhoods to discuss. If the Commissioners had written comments they should submit them to the Planning Department to be incorporated into the final draft of the General Plan. Director Eddington stated that because the document was only a draft, they would find places where the Staff would be asking for specific information and input over the next several months working towards final approval.

Director Eddington noted that the Planning Commission would receive the draft document on Friday. It is approximately 350 pages. To give the Commissions adequate time to review the document, it would not be back on the agenda until late April.

Masonic Hill

Planner Cattan stated that Masonic Hill is surrounding by open space and it has a great trails system. The majority of residents in this neighborhood are second home owners. Due to its proximity and the fact that it is within the natural resource study, it is a highly substantive area in terms of wildlife, central location and possible future fire hazard. The Staff believes that Masonic Hill should be conservation neighborhoods and they should talk about limits of disturbance to protect natural vegetation, as well as wildfire mitigation and protection of the natural setting.

Question – Do you agree with 5.1, that Masonic Hill should be a natural conservation neighborhood? The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 100%.

5.2 – Masonic Hill is a neighborhood dominated by second homes and primary residents. Planner Cattan stated that in most of the other neighborhoods dominated by second homes, there is no restriction on nightly rentals. Currently, Masonic Hill is single family development and nightly rentals are not allowed. The Staff believes it should remain the same to maintain the quieter neighborhood.

Planner Cattan clarified that it would not be a change for Masonic Hill, but it was different from how they treated other neighborhoods that have a majority of second homeownership. Because of its proximity and the sensitive lands issue, the Staff recommended that they continue to prohibit nightly rentals. It would also prohibit lockouts and accessory dwelling units. Affordable housing would only be through deed restricted entitled units.

Chair Worel asked about procedure if the HOA decided to allow nightly rentals. Planner Cattan replied that nightly rentals would be prohibited by Code and the Zoning Code would rule.

Commissioner Wintzer felt Masonic Hill would be a great neighborhood for the second level of deed

restricted units.

Question – Do you agree with 5.2, that Masonic Hill should remain a neighborhood dominated by second homes and primary residents? The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 100%.

5.3 – Improve pedestrian connectivity to Old Town. Planner Cattan noted that currently there was great connectivity in terms of trails, and the Staff was thinking about a more direct connection to Main Street.

Commissioner Hontz referred to a page in the packet showing the layout of the homes versus the roads. She noted that it represented 3% of all the units in Park City and 267 primary residents. In looking at the layout of the homes, Commissioner Hontz noted that 9 lots were remotely close to the street that connects to SR224. She did think it was a good return on investment or return on community to spend money on a connection for 267 people when most would never use the path or they would only use it once. Masonic Hill is designed as a drive-thru subdivision and that should be okay. It was developed as a mountaintop development and it should not be prioritized in any way as a place to spend money on a connection. This is the one instance where people should drive their cars or use the bike trails. Commissioners Savage and Wintzer concurred.

Chair Nann thought it would be beneficial to provide a connection to Main Street from the trails. Commissioner Thomas was not opposed to spending money on a connection if it stops people from driving to the market. Commissioner Wintzer did not think it was practical because of the grade.

Commissioner Strachan thought a direct trail to Main Street made sense because there was no way to get from the Aerie to Main Street. Commissioner Wintzer pointed out that a direct trail would be a vertical cliff.

Question – Do you agreed with 5.3, improving the pedestrian connectivity to Old Town. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 50% No – 50%.

Commissioner Strachan referred to the BLM Land and asked if the City had a policy to purchase that land as open space. Planner Cattan replied that it was calling for open space within the mapping. All the areas shown in green were protected. Commissioner Strachan pointed out that BLM land could not be deed restricted. Planner Cattan stated that it was deemed as deed restricted open space.

Commissioner Hontz recommended that they add a zoning layer to deed restricted open space and possibly consider conservation easements. She was more comfortable with multiple layers because a deed restriction is easy to break. Commissioner Strachan suggested adding a policy in the General Plan to purchase BLM land as it becomes available to preserve open space.

