

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
SNYDERVILLE BASIN PLANNING COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING
November 5, 2012**

COMMISSIONERS: Bruce Taylor (SB), Mike Franklin (SB), Chuck Klingenstein (SB), Greg Larson (SB), Annette Velarde (SB), Charlie Wintzer (PC), Brooke Hontz (PC), Nann Worel (PC), Stewart Gross (PC)

Ex Officio: Thomas Eddington (PC) Don Sargent (SB), Francisco Astorga (PC), Kirsten Whetstone (PC), Anya Grahn (PC), Amir Caus (SC), Matthew Evans (PC) Jennifer Strader (SC), Molly Orville (SC), Tiffany Robinson (SC) Patricia Abdulla (PC), Diane Foster, (PC)

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m.

Park City Planning Director, Thomas Eddington, remarked that the last time the Commissioners met in joint session they worked with envision Utah and reviewed the Summit County Plan and the Park City Balanced Growth Study. The purpose of this meeting was to gather information from the Planning Commissioners through a series of questions that each would be voting on using individual key pads.

Mr. Thomas Eddington, asked everyone to introduce themselves and identify what they thought was one of the more pressing issues in either Summit County or Park City.

Bruce Taylor felt the most pressing issue was to define the character of the community. He realized it would be difficult to find middle ground between long-time residents who say there is no character and newer residents who do not want the character to change. There is an identity that draws people to the community and whatever they define that to be he wanted to do his best to preserve it and to stop urban sprawl.

Annette Velarde thought the I-40 corridor was a critical point. She also agreed with Mr. Taylor.

Greg Larson echoed Mr. Taylor's sentiments at the regional level. At the Snyderville Basin level, he believed that updating the General Plan was a top priority.

Charlie Wintzer thought both the County and the City needed to update their General Plan and move them closer together.

Brooke Hontz stated that she worries about all the issues.

Chuck Klingenstein remarked that like Brooke Hontz, there was very little he did not worry about. He thought it was important to mutually understand the regional economics because it ties to the General Plan and defines who they are, what is special and what needs to be protected.

Stewart Gross stated that everything matters and no one issue is more important than another. If he had to pick one at this point it would be the perceived explosive growth that is occurring, and where they are going to put all the people who allow the services to continue to work.

Mike Franklin believed that a key issue was reasonable growth in a responsible manner.

The Staff was also asked to introduce themselves.

Patricia Abdullah, is the Planning Analyst for Park City. Francisco Astorga, Matthew Evans, Kirsten Whetstone and Anya Grahn were the Park City Planners. Amir Caus, Molly Orville, Jennifer Strader, and Tiffany Robinson were the Summit County Planners.

Don Sargent, the Summit Community Development Director, introduced himself and acknowledged Bob Jasper, the Summit County Manager. He noted that Mr. Jasper is very involved in the planning process and he is always looking for input and offering suggestions and ideas.

Mr. Sargent stated that he and Mr. Eddington had collaborated on this meeting for some time to figure out how they could be productive and make the most of everyone's time. Park City now has key pad polling as a resource and they tried to come up with good questions to address some of the ideas, concepts and concerns previously raised, moving forward in a regional planning aspect. At the last joint meeting in May, the group set a tone for moving forward to continue addressing where they are today, where they want to go in the future, and how to get there. He hoped the input they receive this evening would collaboratively help him and Mr. Eddington and their organizations come together in a regional aspect with respect to bringing together a regional plan that will benefit everyone. At the same time, the City and the County were working on their individual General Plans updates.

Mr. Sargent reported that he and Mr. Eddington had met with Envision Utah since the last joint meeting. A meeting was scheduled with Charles Buki, a consultant who has done growth management work with Park City, but that meeting was cancelled when Mr. Buki was unable to travel due to Hurricane Sandy. They intend to reschedule with Mr. Buki. They also plan to begin discussions with Wasatch County regarding regional aspects that can be pulled together in a global format to address some of the continual concerns.

Mr. Eddington noted that both the City and the County were on the same timetable for updating their General Plan, and that has worked well in their collaboration efforts. Mr. Eddington stated that the Park City General Plan has four primary chapters that are based on the core elements of their visions statement. The Planning Staff has presented two of the chapters to the Planning Commission and meetings were scheduled to present the last two. This evening they were hoping to gather information on how the General Plans are better integrated and to capture the interests of both sides.

