

**PARK CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION  
JOINT WORK SESSION NOTES  
JULY 7, 2011**

**Present:** Mayor Dana Williams; Council members Alex Butwinski; Joe Kernan; Cindy Matsumoto; Dick Peek; and Liza Simpson

**Planning Commission Members:** Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Mick Savage, Jack Thomas, and Nan Worel

**Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Jon Weidenhamer, Economic Development Manager; Diane Foster, Sustainability Manager; and Katie Cattan, Planner**

**Consultants:** Charles Buki, czb; and Becky Zimmerman, Design WorkShop

**Absent:** Planning Commission Members Adam Strachan and Julia Petit

**Visioning Recap / Retail Overview / Facilitated Discussion.** The Mayor thanked everyone for attending but pointed out that there may be not enough time to discuss individual concerns because of time restraints. He relayed that this is the beginning of a year-long process in terms of a re-write of the General Plan. Hopefully there will be time for public comments at the end of the session but there will be opportunities to address the Council at upcoming meetings. He pointed out the benefits of the Planning Commission and City Council receiving updates at the same time. The majority of the meeting will be a recap of the Visioning Session from two years ago on the model for rewriting the General Plan.

Tom Bakaly introduced Charles Buki of czb who will facilitate the session and explained that the goal of the meeting tonight is to get a sense of policy direction as it relates to redevelopment. Mr. Buki pointed out that two years ago today, czb make a recommendation to the City Council about its findings and recommendations. Since 2009, the economy has changed a great deal on many levels and czb is a national firm, working in a variety of market types. He introduced Becky Zimmerman from Design Workshop who will co-facilitate. She spoke about her experience working in mountain communities around the world which provides some great insights.

Through a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Buki explained that the agenda will provide a context to address redevelopment properties and the role of the City Council and the Planning Commission in working together to provide policy clarity. He spoke about interviews held in 2009 with members of the community, information collected and the resulting mandate *to keep Park City Park City*. He relayed that the public articulated four principle building blocks including (1) sense of community, (2) small town feel, (3) natural setting, and (4) history, regardless of where they live or when they came to Park

City. The other message was, *don't screw it up*. Six community ideals surfaced to (1) respect and conserve the natural environment, (2) promote balanced managed sustainable growth, (3) provide a strong sense of place, character and heritage, (4) foster a strong sense of community, vitality and vibrancy, (5) support and promote diversity in people through housing and affordability; and (6) promote a diverse stable and sustainable economy. Charles Buki emphasized that these ideals are not prioritized and open to a great deal of interpretation. It was decided to organize these into categories related to economy, environment, social equity, and quality of life which can be oppositional elements. People are concerned that Park City still feels like a small town which is an important value. He encouraged managing these pieces so that quality of life remains. Quality of life in Park City consists of incomparable arts and culture, world class skiing, outdoor recreation, and resident amenities. Some responders focused on one thing while others acutely understood that trade-offs are necessary to keep *Park City Park City*.

Charles Buki explained that it is intended to present associated market data to help form clear policy direction on redevelopment. Becky Zimmerman referred to the Retail Market Study, distributed to members, which examines the five districts within the City limits. She stated that Main Street is a relatively healthy retail district but there should be higher average sales per square foot than currently occurring. The tenant mix is pretty good but there could be improvement, specifically with regard to ground floor vibrancy and local patronage which is critical to even out seasonal swings. Some key recommendations for the Main Street District include attracting the right tenants, providing gathering spaces and some streetscape improvements. The integrity of Historic Main Street should be maintained.

Key findings for the lower Park Avenue District primarily relate to the day skier visitor but its condition is in a state of decline and ripe for redevelopment. She encouraged redevelopment and expressed that things could be built here that would not *cannibalize* Main Street and promote synergy. The dated building stock in the area was discussed.

Ms. Zimmerman relayed that the Bonanza/Park District is viewed as serving residents, part-time residents, and visitors alike and helps to prevent lost sales to Kimball Junction or Salt Lake City. Its economic performance is okay for the type of uses there but there could be better performance with a renovated product. In response to a question from Cindy Matsumoto, Ms. Zimmerman detailed the process used to calculate sales per square foot information. On average all districts were in the \$250 to \$300 sales per square foot range. The Bonanza/Park District offers a great opportunity for a mixed use neighborhood that includes a variety of retail focusing on residents. She recognized that part-time residents and visitors would also use the retail and some housing, civic and cultural facilities should be considered as well. Connections could be improved and its gateway location could be leveraged.