Lower Deer Valley

Planner Cattan reviewed graphs and charts showing trends that she believed were telling about Deer Valley and what has occurred over the past fifteen years since 1995. More and more sales are coming from Deer Valley and it is becoming a greater commercial area. The majority of sales are hotel and residential sales. Commissioner Savage thought it was important to recognize that the increase was due to the creation of new inventory. Deer Valley has become a popular place to stay

when people come to Park City.

Planner Cattan wanted the Commissioners to have these trends in mind for when they start looking at strategies for the future.

Commissioner Savage clarified that the numbers presented were related to sales activity in terms of lodging, restaurants, retail, or other purchases. It did not reflect the activity that occurred relative to residential real estate sales. Planner Cattan understood that it was sales and not real estate. Commissioner Wintzer was not surprised by the increased numbers because two major projects came online during the recession and did well. He assumed the numbers would look different if the Montage and St. Regis were taken out of the equation. Commissioner Hontz pointed out that St. Regis is in Wasatch County and would not be included in the sales numbers. Director Eddington explained that the St. Regis hotel is actually in Park City in Wasatch County, so the City does get their sales. He noted that the Deer Crest homes are solely in Wasatch County and Park City gets none of the benefit.

Planner Cattan stated that 7.1, the first point in the Deer Valley section was, a resort neighborhood catering to second homes and nightly rentals. She believed that was in line with trending they were seeing. The second point, 7.2 Lower Deer Valley: future development of the parking lots and Transfer of Development Rights receiving zone.

Planner Cattan noted that currently there are 16 pulled business licenses at the base of Deer Valley. In Upper Deer Valley the number is 34 business licenses. The numbers did not count nightly rental units as a business.

Planner Cattan stated that 7.2 talks about the future of the Deer Valley MPD and the parking lots, and the future of redevelopment. The Staff believed there would be a need to maintain view corridors and compatibility of mass and scale. There may be a need for additional height. She recalled that the height was capped at 45 feet. It also talks about flexibility within the building pads to achieve the best view corridors. Planner Cattan noted that this was the last development in Deer Valley. Deer Valley has done a great job with development, but sometimes the last one is more difficult.

Commissioner Thomas stated that the consequence of Silver Lake were building clustered around the base of Silver Lake Lodge. At that time the perception of the valley and the mountain was elegant with the way the lodge sat in the meadow. Today, the meadow, the lodge and the base of the mountain can no longer be seen. When talking about view corridors, they need to think about how massing and the perception of buildings, and be careful with what they do at the base. Commissioner Savage thought a really cool village at the base of Snow Creek would be terrific. Commissioner Thomas clarified that the point of his comment is when that would occur, it is important to have the ability to see through it.

Planner Cattan stated that if additional height was requested in the future, it would be reviewed by the Planning Commission as an amendment to the MPD if additional. It was not the typical process but it was included in the General Plan because as the last piece, height may be needed to get the best design.

Planner Cattan commented on the TDR receiving zone. Currently, 23,000 square feet of commercial is allowed within the MPD for that area. With the numbers they were seeing of growth with hotels and nightly rentals, this would be a great TDR receiving zone.

Question – 7.2 - To ensure the best design to protect view corridors and improve circulation, additional flexibility within the MPD may be necessary. 1) Yes; 2) No; 3) Abstain. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 100%.

Commissioner Thomas stated that if there were to be additional height in a resort, it should be done at the base of the resort and not on top of the mountain. In his opinion, this was one place where they could afford a little more height.

Question – 7.2 – With only 22,000 square feet of commercial within the Snow Park sites this is the appropriate area for a receiving zone. 1) Yes; 2) No; 3) Abstain. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 100%

Commissioner Savage asked if commercial included bars and restaurants. Planner Cattan answered yes. Commissioner Savage noted that the Montage has over 1 million square feet and he wanted to know why the square footage number was so small. Planner Cattan stated that it came from the original MPD. He was told that it came from the desire at that time not to have the competition of Main Street.

The Commissioners discussed traffic load-out issues related to additional commercial in Deer Valley.

Planner Cattan asked Bob Wells to talk about the Deer Valley model of having people extend their stay. Mr. Wells stated that the thought is that the ultimate development of the parking lots with entertainment and an increased dining and drinking level would slow down the load-out. Affecting the load-out time by 30 minutes would be a significant step because of the two clogs that exist coming out of Deer Valley. Keeping people around longer would be the main goal. Mr. Wells stated that Deer Valley has existed 30 years relying on Main Street because they do not have a base village. It would be nice to have more activity there.

Commissioner Wintzer commented on language referencing emergency egress, and noted that once again Guardsman Pass was mentioned. He was unsure how opening Guardsman Pass would affect Deer Valley, but he definitely knew what it would do to Marsac. Commissioner Wintzer thought they should be careful about putting Guardsman Pass as a potential exit out of town. Planner Cattan explained that the language was meant to say that if Guardsman Pass and/or Deer Valley Drive became impassable, there would be a need for other routes from Lower Deer Valley to get out of town.

Commissioner Wintzer thought the language addressing alternative transportation in Lower Deer Valley should be strengthened. Deer Valley will not work if it gets totally built out and people cannot get in or out. Commissioner Thomas agreed.

Upper Deer Valley

8.1 – Upper Deer Valley: Connected to the heart of the City. Planner Cattan stated that in the near future there should be a connection from Main Street to Upper Deer Valley. Commissioner Wintzer concurred.

Question – Improve connectivity to decrease vehicle miles traveled to connect this remote neighborhood to the rest of town. 1) Yes; 2) No; 3) Abstain. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 100%.

Commissioner Savage asked if there was any thought as to how the connection would work. There has been talk about having it go from the Brew Pub, but he wondered how much time and effort had been spent on vetting the alternatives relative to starting and ending points. Commissioner Savage would not want Park City and Deer Valley to make a commitment to establish that kind of connectivity without understanding the long-term strategies for overall connectivity between the resorts. Commissioner Wintzer agreed, but the question was whether they should begin exploring it. Planner Cattan asked if Commissioner Savage would like additional language calling for a study with alternatives and pros and cons. Commissioner Thomas supported Commissioner Savage's idea of a macro plan approach and understanding how the big picture works. It was a new concept for the community because they tend to look at smaller pieces. Their nature is to get from point A to point B without looking at the ramifications of that particular choice.

Commissioner Hontz referred to the current conditions map and noted the different types of open space with varying degrees of protection. Planner Cattan thought the map needed to better explain the types of open space. She noted that some of the areas identified as zoned open space that have not been purchased are deed restricted. Commissioner Hontz thought ownership was a different issue. City owned open space should be one color. Privately owned open space that has a conservation easement is another color. A deed restriction would be a third color. She stated that those values are completely different. Some areas might be private property that could be developed in the future.

Planner Astorga asked Commissioner Hontz if this was the place to include the added protections layers she had talked about earlier, or whether it should be addressed in a different section of the General Plan. Commissioner Hontz was unsure if it needed to be in the different neighborhoods, but it was not representative of what they were trying to do in the neighborhoods. Looking at the green you would assume it is protected open space but it is not. Planner Cattan understood that anything identified with a green open space layer was protected. Commissioner Hontz pointed out that there were different layers of protections. She noted that currently some lands were being developed that had a conservation easement on it. She was not comfortable with a planner or a member of the public looking at the map and thinking that green equals open space and that means forever.

Planner Cattan noted that within 8.3 they talk about not extending the annexation area and not expanding it to incorporate Bonanza Flats or Brighton Estates. Commissioner Wintzer noted that there would still be development whether or not it is annexed into the City. The issue is how to control the traffic coming into Park City.

Question – 8.3, Upper Deer Valley, a neighborhood surrounded by open space. 1) Yes; 2) No; 3) Abstain. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 1) 83% 2) 17% 3) 0%.

8.4 – Upper Deer Valley: Environmentally responsible second homes. Planner Cattan reported that 91% of the residential units are utilized as secondary homes. The Aspen Second Home Study found that unoccupied homes use as much, if not more, than a full time resident. Moving forward the City has goals to reduce the carbon footprint in Park City 15% by 2020. It will take a combined effort of primary and secondary homes. Planner Cattan noted that 8.4 also talks about the trend in larger home size.

Question – In the future should Park City start implementing strategies towards environmentally responsible secondary homes. The Commissioners voted and the result was: Yes – 100%.

Bob Wells stated that he had a handful of correction-type comments that he would submit to the Staff in writing. His comments would not affect anything substantive.

Quinn's Junction

Commissioner Wintzer noted that People's Health was included and he suggested that they also mention the Summit County Health Building.

Commissioner Hontz noted that the wildlife crossings that she was told did not exist when reviewing a previous project, were identified in the Quinn's Study. She also noted that the map of tailings was not part of the Quinn's discussion. Commissioner Hontz understood that Round Valley had not been annexed in. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the petition had just been accepted by the City. Commissioner Hontz wanted annexing that land to be one of the goals. Assistant City Attorney believed the annexation would be processed around the same time the General Plan would be adopted.

Director Eddington asked if the lands east of US40 should be in the ADA boundary for the draft discussion. Commissioner Hontz answered yes.

Planner Cattan presented the original map from 2004. She identified land that was purchased as open space and pointed out that that area would come in with the annexation. Planner Cattan indicated the triangle parcel that is in joint ownership with the City and the County. Planner Cattan pointed out the area for development. It is zoned Light Industrial and the decision was made in joint discussions to keep that as a new industrial area. Planner Cattan stated that the area shown in light green should be recreational open space. Director Eddington asked if it was time to consider crossing US40, and to look at the entry corridor in terms of protection, ownership, zoning rights, etc.

Commissioner Savage asked if there was a list of open space objectives to determine a list of priorities. Director Eddington replied that the recently re-established COSAC was currently working on open space objectives and criteria. Commissioner Savage thought there were other places that would be much more important to protect than the area from Quinn's Junction going up towards Home Depot. Director Eddington agreed that it was not the most aesthetically pleasing open space. However, it is the City's primary wildlife corridor and the primary east-west movement. Director

Eddington stated that they have always talked about nodal development and areas where they would not want a corridor of development. That is another justification for potential protection and/or acquisition of open space.

Commissioner Savage stated that if they could address the wildlife corridors in an acceptable way, having the corridor as open space is only one solution for an attractive entry corridor. He believed that development along the corridor would not necessarily create an unattractive entry corridor, as long as it was thoughtfully managed and designed. In terms of having open space that matters to the integrity of the community, he would not make the corridor a high priority. Commissioner Savage clarified that protection of the wildlife would be a major factor and consideration.

Commissioner Hontz remarked that relocating the annexation boundary is a political move that puts people on notice that the City is interested in having input in the process. Commissioner Savage asked if the City had the right to make that decision or whether it needed County approval. Commissioner Hontz outlined the multiple steps involved in the process. Extending the boundary was the first step by saying that the City might want to consider going through the process in the future. It would then be a public process that would involve the County.

Commissioner Hontz noted that the wildlife studies that were done show how the wildlife come east into Park City, but it never shows them going in any other direction. She believed the wildlife go through the I-40 corridor because it is the only space left. The more they develop the more they shape where the wildlife go. Commissioner Thomas stated that the Planning Commission did not have enough information to address their questions and they needed to talk to a wildlife expert to discuss the significance of the wildlife corridor and related issues.

Planner Cattan stated that by creating a receiving zone, they were having the discussion on the core values and a balance portfolio. They are allowing development but putting it in nodes to protect the wildlife and the corridor. She remarked that the view corridor coming into town does not speak to "anywhere USA". It is Park City, it is natural land, and it has an identity. Director Eddington stated that the opportunity to connect some of the trails up toward Promontory is the regionalism they have always talked about. They do not have it yet but it is something they should strive for with that neighbor.

Commissioner Thomas stated that the open space you see before reaching a community is what distinguishes small towns. Commissioner Wintzer believed that the goal has always been to make Park City an island surrounded by open space and they need to continue working on that goal. Commissioner Hontz concurred. She indicated the area on the map proposed as a potential receiving zone, and stated that if they look at all the existing rights and everything in light green, they could do three times that amount and still not be too tall or sprawling in the receiving area.

Planner Cattan thanked the Commissioners for their input and their willingness to attend extra meetings to help draft the General Plan. The Planning Commission thanked the Staff for all their work. Director Eddington stated that the draft document would be available on Friday and the Planning Staff would probably go out to celebrate after work on Friday. The Commissioners were invited to join them.

Work Session Minutes
March 27, 2013
Page 8

The Work Session was adjourned.