

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION NOTES  
MARCH 24, 2010**

PRESENT: Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Richard Luskin, Julia Pettit, Adam Strachan, Thomas Eddington, Kirsten Whetstone, Francisco Astorga, Mark Harrington, Ron Ivie

Dick Peek was excused

**WORK SESSION ITEMS**

**Montage - Possible Changes to Construction Hours**

Chief Building Official, Ron Ivie, reported that in the technical report on mitigation for the Montage Project at Empire Pass, the City is given the authority extend work hours and other matters of that nature. Based on that authority, a decision was made to approve an extension of the work hours on the Montage project to a 24 hour work period with conditions.

Mr. Ivie would outline the conditions this evening and he encouraged the Commissioners to visit the Building Department to discuss concerns regarding these conditions. He noted that there would be additional truck traffic this year. At this point he was not prepared to identify the exact quantity or what might be further required by USEPA. He expected to know that information very soon. The hope was to complete that activity early this summer so the site could be capped and completed. Mr. Ivie had met with the affected neighbors immediately in the area of the Montage to address their concerns. He believed those concerns were satisfied. However, two other Montage related complaints have been raised recently, both of which were lighting related. Mr. Ivie stated that the lighting has been reduced by half and it would be reduced further once the tower frames are removed within the next few weeks.

Mr. Ivie stated that the Montage is behind schedule and the intent is get the project on a more reasonable schedule to achieve the currently projected opening date of November. The idea is to extend the construction hours to complete the project during the down season in time to open for the ski season. Mr. Ivie noted that there are only a few close proximity neighbors. The extend works hours would be limited to inside finish work, such as laying carpet and painting. Mr. Ivie stated that currently the construction is operating with 850 people and they anticipate adding 50 to 100 to the night crew. Transporting workers back and forth would be prohibited during the night times hours. Once they arrive, the crew would remain on site until the next shift arrives. Mr. Ivie pointed out that the City has access to the Montage security system and they can view activity any time during the day or night.

Mr. Ivie remarked that regardless of the conditions, there would be additional trucks and additional impacts from extended construction hours. Once he has all the information, it will be treated the same as all other activities that have been conditioned. He asked that everyone bear with them for the next few months until the project reaches a point where the impacts can be diminished.

Chair Wintzer asked if the extended hours would be from now until the project is completed. Mr. Ivie replied that this was correct. He asked if the approval for extended hours could be pulled at any time if the conditions are not met or the approval is being abused. Mr. Ivie answered yes. Mr. Ivie pointed out that the hours of construction were already extended by half an hour earlier and a

half an hour later and there have been very few complaints. Most of the complaints have been from people in Deer Valley or in the Marsac region and those complaints primarily relate to lighting and noise. Mr. Ivie stated that there would continue to be noise because excessive deliveries are required to keep 850 people working. Everyone should expect excessive activity and traffic during the next time period, but there was no way to avoid it.

Chair Wintzer asked if the deliveries could be done during the day for the night shift workers. Mr. Ivie clarified that night time deliveries would be prohibited as a condition.

Commissioner Pettit wanted to know if Mr. Ivie anticipated other construction activity unrelated to Montage that would be going on in that area. She was concerned about the cumulative impacts. Mr. Ivie stated that a few houses are currently under construction in Red Cloud. Nothing new has been scheduled for that area at this point. Construction hours have not been extended for any residential construction in the neighborhood.

Chair Wintzer called for public input regarding the extended construction hours.

Marianne Cone, a resident at 86 Prospect, asked what load in/load out periods the neighbors could expect.

Mr. Ivie replied that there would be no change to the current time sequence. The load in/load out would be consistent and they would double-load for the second shift.

Ms. Cone asked if the additional truck traffic would still go to Montage.

Mr. Ivie stated that not all the traffic would be for Montage because there are other projects in that area. He commented on the restriction of not driving personal vehicles to the Montage site. Workers are bused from the parking lot at Richardson Flats to the site.

### **General Plan**

Planner Francisco Astorga stated that the Planning Commission has the responsibility to consider long range zoning and land use objectives, which was a topic of discussion this evening. The focus was on change. Planner Astorga read a quote indicating that change is certain and the world they are planning for today will not exist in this form tomorrow. He noted that the Planning Commission was looking at a specific redevelopment area with regards to land use and transportation.

Planner Astorga reviewed a power point presentation on the general concepts. He assumed that everyone was aware of the boundaries from Kearns to Deer Valley Drive, Park Avenue to Bonanza. According to the General Plan supplemental update that was done a few years ago, the boundaries also include some of the properties on the east side of Bonanza Drive.