She explained that Prospector is the smallest district of the five geographically and sort of lacks an identity but it seems adequate in its role in the broader community. If

deemed important, there is an opportunity to improve its identity through signage and access and take advantage of its proximity to the Rail Trail.

The Deer Valley District serves an important role for visitors and second home owners and there are opportunities in the future for base area development. Key recommendations include businesses and restaurants geared toward guest convenience with the understanding that guests would also come into town to shop and dine.

Ms. Zimmerman continued to explain the metrics piece of the study which is a tool for the City in moving forward. There are guiding principles and a rating system for qualitative and quantitative elements. She believed that people are used to perceiving metrics as quantitative but that does not consider the visitor experience and quality of life piece and there are some metrics that have some subjectivity to them. Baseline conditions are more important than a number to Park City and there are metrics that relate to district or City-wide economics, environment, and community. This tool is meant to be dynamic and change over time.

With regard to redevelopment, Ms. Simpson believed that Park City's sense of community is fostered by not having national chains on Main Street. Joe Kernan agreed that some areas of town should be improved. Bonanza/Park is important and should be protected and he concurred that consideration should be given to the experience of the user who is working, dining and shopping in the area. Jack Thomas expressed that redevelopment offers an opportunity for balance of economies. Statistics and averages do not deal with what affects us most which is the visual experience and there is an opportunity within redevelopment to explore those relationships and aesthetic experiences. As a Planning Commissioner, he hopes to *raise the bar* a little bit to develop a better understanding on how to make a more creative and attractive community. He commented that this ties into the user experience. Alex Butwinski stated that part of the difficulty is recognizing that at the same time we're a resort community. An example is the investment the resorts make every year to improve the skier experience and to remain competitive. At some point, priorities need to be set and for him, it is sense of community that is most important. Becky Zimmerman discussed South Lake Tahoe's costly mistake in not maintaining the town on a regular basis. Mr. Butwinski hoped that Park City would retain its visual experience. Ms. Simpson added that sense of community is also important to her and Mr. Buki summarized comments to mean that not only is redevelopment good but it is essential and buried within that is a high sense of community. Ms. Simpson stated that is not what she said. The examples of good design come from the deep rooted belief in this community. Sense of community should be at the top of the list because of all of the other things that flow from this attribute. Diane Foster interjected that sense of community also positively impacts the visitor's experience.

In response to a question from Mr. Buki, Jack Thomas indicated that historically redevelopment has a negative connotation and the City should be cautious. Dick Peek viewed redevelopment as evolutionary by not starting *with a clean slate*. He discussed

redevelopment models in southern California which he described as extreme and not appropriate for Park City. Charlie Wintzer stated that for over 30 years, everything has been built and redeveloped and the whole town has reinvented itself, excluding Deer Valley. Without redevelopment, Park City wouldn't be what it is today and he credited redevelopment. Probably 90% of Old Town has been redeveloped at one time or another in the past 40 years. He pointed out that some of the properties on lower Park Avenue are not very much behind the poor condition of properties in South Lake Tahoe discussed earlier. Mr. Wintzer relayed that some returning visitors don't want to see change here and familiarity has its benefits. Mr. Buki summarized Mr. Wintzer's comments to mean that there are limits to the scope of redevelopment.

Mr. Wintzer spoke about higher sales on Main Street compared to Bonanza/Park and emphasized that businesses basically have six good months to make a profit and cover costs. There should be a way to even out the areas which he believed can partially be accomplished with redevelopment. However, he warned that if there is too much, Park City may lose core businesses because of increased rents.

Becky Zimmerman discussed Vail's reputation for businesses being closed in the off-season which negatively impacted tourism. Mr. Wintzer spoke about the need for more businesses to target the locals. Full-time residents support businesses in the off-seasons and only 40% of Old Town consists of full-time residents which affects Main Street. Liza Simpson pointed out that she works and lives in Old Town and it has been her observation over the past 14 years that the off-seasons are getting busier and busier, at least the weekends. Most people don't want Park City to be a four-season resort. She referred to a comment in the retail report that described Main Street as *gallery heavy* and pointed out that 12 years ago, it was *too many t-shirt shops* on Main Street. Now Park City has a more vibrant fine arts community which she felt is not a bad thing.