Mr. Eddington noted that there were 75-80 prepared questions for the Commissioners. The first half was primarily questions. The second half was visual preference surveys. The Commissioners would see the answers to the questions after each vote, but the polling was anonymous.

Mr. Sargent stated that both Planning Staffs had been involved with the questions and it was based on comments heard from both Planning Commissions. The questions were drafted accordingly to get a consensus of the direction they should be going.

Mr. Eddington explained the key pad polling process and how it works.

Mr. Eddington began with the questions.

- 1) Identify your top three regional planning concerns. The Commissioners voted and the priorities were: 1) open space; 2) sprawl; 3) density.
- 2) Which of those there issues do you believe we have the most control over? The Commissioners voted and the top two were: Open Space and Sprawl.
- 3) Which do we have the least control over? The Commissioners voted and the top two were: Carbon Footprint and increasing traffic congestion. Affordable housing came in third.
- 4) What defines our Region? The Commissioners voted and the result was: Park City, Summit and Wasatch.
- 5) What is the first step towards better regional planning? The Commissioners voted and the majority was: Regional visioning.
- 6) Who is responsible for driving a regional partnership? The Commissioners voted and the majority chose: All of the above.
- 7) If somebody were to ask you if the Snyderville Basin and Park City area is unique, would you answer yes or no? The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% yes.
- 8) What makes the Snyderville Basin Area unique? 1) where we are; 2) what we are; 3) who we are. The Commissioners voted and 44% chose: 1) where we are/the setting.
- 9) What makes Park City unique? 1) where we are; 2) what we are; 3) who we are. The Commissioners voted and 44% chose: 2) what we are/resort community.

Annette Velarde stated that if they are unique, she was curious to know how they were different from Vail or Aspen or other resort areas that have the same amenities.

- 10) What is your level in developing some type of liaison committee between Park City and Summit County? The Commissioners voted and the result was: 78% thought it was necessary.
- 11) 56% said yes.
- 12) What is your definition of rural? 1) distance from the nearest Starbucks; 2) number of people per acre; 3) proximity to neighbors; 4) open fields and views to the mountains; 5) agricultural use; 6) presence of wildlife; 7) built environment design. The Commissioners voted and the two top answers were: 2) number of people per acre and 5) agricultural use.

- 13) Do you feel Snyderville Basin is rural in nature? The Commissioners voted and the result was: 78% - no.

Ms. Velarde thought the largest question that had not been discussed directly was the change they have seen since 2008.

Mr. Eddington assumed the answer to question 13 would have been different if it has been asked about the County. Snyderville Basin is no longer rural, and he asked those who answered no if they thought it was suburban.

Mr. Klingenstein thought it was a mixture of urban, suburban and sub-rural. He stated that some rural characteristics still remained, but they had lost the agricultural base. Ms. Velarde thought it was more appropriately titled, Pretend Rural or Gentleman Ranches. Mr. Klingenstein noted that the citizens have said that they want an honoring of a rural character. He felt it was important to determine what that character should be and whether rural means keeping a few cows and barns in strategic locations. He has been looking for the definition of rural for a long time.

Mr. Sargent noted that the top answer to a previous question on the definition was that rural was proximity to neighbors. He was curious to know whether that meant near or far apart. Mr. Eddington remarked that the intent of the question was far apart. Ms. Velarde interpreted the question differently. Cluster development with 100 acres around it results in a low number of people per acre. Surrounding open space keeps it rural in nature.

Greg Larson commented on the aspect of different neighborhoods having more rural characteristics than other neighborhoods. He believed there was a component of ruralness in the Snyderville Basin. Mr. Klingenstein remarked that it would behoove them to finally define what that is.

- 14) Do you feel Park City is rural in nature? The Commissioners voted and the result was: 89% - no.

- 15) Do you think we should be, as a group, working with UDOT on road widening plans? The Commissioners voted and the result was: 78% - no.

- 16) Should we be working with them to narrow, creating road diet plans? The Commissioners voted and the result was: 78% - no.

Mr. Klingenstein believed that in reality they want to work with UDOT, but it needs to be done cooperatively to make sure it meets their regional transportation needs. He suggested a Transportation Management Center for the entire Basin so it could be done smarter. Director Eddington noted that they would eventually see questions that address other opportunities to work with UDOT.

