

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION NOTES
MAY 26, 2010**

PRESENT: Chair Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Richard Luskin, Dick Peek, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Thomas Eddington, Katie Cattan, Brooks Robinson, Kayla Sintz, Polly Samuels McLean, Matt Cassel

Ex Officio Participants: Jack Thomas, Craig Elliott, Mike Sweeney, Mary Wintzer, Neil Krasnick, Ruth Meintsma, Mark Fischer, Liza Simpson, Alex Butwinski

WORK SESSION ITEMS

Roll Call

Chair Wintzer called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. All Commissioners were present except Commissioner Pettit, who was excused.

Staff Communications

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington, noted that the Commissioners needed to formalize the designation of Julia Pettit as the Board of Adjustment liaison through June 1, 2011. Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean, recommended that the Planning Commission formalize the appointment through a motion at the next regular meeting on June 9th.

Director Eddington announced that the Staff would be bringing forth a recommendation to change the wording in the General Plan from "Park Bonanza" to "Bonanza Park" to reflect the name change in that area.

Chair Wintzer asked if there were other issues the Planning Commission should consider in the General Plan for the Bonanza Park area. Mr. Eddington replied that the 16 page supplement to the General Plan that was done in 2001 is the only section that addresses Bonanza Park. The recommendation will be for the Planning Commission to amend the name in that supplement.

Chair Wintzer was not comfortable with the entire Bonanza Park supplement and suggested that it be amended to better fit the District. Director Eddington stated that it could be amended as part of the General Plan process. He noted that the Staff has begun the land use discussion with Bonanza Park. He would keep the Planning Commission updated on the progress and request input as they move forward.

Commissioner Hontz recalled that the LMC needed to be changed to correctly reflect that the Planning Commission meets on the 2nd and 4th Wednesday rather than the 1st and 3rd Wednesday as currently referenced in the Code. Director Eddington stated that other sections of the LMC, as well as that section, are being revised and the Planning Commission will see those when they are completed.

Commissioner Luskin asked if the Planning Commission would consider changing their meetings to Tuesday night during the summer so it does not conflict with the free Music Concerts at Deer Valley. Assistant City Attorney McLean, advised against making that change for consistency. Chair

Wintzer pointed out that the Planning Commission had already reduced their meetings to once a month for public hearing items. The Commissioners preferred to keep the same schedule.

Director Eddington requested that the Planning Commissioners email their summer vacation schedules so the Staff could draft a summer meeting schedule for discussion at the next meeting.

General Plan - Discussion on future public participation meetings

Planner Cattan remarked that the next two General Plan meetings would be Outreach and those could be scheduled on a Tuesday. This would allow both the public and the Commissioners to attend the Deer Valley concert on Wednesday. City Council Member, Liza Simpson believed they would have a better turnout for the Outreach if it was scheduled on Tuesday.

Planner Cattan requested that the Planning Commission discuss scheduling possibilities for Outreach. She noted that Commissioner Pettit had suggested one each month so people who miss one can still participate in another one.

Commissioner Savage suggested that they avoid a conflict with the Wednesday night concert if the intent is to draw public interest.

Commissioner Hontz asked if it was possible to hold three Outreach meetings. The first two could be held back to back on a Tuesday and Wednesday of one month and the third could be scheduled the following month. This would encourage those who attend the first two Outreach meetings to talk about it and possibly peak the interest of others who would then have the opportunity to attend the following month.

Planner Cattan stated that the initial idea was to plan an Outreach around the 4th of July since most residents stay in town for the holiday. After further discussion, the Planning Commission and Staff agreed to tentatively schedule the first Outreach on Tuesday, July 6th and the second on Tuesday, July 20th.

Planner Cattan noted that the intent this evening was for the Planning Commission to interact and test the exercises that the public will be participating in during Outreach. She wanted the Planning Commission to identify any gaps and to provide ideas to fill in those gaps.