Nan Worel expressed that redevelopment is evolutionary and it is also an opportunity to be proactive rather than reactive to change. Goals establish a framework to evaluate development and protect a sense of community. Ms. Simpson spoke about incentivizing affordable housing by granting additional height, for instance, which may be a good approach for attracting the right type of redevelopment. Charles Buki asked what it means to be *proactive* and Ms. Worel explained having a collective vision of where the community wants go which should be the basis for decisions.

Brooke Hontz believes that the Planning Commission will have the tools with the revised General Plan and Land Management Code. The current General Plan is inadequate because of conflicting language throughout the document. She would love to support redevelopment to make the community better based on a process that people feel is fair. The Planning Commission gets there now, but it can be a painful process for some applicants. She acknowledged staffing limits and felt the City needs adequate resources so that the process is better, faster, easier, and fairer. Mr. Buki asked how she feels about the word redevelopment and Ms. Hontz responded that it is a great word but it is dependent upon how it is accomplished.

Charles Buki stated that the City is operating with a dated General Plan, a dated LMC, redevelopment pressures, and lack of clarity on how to prioritize those pressures. He felt that direction from the Council and the Commission is critical in rewriting the General Plan so it is not written in a vacuum. Mick Savage expressed that the lion's share of the effort needs to go into the vision question and the vision needs to be as explicit as possible and within a 20 to 30 year perspective. He believes that agreement as it relates to a long-term vision will promote efficiency in terms of developing a General Plan and a LMC that is well-informed by the vision. The visioning work done so far is good but it is *fuzzy*. The districts in Park City should not only be defined as to what they will be but also what they are, which allows us to think very explicitly about the way we connect. He agreed with Commissioner Thomas about thinking about this from a visual perspective.

Charlie Wintzer felt it important to formulate a list to evaluate projects, i.e., size and mass, environment, economics, etc., giving the Planning Commission a tool to make sure that goals are being achieved and to have a target. He asked for guidance from Council and clarified for Mr. Buki that an application would not have to meet every criteria on the list but at least this is a tool to rank projects. Cindy Matsumoto believed that redevelopment is important for Park City but it doesn't necessarily mean growth. She views lower Park Avenue as servicing tourists and Bonanza/Park as a locals center. Sense of community keeps us all here and redevelopment should support sense of community. She spoke about encouraging a vibrant economy and reinventing older product that will attract tourists. Ms Matsumoto was concerned about losing 600 residents (reflected in the Census) and felt high housing prices played a part. With no growth, she questioned how Park City will be able to support adding another one million square feet of retail without hurting existing businesses.

Alex Butwinski pointed out the partnership the City can develop with an applicant with regard to obtaining community amenities. Mr. Buki summarized comments to mean that redevelopment can be a partnership tool and should be complimentary. Mr. Butwinski agreed and felt criteria is necessary. Currently, the LMC and the General Plan don't provide criteria and once there is a vision, it will be translated into redevelopment projects. Mr. Buki asked if the LMC and General Plan are the right tools. Alex Butwinski believed that the revised documents should provide redevelopment criteria. Joe Kernan felt the General Plan should address grid systems, form-based codes, etc. so that areas are developed accordingly. Mr. Buki asked if other tools would be helpful and Mr. Kernan felt that the consultants or City Manager should be advising the group on this point.

Mayor Williams commented on proactive planning and the Park City Heights Project where the City bought half of the project and was able to control housing prices. The City then had an opportunity to proactively design a neighborhood that hit price points that aren't available in town anymore. One of the over-riding guiding principles is being a socio-economically diverse town with a working class living here which distinguishes Park City from other resort towns like Vail or Aspen. Park City has some history of

proactive planning. The Mayor discussed the cooperative relationships between the City and the owners of Treasure and Bonanza/Park and cited a fundamental shift in the development community here.