Planner Astorga outlined the broad range of land uses in the area. He noted that the area also has one of the only two supermarkets in town and a movie theater. The Staff recognized that this is an area that has been struggling, which is why it was included in the redevelopment area. Planner Astorga stated that some of the owners have tried to brand this area to move forward with redevelopment efforts.

Planner Astorga wanted to talk about the concepts that relate to long range planning of this area, which might also include other parts of town. He introduced the 3% strategy that was done by Envision Utah. Planner Astorga stated that the 3% strategy is illustrated to accommodate 33% of future development on 3% of the available land. He noted that the document provided to the Planning Commission was prepared in conjunction with the Wasatch Choices 20/40, a four County land use and transportation vision that was conducted last year. It outlines principles that allow them to move forward with progressive planning principles.

Planner Astorga requested comment from the Planning Commission regarding the 3% strategy.

Chair Wintzer thought it made sense to consolidate and move things closer together. Commissioner Strachan agreed and felt it was particularly important to move things closer to transit.

Commissioner Pettit stated that conceptually, the idea of putting density into areas of town that have access to transportation, walkability, and eliminating the need or desire to use a car is fantastic. However, she struggles with that concept in terms of how to encourage growth in that manner, but still have the ability to preserve that other part of town they want to preserve as open space for recreation activity and trails.

Planner Astorga believed that the purpose of the 3% strategy is to preserve open space. Commissioner Pettit commented on landowners who own property in parts of town where they do not want development to occur. She asked how they could encourage, incentivize and coordinate to keep development only where they want it to occur. Planner Astorga suggested that additional study and analysis could be done on transfer and development rights as a tool utilized for mitigation. He offered to spend more time looking into this in the future, as well as looking at alternative solutions to help mitigate development.

Planner Astorga reported on the benefits of the 3% strategy found in the study. These include improved air quality, reduced traffic, less water usage, create vibrant communities and gathering places, marketing of more choices for living, working, shopping and playing. Planner Astorga noted that every City has the same goal of wanting their city to be where people live, work and play.

Planner Astorga presented the five guiding principles for achieving the 3% strategy. The first is to focus growth in economic centers and along major transportation corridors. Planner Astorga stated that Park City has that opportunity in this redevelopment area through Park Avenue and Kearns Boulevard. The second is to create significant areas of mixed use development throughout the region. Planner Astorga pointed out that this study was prepared for the entire Wasatch Front, but it could also be utilized for Park City. Other principles include targeting growth around transit stations, encourage infill and redevelopment, and preserve rural, recreational and all open spaces.

Planner Astorga requested input from the Planning Commission on whether or not to move forward with the principles outlined within the 3% Strategy, relative to long range planning for the Bonanza/Park District. He stated that the need to provide a master plan for this district is essential to the City to realize improved design and economic development opportunities. Planner Astorga remarked on the importance of bringing these ideas into the General Plan to help achieve the main

principles.

Commissioner Pettit questioned this type of approach in a resort/mountain town community versus a more metropolitan area. She understood that what makes this approach more successful is the economic center or economic business component to the mixed-use development. Commissioner Pettit was unsure what type of businesses they could incorporate that would be consistent with who they are as a town, but would also create economic opportunities for people who want to live, work and recreate in town.

Chair Wintzer felt this was a discussion for later in the process. He agreed with the importance of looking at the types of businesses and the roads to get there, but they first need to decide if this is something they want to pursue. Planner Astorga clarified that this was a working instrument that could be fine tuned. The Staff was not suggesting that the Planning Commission adopt this as a final plan to move forward. The intent is to see how it can be applied to the Park City community in general. Planner Astorga stated that the idea is to come up with a similar strategy that would be specific to Park City's needs and challenges.

Commissioner Luskin stated that Newpark came to mind when he first saw this strategy. He asked if the Staff was looking at moving towards a Newpark model. Planner Astorga stated that the concept is similar to Newpark but it would be more sensitive to the needs of the Park City community, particularly in terms of retaining visitors. Park City wants visitors to stay in Park City and enjoy the amenities and services; and not go to Newpark.

Commissioner Luskin clarified that he was asking if they were envisioning Newpark where Fresh Market is located in this redevelopment area. Planner Astorga replied that it was the direction they would like to take.

Director Eddington clarified that in talking about Newpark, Commissioner Luskin was talking about a different scale. Newpark has a lot of large scale development and while they have a mix of uses, they also have a more typical suburban layout. Director Eddington stated that the approach for the Park City redevelopment area would be a main street concept with people living above. It would be a smaller scale than Newpark and parking would be hidden on the backside and on the inside of blocks. Director Eddington envisioned a local mountain village concept where people live but are intermixed with boutique hotels and visitors. Commissioner Luskin understood that it would be more like the Interwest Village concept. Director Eddington agreed.

Planner Astorga commented on form based codes versus euclidean zoning as a different way of regulating development. He explained that form base code focuses primarily on the form of such buildings, and it talks a little bit about use and management. The traditional zoning focuses on use and identifies what is allowed, what is conditional use and what is prohibited. It also focuses on the management of such uses and how they are treated. Planner Astorga noted that traditional zoning touches on specific form.

Planner Astorga provided examples of conventional suburban development and traditional patterns. One example showed significant parking around the building. An additional exhibit showed a grid pattern with zero lot lines and a second exhibit showed buildings that go to from property line to

hide the parking. Planner Astorga stated that cities who have been more progressive in their zoning efforts have been able to utilize form base codes and their success can be documented.

Planner Astorga presented slides of another town similar to Park City. He used an existing site condition and then added different amenities to show examples of using form based codes.

Planner Astorga stated the standards for form based codes include building height, building orientation and uses in general terms. Other parameters that Staff would consider in their analysis is landscape standards and quantity and placement of trees. Form based codes also focus on architectural standards that dictate specific architectural styles, materials, colors and construction techniques.

Planner Astorga requested that the Planning Commission discuss the concepts presented this evening and determine whether or not they concur with the Staff's recommendation to move forward with additional analysis of form based codes for the long range planning of the Bonanza/Park Area.

Chair Wintzer disclosed that he owns property in the Bonanza/Park area. He recalled recalled that when the Planning Commission previously made changes to the General Plan for the Bonanza/Park Area it included the east side of Bonanza to encompass all of Bonanza Road. He felt that was a better idea than what is currently presented because it allows the opportunity to look at both sides of the street in the same context.

Director Eddington clarified that Chair Wintzer was referring to the supplement to the General Plan that was done in 2004-2005.

Commissioner Pettit noted that by extension, there is another quasi-residential/commercial area that extends to the Silver Mountain Sports Club. She believed there were opportunities to create a vision for the entire area to provide essential inter-connectiveness between Prospector and Bonanza/Park. Commissioner Pettit asked if the Staff was looking at form based codes only for the Bonanza/Park area or in the context of the whole town.

Director Eddington replied that the Staff was initially looking at the form based codes for the Bonanza/Park area because of larger scale redevelopment. There is also an opportunity for more transition in the Bonanza/Park area in the immediate future. The idea was to try form based codes in the Bonanza Park area and if it goes well, they can see if it is applicable for other zones. Director Eddington stated that it is more challenging to put form based coding in an existing area that has a lot of fabric that would remain.

Chair Wintzer commented on projects currently approved and in-process in the Bonanza/Park area. He remarked that any projects that would be part of the five to ten year re-development plan should be included. Director Eddington agreed and stated that they also see re-development potential to the Dan's Market area to the north.

Commissioner Strachan liked how the 3% strategy targets the development of economic centers around transportation corridors. However, since this is an area with space amendable to

transportation, he thought it made sense to put in the transit stations and the transportation corridors first and then put development around them. Commissioner Strachan pointed out that once development is in, it is difficult and expensive to condemn land for a transportation system. They should dictate where the transportation hubs are going to be before they decide on where to place the buildings.

Commissioner Pettit felt this was one reason why it was important to identify where the optimal transportation corridors would be located. She understood that a study is currently occurring and a separate group is working on that issue. Commissioner Pettit agreed with Commissioner Strachan that transportation and development should dovetail together.

Director Eddington stated that the group currently working on the Transportation Plan is coordinating with the Planning Staff to tie into the General Plan, land use zoning, redevelopment, etc. They are working with Sustainability, with Public Works and the Engineering Department to make sure it all ties together.

Planner Astorga noted that in Bonanza/Park area they need to focus on the pedestrians and then plan for the vehicles. They should have an urban linear road alignment that would support the grid system and include narrow streets, natural traffic calming strategies, and smaller blocks. They should try to hide parking behind the buildings as much as possible and they should move forward with increased density and zero lot lines that would facilitate some of these planning principles.

Planner Astorga presented exhibits showing the progressive principles in examples of form based codes used in a Los Angeles suburb and downtown Portland. Planner Astorga commented on the challenges of Los Angeles versus Portland and felt these were good examples of form based coding.

Planning Director Eddington stated that the Staff tried to apply the concepts of form based coding and new urbanism concepts to the Bonanza/Park area. He asked the Planning Commission to remember that the presentation this evening was very conceptual in terms of applying the planning techniques. He asked for them to consider preliminary thoughts in putting these concepts on the ground in Park City.

Director Eddington presented slides of the Bonanza/Park area and explained how the Staff incorporated form based coding and new urban concepts into conceptual development and connectivity.

Chair Wintzer asked about the next step. Director Eddington stated that the Staff would do additional analysis with regard to form based coding and density and square footage numbers. They have already started a detailed number analysis for the Bonanza/Park area utilizing existing zoning, square footages, and how that would lay out in the future. The current zoning supports a traditional suburban layout typical to the Fresh Market, with parking up front and the building in the back. Director Eddington stated that the Staff has also looked at the numbers with regards to master planned developments with 60% open space, as well as redevelopment master planned developments under the current Land Management Code that talks 30% open space. The Staff would look at square footage numbers for form based coding and provide the Planning Commission

with those numbers. Director Eddington pointed out that overall development would be long-term with many phases. The long range planning they do now will set the stage for the future of the Bonanza/Park in terms of land use, transportation and economic viability.

Director Eddington noted that there are many re-development opportunities and in-fill properties in town, but only three main sites are left to be developed; Deer Valley's parking lot, PCMR's parking lot and NOMA.

Director Eddington stated that the Staff would continue their analysis and provide some of the specific numbers to the Planning Commission to consider in determining how to move forward.

Chair Wintzer stated that if they include the east side of Bonanza, he wanted to know if the Staff envisioned Bonanza as the escape route in and out of town or a neighborhood street. Director Eddington replied that Bonanza is envisioned as a complete street that would function as a route for moving skiers in and out of town. He noted that currently Bonanza is a physical barrier between Bonanza/Park and Prospector. It is important for the road to serve both functions. Director Eddington felt this was a good example of looking for ways to create connectivity. He stated that part of the transportation network solution is pacing how people leave the City so they are encouraged to stay and spend money in Park City before they leave. It would be better economically and for the road system.

Commissioner Pettit remarked that a corollary was thinking about not over-parking the area and actually reducing the amount of parking to encourage people to use alternative transportation. Director Eddington agreed, as long as they can provide alternative methods. Commissioner Pettit noted that the challenges in Old Town are cars and snow. She thought it was important to face the reality of location and address some of those challenges.

Chair Wintzer recalled previous discussions on a different concept. At that time questions were raised about the traffic study and trying to create public transportation. Chair Wintzer noted that the issue was stopped at the City Council level. He suggested that the Staff make this same presentation to the City Council so they could understand that the whole community needs to embrace the transportation issue, because it is not the problem of one neighborhood. Director Eddington concurred and expressed his willingness to take the presentation to the City Council.

Director Eddington reiterated that the issue is tying transportation to zoning, land use and economic development. These elements are interrelated and are part of the long range future of Park City.

Commissioner Hontz echoed Commissioner Pettit regarding incentivizing density and being able to support and grow new businesses in this area. However, an incentive program must go hand in hand with whatever Code they develop for this area. Commissioner Hontz stated that as they talk about the uses that currently occur in the area, it is important to decide if they need to continue to support those uses. She noted that the Bonanza/Park area is the only place in town that has industrial or quasi-industrial uses. If they follow a land use pattern in some of the concepts shown this evening, she wondered if they would be able to accomplish the storage and some of the staging and industrial uses that currently exist. If a new pattern forces out those uses, is there another place where those businesses can be relocated. Commissioner Hontz felt it was necessary to

look at the existing uses because many of those uses are necessary and should be accommodated.

Director Eddington stated that the uses should be mixed and most of the uses can co-exist. That is the advantage of form based coding. Planner Astorga noted that form based coding allows more uses by managing the form and design of the building.

Chair Wintzer stated that he was more concerned with businesses that people use everyday such as the sign company or the paint store. If they end up with no support commercial in the area, people would have to drive to Silver Creek for something as minor as a screwdriver. That by itself would generate traffic. Chair Wintzer stressed the importance of keeping smaller support commercial uses in town. Director Eddington hoped the businesses in the area would remain. It might be a different form, but all of the uses would still belong.

Chair Wintzer stated that an incentive plan is crucial because a support commercial cannot pay higher rent. Director Eddington replied that these issues and the mix is why form based coding is a better option.

The work session was adjourned.