Planner Cattan stated that on the night of Outreach, the public will see a presentation on the findings of visioning. A list of goals under the General Plan will be provided and the first activity will be for the public to rate those goals. This exercise will help with consensus building on goals the Staff has been working on for the community based on visioning and other research.

Planner Cattan noted that the public would also receive a neighborhood survey. She requested that the Planning Commission review the survey this evening and provide input. The point of the survey is to get feedback on different neighborhoods within the City.

The first exercise this evening was to define the neighborhoods within the City.

Mike Sweeney suggested that in addition to circling “the neighborhood where you live”, they should also include the neighborhood “where people work” in order to hear from those who work in the community but live elsewhere. Commissioner Peek pointed out that you have to live in a neighborhood to give input on that neighborhood. Mr. Sweeney remarked that people who work there also contribute to the neighborhood. Commissioner Peek stated that he lives in Park Meadow and asked if he could give input on Deer Valley or Old Town.

Planner Cattan explained that residents living in one neighborhood should not be able to provide input on another neighborhood. However in cases like Mike Sweeney, he lives in Salt Lake but comes to Park City every day to work, that group should have some input.

Commissioner Luskin disagreed because living and working in Park City are different experiences. What he experiences as a resident is different from what the construction worker experiences when he comes to Park City to work. Planner Cattan commented on people who work in the commercial areas of the City. Commissioner Luskin thought the survey should separate commercial and residential areas.

Chair Wintzer suggested adding a question that asks, where do you live and where do you work. He agreed that people who live and work in Park City see things differently than those who live one place and work in another place.

Neil Krasnick asked about the number of areas in town that are predominantly rental versus residential. He lives in a predominantly rental neighborhood and this time of year it is empty. Planner Cattan replied that this is a huge trend in Park City and more than 60% of the homes are rentals. There are more second homes in the Historic District than in areas like Park Meadows.

Commissioner Savage asked if the survey targets taxpayers, but not those who pay property tax. Planner Cattan stated that they want to hear from anyone who lives in Park City or has a connection to Park City. She pointed out that renters still share the experience. Planner Cattan clarified that the Staff did not want to nick-pick those who fill out the survey and everyone should participate.

Chair Wintzer thought the survey could identify people by asking if they are full-time residents, where they work, where they live, etc., and use those answers to build the data base.

Planner Cattan stated that the intent of the survey questions was to make everyone feel included. Council Member Simpson pointed out that people who are not interested will not fill out the survey or participate in Outreach. Director Eddington noted that the survey would be posted on the website so a second homeowner would have the opportunity to fill out the survey and be heard.

Mr. Krasnick asked Planner Cattan to provide a brief summary of the purpose of the survey. Planner Cattan stated that the Staff has been doing research on current planning and General Plans and goals. They have compiled numbers on the trends in Park City and the direction the City

is taking. The Staff wants feedback from the community in terms of land use and what the people want to experience. The questions were designed to think about the future and what new ideas should be incorporated into the General Plan. She noted that the survey contained sustainability questions. Planner Cattan pointed out that visioning indicated that they want to be a green community and they care about nature. However, when it comes down to what people actually want in their backyard, they need those questions answered so the Staff is not making assumptions for the community.

Commissioner Savage asked if there was a mechanism to quantitatively analyze the results of the survey or if the procedure was more qualitative. Planner Cattan believed they would quantitatively bring the answers together, but many of the questions are qualitative, which presents a balancing act for the Staff.

Commissioner Savage asked if the Staff had given any consideration to the mechanism or how to analyze the data once it has been gathered. Planner Cattan replied that the Staff had not discussed the method. Commissioner Savage encouraged the Staff to consider how they would analyze the data once it has been compiled. That type of thinking might help create opportunities to clarify, modify or enhance the survey to make sure the questions provide the information they want to obtain.

Jack Thomas thought the questions were good and quantitative; however, he suggested adding a series of questions that address the issue of the aesthetic component of the community. People could identify the most and the least aesthetically pleasing component of their specific neighborhood. Mr. Thomas remarked that aesthetics is an important aspect of the community that gets forgotten. He believed that aesthetics should be a significant part of the General Plan. Chair Wintzer agreed that asking that question leads people to start looking at their community as a picture rather than a word.