The Mayor pointed out the fluctuation in Old Town of year-round residents versus renters and emphasized that Park City is always shifting. He quoted the Hyatt Palmer study advising *to be the funk that you are* which attracts visitors even in poor economic years. Mayor Williams stated that he is not afraid of redevelopment and feels it is necessary. There was a conscious effort years ago to discourage big box and chain stores here and he doesn't consider Kimball Junction the main entrance to Park City anymore, but rather Quinns Junction; this is a different era. The LMC has changed over the years and at one time, density bonuses were relatively easy to obtain by providing trails, affordable housing, open space, etc., but now 60% open space, trails, and affordable housing are required in order to be approved. Even though this document needs to be updated, in perspective the LMC has changed a lot over 20 years. In his opinion, there is cohesiveness and interested residents of all ages in the community. People expect to receive increased services when paying a property tax increase and are not necessarily supportive of bonding for projects supporting our resort economy which ironically attracted most of our residents. It is his opinion that redevelopment is positive.

Mr. Buki referred to Commissioner Savage's comment about *informing* the General Plan. He summarized the discussion to mean that redevelopment is okay with partners in a complimentary relationship but criteria are needed. He asked if there is agreement that part of being proactive is pushing for things that the market may take longer to generate. Ms. Simpson believed the Council is already taking that approach with lower Park Avenue. There have been studies and members are not waiting for Park City Mountain Resort to come to the City. The Mayor acknowledged that there has been debate about facilitating more growth.

Mr. Wintzer stated that he agrees with everything said but some points are not consistent with the visioning statement about mountain life style, open space, etc. He acknowledged, however, that without redevelopment the community may lose these attributes anyway. The Mayor felt that the public expects the City to be proactive in terms of steering growth. Mr. Wintzer questioned losing *a great small town sense of community* if redevelopment is proactively sought. Each survey statement seems to say *stay the way we are* which is not a healthy environment. Ms. Simpson countered that if the City is proactively involved in redevelopment, it is guiding the vision into the project. Mr. Wintzer explained that if the City is proactive in redevelopment, it needs to be educating the community. Joe Kernan spoke about the power of gathering places in creating a sense of community and suggested adding them in the Bonanza/Park area. Mick Savage stated that visioning tells us how it feels but it is our job to try to convert that into a redevelopment strategy that says how it is going to look and implement it in a way that is acceptable to the community.

In response to a question from the consultant about planning resources, Tom Bakaly explained that staff needs help with a strategic plan and with how we get there. Implementation tests a plan and he asked whether the hard work is going to happen at the General Plan strategy level or is it going to happen when individual projects are processed. He again felt a strategic plan is necessary and referred to examples of goals and strategies in the staff report. The goals listed are not far off from those cited tonight but more work needs to be done to avoid conflicts on individual projects whether they are lot combinations or issues relating to Bonanza/Park. Charles Buki emphasized that few communities get clear marching orders from even the best written general plans as they are intended to provide general direction and along the way there can be all kinds of migrations made for economic reasons. Mr. Bakaly commented on potential priority conflicts because making decisions is often hard and he prefers establishing priorities now before the revised General Plan is finalized.

Mr. Buki referred to Exhibit A in the meeting packet which lists goals and strategies and strongly encouraged Council and Planning Commission members to review this information over the next two weeks. The current General Plan needs direction and he asked that specifics be provided at the next meeting. Mick Savage suggested articulating individual characteristics of each district. Katie Cattan stated that staff needs clarity that the draft goals and strategies are supported by members and the City Manager directed attention to the projects which may change goals and strategies.

The Mayor discussed the controversy and objections voiced by the local soccer community over bringing a non-local soccer tournament to Park City and pointed out that officials may have a collective vision about things but no matter what is done, there is always going to be a difference of opinion. For instance, the Treasure Project was approved 25 years ago and no matter what is done, there will be people unhappy about the decision. Mr. Buki again asked that members work in groups, *tear the list apart* during the next two weeks, and return prepared so that Bonanza/Park and lot combinations can be addressed within a context. Secondly, he pointed out that the General Plan is a document that changes at least annually and suggested forming a working sub-group of Council, Commission and staff to generate an annual review of the General Plan. Staff needs clarity. Alex Butwinski encouraged the public to provide feedback on this project. Ms. Simpson believed the annual review naturally falls within Council's annual Visioning Session. Mr. Buki asked if any official is opposed to redevelopment; there was no response.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder