

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

PRESENT: Chair Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Richard Luskin, Dick Peek, Julia Pettit, Adam Strachan, Thomas Eddington, Kayla Sintz, Katie Cattan, Francisco Astorga, Jacque Mauer, Mark Harrington

Work Session Items

Round Table Discussion

Planning Director Eddington stated that the Staff had scheduled a round table discussion with the Planning Commission to discuss issues that were raised over the past few months. As some of the more complex projects come forward, he encouraged the Planning Commission to contact the Planning Department if they have questions or concerns or if one of them misses a meeting. The project planner has materials available in the office that are larger and more detailed than what can be provided in the Staff report.

Chair Wintzer asked if they could establish a policy where the Staff would be available during certain hours on the day of a Planning Commission meeting. The Staff favored that idea, since it would help with their scheduling. Commissioner Pettit felt they needed to be careful about having too many Commissioners in the Planning Department at one time to avoid a quorum situation. Director Eddington suggested that each Commissioner email the Staff if they plan to come into the office. If they receive four emails on a particular day, the time could be adjusted to accommodate everyone at different times.

Chair Wintzer suggested the possibility of the Tuesday before the meeting. Director Eddington replied that the Staff is available any day of the week and they do not need to specify one day. The Commissioner should contact the Project Planner to let him or her know they are coming and what it is they would like to discuss.

Director Eddington requested that the Planning Commission let the Staff know if they need additional information to make a decision or if something is consistently missing from the Staff report that they would like to have included.

Director Eddington stated that when a large project comes before the Planning Commission, the Commissioners should raise their issues and concerns in the first meeting, rather than waiting until the second or third meeting. It helps the Staff and the applicant if they can begin to address the concerns and provide appropriate information.

Chair Wintzer remarked that the applicants should understand that if questions are raised during the first meeting, the Planning Commission would still have additional questions and concerns throughout the review process. Commissioner Pettit suggested that it would be helpful if the Staff could provide a summary of the questions and concerns they heard during the discussion to make sure all the issues are included. Director Eddington stated that he intended to do a better of taking notes during the meeting to pick up all the pertinent issues and requests for information. At the end of the meeting he could recap his notes to make sure nothing was left out.

Director Eddington stated that the Commissioners have the responsibility to contact the Project Planner if they miss a meeting to get up to speed with the rest of the Planning Commission before the matter is heard again.

Director Eddington remarked that the goal of the above stated exercises is to eliminate continuations, since continuations are time consuming for both the Staff and the Planning Commission. Contacting the Staff ahead of time if additional information is needed to make a decision would expedite the process and possibly avoid a continuance.

Commissioner Strachan asked if the Staff was backed up on their workload because of continued projects. Director Eddington replied that it was not a problem now, but a few months earlier they were backed up. When several projects are continued it is difficult to get all the applicants on the agenda and still keep the meetings on a reasonable time frame.

Chair Wintzer thought the Planning Commission could help avoid continuations by asking the right questions and providing adequate direction. If they find the need to continue an item, the Commissioners should state specific reasons why it is being continued so the applicant can address their concerns at the next meeting. Director Eddington believed that a recap at the end of the discussion would help inform the applicant as to what issues need to be resolved.

Commissioner Pettit commented on the number of times the Planning Commission has requested information for the next meeting and the applicant fails to provide it. She agreed that in fairness to the applicant the Planning Commission needed to give better direction, but the applicant should also be held accountable if they do not honor a specific request. The applicant needs to be aware that if the requested information is not provided, the result would most likely be a continuance.

Commissioner Hontz felt the Staff and Planning Commission was doing a lot of hand holding by making checklists. If the Planning Commission requests information, the applicant should be responsible for taking notes and providing the material. The Staff should not have to remind the applicant.

Director Eddington asked the Planning Commission to help define what projects might be appropriate on a Consent Agenda. Commissioner Pettit stated that a steep slope CUP should not be on a Consent Agenda. Director Eddington requested that the Planning Commission let him know if they think anything can be consolidated on a Consent Agenda.

Chair Wintzer suggested that if a matter was continued for a smaller issue and the issue was resolved, the Staff could ask if the Planning Commission would be comfortable approving the matter on a Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Pettit commented on situations where the Planning Commission continues an item based on procedure, only because they want to see the changes before voting for approval. She suggested that something in that context could come back as a Consent Agenda item. If the Commissioners are not satisfied, it could be pulled off the Consent Agenda.

Commissioner Peek liked the idea of having someone outside of the conversation recapping the

discussion. The Commissioners concurred. Planner Cattan felt the Commissioners were good at stating concurrence if they agree with a point made by a fellow Commissioner. This helps move the discussion forward without repetitive comment.

Commissioner Luskin asked if the packets could be spiral bound. Director Eddington stated that spiral bound looks nice, but pages cannot be taken out or inserted. However, the City could use generic plastic binders if the Staff report is not too large. A suggestion was made to 3-hole punch the packet. Commissioner Strachan was not concerned with the format and he was willing to accept whatever the other Commissioners wanted. Chair Wintzer stated that he puts the packet in a binder and paperclips each project. This keeps the packet together but separates the projects. Commissioner Luskin reiterated his preference to have the packet spiral bound, unless everyone else had their own system. Commissioner Pettit preferred the 3-hole punch. When a matter is continued, she pulls it from the Staff report for future reference and recycles the rest of the packet.

Director Eddington reported that Patricia had researched basic laptops that are used for information. He asked if the Commissioners would like to have the Staff report on a computer. Commissioner Peek stated that he would only like it if they had software with the ability to make notes on the pages. He noted that a PDF document is useless for making notes or highlighting. Chair Wintzer stated that he needs to have the ability to read the report and make notes. Commissioner Strachan stated his preference for a paper report. He was not opposed to having an option for those who wanted the laptop, as long as there was also a paper option. He was not in favor of eliminating a printed Staff report.

Chair Wintzer remarked that microphones are a continual problem. He would prefer to have a round table discussion sitting around a table rather than on the podium. Chair Wintzer understood that the meeting needed to be recorded and asked if it was possible to look into a system that allows more flexibility. Director Eddington offered to look into it.

Commissioner Hontz thought that it would be helpful if the Planning Commission could be given a complete schedule of all the meetings dates so they can schedule it on their calendars, particularly special meetings or changes during the holidays and Sundance.

Commissioner Pettit stated that the Staff report and associated materials have greatly improved and she thanked the Staff for their efforts. Commissioner Strachan echoed her sentiment and noted that he rarely has problems with the reports. Commissioner Pettit remarked that the drawings are still a problem because the quality is diminished when the drawings are reduced. Director Eddington suggested that if the drawings are difficult to read in the 8-1/2 x 11 format they could try 11 x 17. The drawings would be slightly larger and they would still fit in the packet. The Staff and Planning Commission discussed ways to obtain more readable drawings.

Planner Sintz stated that if a Commissioner is not able to attend a meeting but has reviewed the information and wants their comments included, they should submit their comments in writing to the Planning Department with a request that it be shared with the Planning Commission and made part of the record.

General Plan Discussion

Director Eddington stated that the objective this evening was to present the goals the Staff had outlined to see if the Planning Commission felt they were on the right track. The Staff encouraged input or discussion from the Planning Commission on additional items. As a second issue, Director Eddington asked if the Planning Commission was interested in establishing a Planning Commissioner/Planning Staff relationship.

Regarding the goals, Director Eddington noted that the Staff report contained a goal strategy for each element of the General Plan. He stated that these were only the initial goals/strategies/actions the Staff had identified to begin a direction. They were still completing the data analysis.

Chair Wintzer wanted to see a stronger comment on the environment in an effort to become more pro-active.

Commissioner Hontz had researched general plans for other communities but she was unable to find anything that meets their goals. However, Aspen is in the process of doing their General Plan and she thought their model was valuable. She noted that Aspen started with an analysis and data section first and published that before they created their goals and strategies. Commissioner Hontz remarked that a majority of the issues mentioned in the Aspen model are the same things that Park City already has listed. She felt there was value in looking at what Aspen has done in their General Plan process. Commissioner Hontz stated that Aspen's Code, which is equivalent to the LMC, talks about development teams. They use different terminology but the content is fascinating and the data collected was astounding. Commissioner Hontz remarked that she has been thinking a lot about circulation and traffic and how people come into town. She spoke with Deer Valley on this issue and found out the percentage that comes from the Heber Highway 40 corridor. She pointed out that several things go along with that, such as a UDOT approved project for an extended parking lot, an underground connection with a transit system to get people to the Gondola, and expanding the use. Commissioner Hontz noted that those items were under Wasatch County purview. She thought it would be helpful to understand what Deer Valley projects in terms of how they want to utilize that corridor in the future. Once they have that information, Park City can determine if it will benefit SR224 and alleviate some of that traffic in the future. Commissioner Hontz stated that in thinking about this issue, her economic development side does not want Park City to lose dollars from ticket sales at the bottom of the Gondola. As they begin to layer these issues on top of each other, important factors need to be considered, such as where the traffic comes from for PCMR. Commissioner Hontz thought they needed to look at the bigger picture and suggested that they start the General Plan process further back from the strategies presented this evening.

Commissioner Pettit felt it was important to consider the skiers who patronize restaurants or establishments in Park City as they come in and out of town. If a portal takes the skiers directly to and from the mountain, those establishments would be bypassed and that would affect the economic factor. She believed there could be other creative ways for people to move into the community from a different portal that would provide access to a restaurant or store. That would be a discussion for the transit plan. Commissioner Pettit stated that the vehicle and the traffic issue is a huge deterrent and a major problem for those who come to enjoy the Park City setting. It is a balancing issue and they need to be careful that solving one problem would not create another

problem.

Director Eddington reported that Park City had spoken with Wasatch County regarding the connection and the City is aware that it would be a good entry to Deer Valley for those coming from Highway 40. Planner Cattan stated that the City Engineer, Matt Cassel, is working on a transportation master plan. Therefore, they are collecting raw data and figuring out trips and traffic patterns. She expected the master plan would be completed in 9 months to a year. At that point the City would have GIS data that identifies parking, which streets are most utilized, etc.

Commissioner Luskin remarked that this all predisposes a larger and more complicated question. He referred to the picture on page 30 of the Staff report and noted that this was Park City's jurisdiction and they were re-writing a General Plan primarily for that area. Commissioner Luskin stated that the entire valley, including Kimball Junction, Snyderville Basin and other outlying areas are all linked together, and whatever happens in those areas affects Park City. As the City goes through great efforts to re-write a General Plan, he wondered if they should interface with other agencies or bodies to achieve a unified plan or something that dovetails to make it all work together. Commissioner Luskin did not believe that harmony inside the community would be effective if it is not linked to the outside communities.

Director Eddington agreed that this was a major challenge, which is why the Staff keeps in contact with Wasatch and Summit Counties to work with them on the regional components. Commissioner Luskin felt the goal of the General Plan should be to interact with the adjacent counties.

Director Eddington reiterated that the Staff has had cursory meetings with the Planning Staff in Wasatch and Summit County, and the challenge is getting the counties to accept some of their beliefs. It is particularly difficult with Wasatch County, where tremendous growth occurred several years ago. He noted that Summit County is pursuing their own General Plan, which ties in with the timing for the Park City re-write.

Chair Wintzer requested that they try to incorporate the word "neighborhood" more frequently to emphasize the goal of trying to protect neighborhoods in the community. He felt they would be more successful if they look at the General Plan from the standpoint of neighborhoods rather than just zoning.

Commissioner Luskin remarked that when he first joined the Planning Commission, former Commissioner Jack Thomas recommended that he read the book Cityscapes. The term "Cityscapes" was used frequently and the book contained many pictures. The point was that in order to maintain a historic character, a visual character component is also needed. Commissioner Luskin did not think a visual character component was evident in the General Plan. He offered to bring the book to share with the Commissioners. Commissioner Luskin believed that a cityscape is important to preserve the existing character. He noted that character can mean a lot of things, but the visual impact is one aspect of the character.

Chair Wintzer agreed, noting that he has always stressed that more photos were needed in the General Plan to visually identify the character.

Commissioner Pettit commented on the number of pictures that were taken by the citizens and used during the visioning process. She suggested that the Planning Commission incorporate some of those photos for each of the General Plan elements. Commissioner Pettit stated that the citizens are the eyes and ears of the community and it would be beneficial to bring their inspiration and thoughts into the process. Commissioner Pettit liked the idea of moving away from the current goals and bringing the process more up-to-date and more in line with the visioning process. She suggested they should try to eliminate as much overlap as possible as they move through the process.

Director Eddington stated that as they work through individual data collecting, the goal is to create a different format than the element presentation. He asked if each Commissioner would be interested in working with a Planning Staff on a specific element. Seven elements were outlined in the Staff report.

Commissioner Luskin volunteered to work with Community Character & Historic Preservation. Commissioner Hontz volunteered for Community/Economic Development Commissioner Peek chose Land Use & Growth Management. Commissioner Pettit chose Environment/Conservation/Sustainable Development. Commissioner Strachan volunteered for Housing. He would also be involved in Open Space & Parks and Recreation until they have a new Commissioner. Chair Wintzer would work on Transportation and Community Facilities.

Director Eddington stated that the Staff typically reserves Monday and Friday afternoon to work on the General Plan. If the Commissioners are available on those days, he encouraged them to come in and participate in the discussion. Commissioner Strachan was interested in being involved whenever his time permitted. The Commissioners concurred that they would like to be invited to participate, even if they could not attend every meeting.

Director Eddington stated that when the Staff sets up discussion times, he would notify the Planning Commission. Commissioner Strachan felt the Staff should schedule meetings at their convenience and let the Planning Commission work around them. Director Eddington noted that meetings would be set up as they get further into the process and he would make sure that not more than three Commissioners attend at one time. He would email the schedule.

The Commissioners moved to the regular agenda to discuss LMC Amendments.