Mr. Krasnick pointed out that one man's beauty is another man's ugly. Planner Cattan clarified that this was the reason for getting a perspective from everyone. With regard to aesthetics, Planner Cattan stated that stars will be utilized for people to identify special and aesthetically pleasing places in their neighborhood.

Commissioner Strachan suggested that the Staff use pictures of different homes and structures in different neighborhoods in the survey and have people identify which ones they like. Planner Cattan liked that idea and suggested that the Staff could solicit volunteers from each neighborhood to help with that process.

Mapping the neighborhoods of Park City

The Commissioners and other participants broke into two groups to identify and map the neighborhoods. Planner Cattan asked that both groups circle areas that they think should be defined neighborhoods to fill out the survey. At the end of the exercise, both maps would be discussed. The goal was to reach a consensus of the entire group.

Director Eddington stated that sub-neighborhoods could also be identified on the maps. Planner

Sintz cautioned them against breaking down the neighborhoods so far that they would miss the purpose of looking at evaluating areas as a whole.

Once both maps were completed, the two maps were overlaid over each other so everyone could see the similarities and differences between the two. In general, the maps were more similar than different.

Planner Cattan asked each group to explain their thoughts, beginning with Park Meadows. Chair Wintzer explained that his group thought the flatter part around Park Meadows, which are areas not around the golf course or on the hills, was more primary residence. The flatter areas were divided from the hilly portions because the issues would be different.

Commissioner Hontz pointed out that her group had the same thought and believed the values for the two areas would be different; however, they chose to keep it intact as one neighborhood. Both groups came to the same conclusion but with different ideas. Planner Cattan noted that the Planning Department cut the flats and the hills a little higher than the first group. The group discussed whether Park Meadows should be kept intact as one neighborhood or broken into areas.

Chair Wintzer stated that he would be interested in keeping Park Meadows as one neighborhood if people would put their address and whether or not they live there full-time. He believed the people in Park Meadow would divide it out themselves. Everyone agreed.

Commissioner Peek suggested including a blank map on the survey and ask people to survey their neighborhood. Planner Cattan explained that the first step for Outreach is for people to come in and see their neighborhood in terms of where they actually live and how the Staff and Planning Commission defined their neighborhood. At that point, people will be divided into specific groups based on the neighborhood they live in. She was concerned about making the process too confusing.

Planner Cattan noted that both groups had defined the Aspen/Thaynes area almost identical. Craig Elliott pointed out that the only difference was that one group had included the Hotel Park City in that piece. Commissioner Hontz stated that her group had put the Hotel Park City with PCMR. After further discussion, Chair Wintzer and his group agreed with that assessment and the Hotel Park City was included with the Resort. Planner Cattan noted that the Staff had not put PCMR as a separate area. They included PCMR and Silver Star with Old Town. The group was not comfortable including PCMR as part of the Historic District. Both groups had separated PCMR from the Historic District at Park Avenue.

Planner Cattan noted that both groups defined Upper and Lower Deer Valley the same. There was a definite difference in how the two groups mapped Prospector. One group showed Prospector all the way out to Bonanza and the second group separated commercial from residential in Prospector.

Commissioner Strachan stated that the residents in Prospector use the commercial district and when NOMA is built up, he believed the residents would use it even more. People in Prospector already consider that to be their neighborhood. Planner Cattan noted that the Staff had the same thought. Chair Wintzer believed it was a good point. He explained why his group had divided the two, but he thought Commissioner Strachan was right. Mr. Elliott thought Snow Creek should be dragged into Prospector. He remarked that the road is not the divider, it is the part that holds it all

together. Commissioner Peek agreed that the hill that divides the cemetery from Park Meadows was the dividing line.

Commissioner Hontz noted that some of her group supported that idea and others were unsure. She was comfortable with the dividing line and including Snow Creek with Prospector. Commissioner Strachan thought Snow Creek should be separate because it is accessed by every neighborhood. In his opinion, no single neighborhood can claim Snow Creek. Mr. Elliott explained why he disagreed. He did not see Snow Creek as part of Park Meadow. He believed the road holds that piece together as opposed to breaking it up. It is commercial activity that uses both sides and the use is very similar.

Planner Cattan remarked that Snow Creek did not have a connection to Prospector, but it could connect to the frontage on Park Avenue.

Council Member Simpson believed that the residents at Windrift would say that they live in Park Meadows. Planner Cattan asked if they should put the residential portion of Snow Creek into Park Meadows. Chair Wintzer thought they should be careful about dividing it up too much, particularly if they are only trying to determine where people live. He was unsure how many of the Windrift residents would even participate in Outreach.

Planner Cattan suggested putting the residential area of Snow Creek into Park Meadows and the commercial portion into Bonanza/Prospector. Mark Fischer pointed out that when people turn into that neighborhood off of the highway, they think it is Park Meadows. He recommended bringing it in a couple of blocks to the south so the residents are part of a neighborhood rather than a commercial zone.

Mr. Thomas thought they should not always separate the commercial from the residential because the combination in a neighborhood is what makes the community work.

Planner Cattan asked about Deer Valley Drive and the entrance into Deer Valley. Council Member Simpson replied that Rossi Hill Road was the dividing line. Both groups had treated that area identical.

Discussion of interactive maps exercise

Each person was given labels and asked to pretend that they all live in Lower Park Meadows. The stickers represented uses in a neighborhood such as a café, deli or bar and each person was to place the stickers on a map to indicate where they would want those uses located. Anyone who did not want a café, deli, or bar located in their neighborhood, would specify that on a blank piece of paper provided titled, "This use does not belong in my neighborhood." Planner Cattan indicated an area called the "void", which indicates an under utilized area in the neighborhood. Everyone was also given stars to identify special or aesthetically pleasing places in the neighborhood. The first row of stickers were placed on the map. The second row of stickers indicate larger uses such as a wind farm, solar farm, a big box store, etc.

Planner Cattan clarified that the top row of stickers was for the Park Meadows neighborhood, the

middle row of stickers was for greater Park City, and the rest should be used on the County map.

At the end of the map exercise, Planner Cattan asked everyone to give one piece of advice on how this exercise could be made easier for the public.

Chair Wintzer thought the legend identifying the stickers should be placed on the map it was intended for. Commissioner Peek suggested colored backgrounds for each row of stickers. A green background could indicate in favor of something and a red background would indicate being against something. That would replace the “doesn’t belong in my neighborhood” sheet and color would make it easier to identify for and against. Commissioner Peek pointed out that a piece of paper of “doesn’t belong in my neighborhood” would not indicate which neighborhood.

Director Thomas clarified that for the Outreach, each neighborhood would have its own map and only people in that neighborhood would be placing stickers on the map or writing on that piece of paper. Planner Cattan pointed out that each neighborhood would also have the greater Park City map. The exercise will be set up for nine different neighborhoods throughout the room.

Commissioner Hontz liked the interaction that occurred when the legend was not on the map because it encouraged people to talk to each other and ask questions.

Ruth Meintsma found the exercise confusing because she was unsure where solar would work. She thought the bus stop was the simplest and most straightforward sticker because people will know if they want buses closer to their neighborhood.

Commissioner Savage asked if the City had done an analysis to determine the most suitable locations for solar or wind facilities. Planner Cattan replied that one location at Quinn’s Junction was tested for wind power, but there was not sufficient wind. The University of Utah also did a solar inventory for the County. Council Member Simpson pointed out that Park City has such great solar that as long as they have the angles it could be located anywhere.

Commissioner Savage asked if wind energy was a viable option based on recent studies. Director Eddington replied that only one or two anemometers were put up for testing and the wind was questionable. Commissioner Savage questioned why wind would be a matter for Outreach if there is no reason to think wind is a viable option. Planner Cattan replied that the intent is to see if people agree or disagree with the use from a land use perspective. The person investing in wind power would be responsible for doing the background research of whether or not it would work.