- 17) Should Park City and Summit County consider adopting a comprehensive General Plan that mirrors each other's efforts? The Commissioners voted and the result was: 89% - yes.

- 18) Should we consider adopting regional architectural standards that are similar to each other? The Commissioners voted and the result was: 68% - no.

Mr. Eddington assumed the majority voted no primarily because the City and Snyderville should be distinct from one another. The guidelines should be independent and reflect the unique character of each one.

Mr. Klingenstein stated that Snyderville has seven different neighborhood plans and they want to honor each area. The City is one big neighborhood. Ms. Velarde thought the answer on this particular question depended on which Planning Commission you were on. Specific buildings and architectural design in both the City and Snyderville Basin could influence the answer.

Mr. Eddington asked if there was general agreement that architectural standards are important. Everyone answered yes.

- 19) Should the Snyderville Basin consider instituting any agricultural land use preservation methods? The Commissioners voted and the result was: 56% - yes.

Mr. Klingenstein stated that he voted no because there is so little left that is was no longer economically viable.

Mr. Sargent asked if someone wanted to continue to farm their land, whether there should be preservation methods or tools to address nuisance laws, complaints, odors, noise, or dust. Mr. Klingenstein was not opposed to preservation activities, but it was not a major priority.

Mr. Eddington asked if agricultural land use preservation was significantly different than open space. He was told that it was.

- 20) What is the future use of SR224 from Kimball to Old Town. They were asked to think 15-20 years ahead and prioritize the choices. He noted that trolley would be considered light rail. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 27% - Light rail; 27% BRT, 18% - Increased bus service

Mr. Eddington noted that an alternative mode was favored. He explained that BRT is where a center lane is reserved for buses only and could not be used by other vehicles. Increased bus service might be the quantity of bus times allocated to a bus stop.

- 21) What is the future use of I-80 from Salt Lake City to Park City/Snyderville Basin 15-20 years out? They were again asked to prioritize the top choices. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 30% - Light rail; 26% Increased bus service. There were some votes for a carpool lane.

- 22) How critical is collaboration between Park City and Summit County to create a regional plan

for the entire Wasatch Back area? The Commissioners voted and the result was: 45% - critical at this time.

- 23) How essential is collaboration on a shared TDR, Transfer of Development Rights program. The question addressed Park City and Snyderville Basin. Currently, State law does not allow the transfer of development rights between the City and the County because intra-jurisdictional transfers are not allowed. However, that may change in the future. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 56% - Very essential.
- 24) Implementation of a regional TDR program would allow your community to gain from accepting density outside your jurisdiction. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 56% - true.
- 25) Should the following land use principle be adopted regionally – “Direct desired land uses and development to existing developed areas that are well suited for the use. Supporting energy and greenhouse gas emission, reduction, goals and have available resource capacity. Infill development should complement the existing developed area.”

Mr. Klingenstein revised the language to say, “complement and improve”.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - yes.

- 26) Should this principle be adopted regionally – “Each neighborhood should have a well defined edge such as an open space or a naturally landscaped buffer zone permanently protected from development, with the exception of areas where a neighborhood transitions into another neighborhood.” The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - yes.
- 27) A think tank organization has four planning principles which were listed on the screen. The Commissioners were asked to rank the top two they would like to see adopted in the City and County’s General Plan. The Commissioner voted and the result was: 48% greenbelt; 28% institutions.

Ms. Velarde thought it was an interesting statistic because the current Code says very little about wildlife.

Questions 28 through 59 were a visual preference survey. Mr. Eddington explained that two photos would be presented on the screen and the Commissioners should vote for their preference. Number one would be the slide on the left and number two would be the slide on the right. They were asked to vote based on their initial instinct.

On questions 60 through 68, the Commissioners were shown photos of open space and asked to vote on whether it was 1) private open space; 2) public active open space, 3) public passive open space, 4) not open space; 5) circulation.

- 69) The Commissioners were shown a variety of open space photos and asked if they would support it as a greener open space project. The Commissioners voted and the result was: 100% - yes.
- 70) The Commissioners were asked if they would still support it if it was above a Home Depot and grocery store. It was noted that the project shown has 90 residential units and 200,000 square feet of retail.

Ms. Velarde thought the real question was whether the Development Code would count that as open space in the requirements. Mr. Eddington stated that it is currently not addressed in the Code and, therefore, it is not counted. The purpose of the questions was to see whether the Commissioners would support this type of project as open space. Mr. Gross remarked that it would become private open space. Ms. Velarde asked if support meant that they would forgive some of the open space requirements in the development. Director Eddington answered yes. It may be setbacks or some other form of open space. He noted that the challenge is that setbacks in open space often become circulation and trails, and they are not always identified as open space to the typical by-passer.

Planner Astorga noted that the development shown in the photo is on a light-rail line and the parking garage would be buried.

The Commissioners voted and the result was: 67% - yes.

Mr. Eddington believed this type of project would be better suited for the heart of Kimball Junction or for Park City.

Mr. Eddington clarified that the many of the questions were not applicable for Snyderville Basin or Park City; however, the Staff was trying to derive architectural cues and/or open space cues. Their answers were very helpful. Mr. Eddington stated that there are a number of challenges in Park City regarding open space, particularly in how they utilize and define urban open space. Currently in Park City, hardscape and sidewalks on a property count as open space. However, as indicated from the answers, most people think of it as circulation and not open space. In looking at roof top gardens in the future, they need to determine whether that should count as open space, and if so, what percentage should be counted as open space. Whether it is food production and/or carbon reduction, the challenge is addressing how that open space should be used. Is it just for people, for viewing, or for the environment.

Mr. Eddington believed that in the Snyderville Basin they were grappling with larger open space issues. Is it used for open space passive visual or agricultural, and whether they would support Code changes. Mr. Sargent noted that Mr. Eddington had offered the use of the key pad polling system. He would like to use it as they progress more into the General and Regional Planning at the Planning Commission level. It would be helpful in addressing some of the questions regarding open space, the built environment, access, and other issues.

Mr. Eddington thought the answers this evening showed that both Planning Commissions had

indicated a preference for nodes of development, which is a major part of the regional planning effort. Mr. Sargent stated that another challenge for Snyderville Basin is that the Development Code has certain standards and regulations; however, often times a project complies with the standards but the end result is not the quality they anticipated. He would like to look at the built environment under the current standards and regulations to see where there are deficiencies and what changes should be made to achieve the result they anticipate when the project is approved.

Mr. Eddington noted that the Park City Staff had a meeting with the Park City Planning Commission to discuss the Bonanza Park area between SR224 and SR248. The City is looking to do Form Based Code in that area. What the Staff heard from the Planning Commission was a desire to see more pictures and images and design guidelines so the end product is much clearer.

Ms. Velarde suggested the idea of a joint architectural standards committee. Even though Kimball Junction will always have a more industrial feel than Old Town Park City, to be able to blend those two would be very beneficial and help to complement each other. Mr. Sargent agreed. The two areas are different in their own respect, but there should be some complimentary elements, features, style and form so it looks like Snyderville Basin and Park City are still in the same community. Ms. Velarde remarked that when people turn off I-80 into Kimball Junction to go to Park City, they should feel like they have arrived at a vacation destination rather than an industrial center.

Mr. Klingenstein noted that Summit County split their General Plan in July because of different issues. Mr. Sargent and his Staff have to deal with two Planning Commissions; Snyderville Basin and Eastern Summit County, and they face an incredible work load. A major concern is that the Planning Commission wants to do a better job but they do not have the tools. A good example is the Village at Kimball Junction, where he believed they could have done a better job with the proper tools in place. Mr. Klingenstein remarked that the County is now going into re-development, which is another element of the General Plan, Phase 2. With re-development they can use economic development incentives to do a better job, along with the urban design. He believed they all have great desires, but lack of funds is one of the biggest problems in achieving those desires. Mr. Klingenstein was concerned that they were trending towards having a Sandy or Murray in the mountains if they did not get their tools in order quickly. He advocates for the economic base analysis, because if they truly are a resort driven economy and that is the base economy, the non-base economy builds off of that and they should honor it. They have the ability to make choices but they need the appropriate information.

Mr. Eddington asked if Mr. Klingenstein thinks of Snyderville as resort-base driven. Mr. Klingenstein replied that he would like to think that, but he was uncertain because they have a mixture of economic uses. Ms. Velarde did not agree that Snyderville Basin was resort based. However, Snyderville Basin would not exist without the resort based economy of Park City. Snyderville Basin provides support services, and it is also the attraction to the population because it brings in Salt Lake. Ms. Velarde understood from other discussions that incorporated Park City wants to stay resort and second home owner based, whereas, Snyderville Basin is full-time residential based. Those were two different approaches to growth.

Mr. Eddington questioned whether the Park City Planning Commission would agree that Park City wanted to stay second home based. Commissioner Wintzer pointed out that Park City is trending that way and he could not see it stopping. He noted that Park City went from 100% primary homes to every home being sold as a second home.

Mr. Sargent reported that County-wide it was 50/50, excluding Park City. He believed the trend in the County was more permanent residents. Mr. Eddington agreed that the trend in the County was more permanent and the trend in the City was more second homes.

Ms. Velarde stated that if they accept that as fact, they could not plan effectively. Mr. Klingenstein thought it would be nice to have the data to understand where it was going. Mr. Eddington asked if the group wanted to discuss any issues that had not been addressed in the presentation.

Mr. Gross suggested parking and signage. Mr. Eddington noted that the Park City Code currently has parking standards that require a minimum. He asked if the parking standards should require a maximum. Commissioner Gross thought it was difficult to get people out of their cars. Park City has very difficult parking situations and people tend to stay home to avoid the parking problems rather than use the bus. From a commercial standpoint it creates a problem for businesses. He was unsure if a maximum standard was the answer because developers will develop as much as they can. Mr. Eddington noted that developers typically develop beyond the minimum. Commissioner Wintzer anticipated that at a cost of \$30,000 per car to build structured parking, the trend would change. He thought it would reduce the parking standards and hopefully encourage people to ride the bus.

Mr. Gross asked if it was the job of the taxpayers to underwrite the transit infrastructure to allow the minimum. Mr. Wintzer replied that it could be if they gain from it, such as less traffic and a better environment.

Ms. Velarde felt they needed improved bus service in the Snyderville Basin area because there are still many places where there is no bus, and other situations where you have to ride the bus all around town to get to your destination. She liked the light rail in Salt Lake and thought they did great PR to encourage people to ride it. The County needed to do a PR campaign to get people attending events in Park City to park in Snyderville and bus into Park City.

Mr. Sargent stated that the Staff would provide the results of this meeting to everyone for their review. The City and County would use the analysis to see if they were on the same mindset. Mr. Sargent would like to continue the joint discussions as they look at their regional planning efforts and both General Plans continue to refine.

Ms. Velarde suggested using the key pads to gain feedback from the public using the same set of slides and questions.

Mr. Klingenstein requested an actual commitment in writing outlining how they would move forward. It was a long time between this meeting and the last, and he believed everyone wanted to keep moving forward. He would like to see a schedule and a very global work plan based on their comments this evening. Mr. Eddington stated that both Staffs would like to expedite some of this collaboration and he and Mr. Sargent would work towards doing that. Mr. Klingenstein remarked that the gateway corridors were also under attack. Park City had done a good job stopping the movie studio. The County was facing the possibility of three lanes each direction from Kimball to the Canyon. In his opinion it would be the worst urban solution. Mr. Klingenstein stated that there were too many issues to be concerned about and they needed to stop spinning their wheels.

Mr. Sargent stated that once they re-connect with Charles Buki and Envision Utah, and the Staff figures out how to move forward with the regional plan, they should be able to set a schedule.

Diane Foster, interim Park City Manager, stated that plans were underway for the managers and planning directors from Park City, Heber City and Summit and Wasatch Counties to meet with Charles Buki to begin a regional planning discussion.

Commissioner Gross asked about relationships with UDOT. Ms. Foster stated that the City and Summit County have good relations with UDOT and UTA. Kent Cashel with Park City and Kevin Callahan with Summit County stay very involved with both entities. Commissioner Klingenstein stated that UDOT has taken a more active role with the communities as opposed to their past approach. He believed the City and County needed to approach UDOT together and have elected and appointed officials attend public hearings so they realize it is the community and not just Staff.

Director Eddington offered to compile the results from this meeting and email it to everyone. They would also work to schedule another joint meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.