Director Eddington clarified that this as an aesthetical exercise to see if people were willing to see wind towers and whether the LMC would eventually be amended to allow them.

Mr. Krasnick suggested that they reduce the number of items they are asking for opinions on in order to keep the analysis manageable for the Staff.

Mary Wintzer liked having the sheet for what you do not want in your neighborhood because it helps to quickly identify what people oppose.

Commissioner Strachan thought it was important to emphasize during Outreach that this is a hypothetical exercise; otherwise people will be like Ms. Meintsma and think they need to understand whether something would actually work in a specific location.

Mr. Thomas stated that in his mind, a community garden did not register as a potential greenhouse. The thought of a greenhouse rendered many more possibilities. Mr. Thomas believed that greenhouses could be a new component in the community that could be integrated into a number of different areas, particularly roof top greenhouses. Ms. Meintsma noted that greenhouses came to mind when she saw residential agriculture in the survey.

Council Member Simpson suggested having two maps for each neighborhood and dividing the stickers between uses, such as a commercial and transportation. She was concerned how the Staff would sort out a giant pile of stickers at the Racquet Club if it was all lumped together.

Commissioner Luskin thought they should have two maps of each neighborhood. One map would be things you want in your neighborhood and the second map would be what you would not want in your neighborhood. He felt that important things would get lost if all the stickers were placed on one map or the negatives were put on a sheet of paper.

The Staff and Commissioners discussed the best place to put the legends relative to the maps. The majority still favored a sheet of paper for the things people would not want anywhere in their neighborhood and stickers on the map for favorable things.

Planner Cattan stated that from the standpoint of collecting data, it is better to keep the process simple.

Commissioner Savage was concerned about clustering because people tend to follow the cluster rather than think on their own. He suggested using tracing paper that can be changed and only allow three or four people at the map at one time. If the paper is changed frequently they would continue to get quality input as different people go the map. Director Eddington stated that the Staff could print out several maps and instead of using tracing paper, the map could be changed when one is full. Chair Wintzer liked the idea and preferred a map over tracing paper.

Commissioner Luskin suggested a blank sticker that people can write on if they would like to suggest something that the Staff did not foresee with the stickers.

Planner Cattan asked if the Staff had left out any uses that people might like to see. She noted that Ms. Meintsma had raised the issue of being able to have chickens in a backyard. Planner Cattan remarked that in the larger areas they would add a conference center or convention space. Commissioner Peek suggested recreation uses. Another suggestion was a dog park. Planner Cattan clarified that she was looking for uses that do not currently exist. Council Member Simpson thought that would be the purpose of the blank sticker. Everyone agreed.

Review and Edit Neighborhood Survey

Mr. Elliott recommended adding commercial questions in the "How often do you" section of the

survey, such as how often do you go to Main Street, how often do you go to Prospector, how often do you go to Bonanza Park. This would identify different neighborhoods that have different relationship to uses.

Chair Wintzer suggested that the survey ask people to list three places they drive to most often and three that they walk to most often.

Council Member Simpson thought the transportation question should ask people to give their two primary forms of transportation. Commissioner Savage suggested ranking the modes of transportation on a percentage basis that totals 100%. This would give quantitative information on how much people walk, drive, bike, or bus.

The group reviewed the survey questions in order beginning with question one.

Commissioner Luskin thought questions 2 and 3, were too vague. A better approach would be to ask for the best and least desirable features of the neighborhood.

Ms. Meintsma commented on question 4 and felt the choice of "commercial" was too broad. She suggested that they ask people to describe the type of commercial they would like to see in their neighborhood. For instance, A coffee shop might be fine but other commercial uses may not.

Regarding the residential component of question 4, Ms. Meintsma stated that in her neighborhood there is nightly, yearly, primary and secondary. She stated that it would be great to have growth of primary residential in her neighborhood, but primary compared to yearly are completely different. Council Member Simpson suggested making residential growth a two-part question.

Commissioner Strachan stated that people will interpret the questions differently and it would be helpful to provide space where people can comment on their choice.

Commissioner Savage felt it was important for the Staff to make sure that the questions are asked in a way that obtains the information they hope to gain from the survey.

Commissioner Hontz commented on the importance of knowing what data they actually want and balancing that with how fast it can be processed and analyzed. She did not think that most of the questions as written passed the test for quantitative and qualitative analysis. However, in the end the Staff would need to determine if all the data and comments can be analyzed. Planner Cattan agreed. That was her concern with allowing space for comments on every question.

Planner Cattan favored the suggestion to break down question 4 and ask specific questions about the types of residential and commercial. Chair Wintzer thought they should change "commercial" to "support commercial" because no one wants larger commercial uses in their neighborhood.

Commissioner Peek suggested that they avoid hot button terms such as "affordable housing" and "green building standards". He believed those terms politicize the question. Question 5 asks people to identify their primary mode of transportation within town. Per their earlier discussion, Planner Cattan would revise the question to rank the choices by percentage.

Question 6 was a yes or no question on whether you utilize public transit. Planner Cattan remarked that if question 5 was answered with percentages, that would provide the answer for question 6. Ms. Meintsma stated that if the answer is yes, people should be asked to comment on what does or does not work with public transit.

For purposes of analyzing, Director Eddington suggested that they add more choices to some of the questions and limit the number of comments.

Commissioner Luskin noted that question 7 talks about parking but nothing in the survey addresses traffic. A question regarding traffic would be added. Chair Wintzer thought question 7 should be revised to ask whether or not people are willing to decrease the amount of parking in their neighborhood to encourage use of public transit, walking, etc. Commissioner Hontz felt that was a good question for the survey matrix to make sure it would obtain the right information. Commissioner Luskin wanted to know the point of question 9, how often do you leave Summit County. Commissioner Strachan also could not see the relevance of question 9. Planner Cattan replied that the issue is whether public transportation works within the County or if a transit system connection to Salt Lake is needed. Commissioner Strachan suggested that question 9 be revised to ask that question directly.

Commissioner Savage felt the real question is why they care how many times people leave Summit County. Mr. Thomas stated that it is important to know if people are leaving because goods and services are not available in Park City or Summit County. Director Eddington stated that the question could be broken down to address transportation and goods and services.

Commissioner Luskin pointed out that the grid on question 16 could address all the issues asked in the previous fifteen questions and the format would provide better information. He suggested expanding the grid to encompass the other questions and provide space at the bottom for further comments or issues.

Chair Wintzer agreed. In addition, they could ask a few additional questions, such as list the five places you go to most often. Commissioner Strachan agreed with Commissioners Luskin and Wintzer. The survey could be condensed into a grid with a few follow up questions. He was concerned that people would lose interest filling out a long survey.

Mr. Sweeney disagreed with the approach. He noted that Park City is a destination resort community with 7,000 people living in the community and 100,000 who come and visit. He stated that the neighborhoods are being supported by the destination resort tourist. Mr. Sweeney thought a more important issue was how to encourage the tourists to spend money in Park City to make the neighborhoods better. He believed the Planning Commission has the responsibility to look at those issues when revising the General Plan for the community.

Planner Cattan pointed out that the purpose of these exercises is to determine what this community wants to be in 20 years so that can be considered in the General Plan. Planner Cattan stated that the information Mr. Sweeney wanted could be obtained from the census data and it did not need to be asked in the survey.

Mary Wintzer stated that as a 30 year resident in Park City, this process and the questions about neighborhoods are important to her and others who live in the community. Ms. Wintzer pointed out that people who live in Park City see the issues differently than those who only work or own businesses in town.

Mr. Sweeney did not disagree, but he questioned the point of the process. Planner Cattan replied that the point was land use and future development for both small neighborhoods and the community as a whole.

After further discussion, the decision was made to expand the grid on question 16 with a few additional questions or comments, as opposed to using the sixteen question survey.

The work session was adjourned.