

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION NOTES  
OCTOBER 27, 2010**

PRESENT: Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Julia Pettit, Dick Peek, Katie Cattan, Francisco Astorga, Kayla Sintz, Phyllis Robinson, Polly Samuels McLean

Commissioners Luskin, Savage and Strachan were excused

**WORK SESSION ITEMS**

**Affordable Housing Update**

Phyllis Robinson with the Sustainability Department provided a training overview of how the affordable housing program operates in the City.

Ms. Robinson reported that housing has been City Council goal since the early 1990's. Beginning in 1993 and through current day, housing resolutions have been in place and each resolution becomes more refined in terms of addressing housing needs. The first resolutions were only for annexations. They later proceeded to annexations and large scale master plans, which were 50 units or more. In 2006 the resolution was modified when the City went through the LMC and realized that the term "large scale master plan" was no longer used. Therefore, all MPDs and Annexations are the subject of housing resolutions.

Ms. Robinson remarked that affordable housing is a top priority under the goal of preserving Park City character. During the visioning, the number one response to the question of what people do not like to admit about Park City, is that people do not like to admit concerns about growing income gaps and people being pushed out. Ms. Robinson stated that this has been a continual issue/concern/discussion point, going back prior to the first housing resolution in the early 1990s.

Ms. Robinson reported that in 2003 the City Council adopted a set of housing vision goals and strategies, with the vision to provide a range of affordable quality housing opportunities for all economic levels. The City does not target a specific income group. The Council also adopted a benchmark, with a City goal of 10% of the housing stock being reserved as deed restricted affordable units. She noted that currently they are at 6.3% and each year the goal is increased. The goal for 2011 is to reach 6.5%. Ms. Robinson stated that 10% is an aggressive goal that many communities throughout the Country adopted a few years ago. In resort communities where there is a mix of permanent housing stock, as well as significant seasonal or second home owner stock, 10% appeared to be a reasonable benchmark. Twice a year the Sustainability Department reports back to the City Council on that benchmark.

Ms. Robinson stated that the City Council adopted a set of housing goals primarily to create a continuum of housing in the community, consisting of a range of owner occupied housing and rental housing types. Recognizing that these are homes where people live, the housing should be quality housing, energy efficient, and environmentally sensitive.

Ms. Robinson explained that affordable housing is not a "thing". It is not a type of unit or type of ownership. HUD defines housing as percentage of income. If what you pay for housing exceeds 30% of your income, housing is considered to be non-affordable. That becomes less of an issue as salaries increase. Ms. Robinson stated that HUD looks at the formula as a relative concept,

therefore affordability is relative across all income levels. It also ties into underwriting because underwriters use 30% as an initial benchmark.

Chair Wintzer clarified that the 30% benchmark means that the mortgage payment is 30% of what you earn. Ms. Robinson replied that for home ownership, it is a mortgage payment, including taxes and insurance. For those renting, it is the combination of rent and basic utilities. She noted that Park City uses the HUD benchmark when setting unit prices for targeted incomes.

Ms. Robinson noted that affordable housing is also a percentage of AMI, which is Area Median Income. An AMI is produced every year by HUD and it puts all the earned income together in a community. For Summit County, the AMI is \$93,400. Ms. Robinson stated that they are waiting for new census data, but what they have seen over time in looking at tax returns, the AMI is becoming bifurcated. People are either considerably above \$93,400 or far below. There is very little in the middle range.

Ms. Robinson commented on the terms, "very low income", "low income", and "moderate". HUD defines those very specifically based on AMI. A very low income household in Park City and Summit County is considered a household that makes \$28,000 or less. Low income is at \$47,000 or less and moderate is \$74,000 or less. A household that makes \$93,400 is considered a median income household. Ms. Robinson stated that most of the programs that assist lower income households are targeted to the 80% or less number, and that does not always work in resort and destination communities. It is important to have a range of housing. If assistance cuts off at 80% and someone is making \$94,000, they would be able to obtain an affordable home because they would not qualify for many of the assistance programs. Ms. Robinson stated that the City is looking for different solutions in terms of how to finance the back end for housing.

Ms. Robinson stated that Park City is considered a rural community based on its size. There are several tiers or programs, one of which goes higher than the 80%. It is a mortgage guarantee that provides a guarantee to the lender for the top 20% of that loan.

Ms. Robinson referred to a study done at Harvard that stated that affordable housing in resort communities is very difficult in any type of housing. This is partly because the types of units being built do not economically make sense and there is competition for the land value. It is a matter of supply and demand and who is willing to pay. This was called out in the study as an area for special concern and special research. Ms. Robinson remarked that the Urban Land Institute is doing more of that as well, realizing that world resort communities have some of the greatest challenges in terms of meeting housing needs.

Ms. Robinson noted that Utah is too small to qualify for a lot of federal assistance. Because of their size, Salt Lake City and Washington County gets a direct infusion of "home funds" from HUD to help provide assistance for their affordable housing. They also get direct infusions of CDBG. Park City and Summit County are part of the Mountainlands Association of Government Regions and they have to compete against every community for the available funds allocated. Park City typically does not score well because of the income levels compared to smaller communities such as Francis.

Ms. Robinson remarked that the State has the perception that Park City is a rich community and the City can take care of their own problem. That perception is a disadvantage for people who are

trying to move into affordable housing in Park City in terms of accessing resources. Park City continues to lobby the State on that issue.

Ms. Robinson stated that in 2006 the City adopted the Park City Work Force Housing Wage. It addresses people who live in Park City, have at least one-and-a-half full-time equivalents working in the household, and they work in one of the core industries in hospitality/leisure. The current wage is approximately \$52,000 and the City decided to benchmark off of that number rather than a random number. Ms. Robinson pointed out that if Park City was separated from the rest of Summit County, their AMI would be approximately \$110,000.

Ms. Robinson stated that in the current housing resolution, projects should be affordable on average to households who earn the Work Force Housing wage. For owner-occupied housing, the households are earning 150% of that on average. She noted that the "on average" is important because they do not want every house or rental unit being identical. Units can rent for more or less, as long as they remain affordable at that income level.

Ms. Robinson remarked that a frequent question is what affordable housing means and why they should care about it. It can mean different things in different places, but Park City looks at it from an economic, community, and individual perspective. In a survey five years ago when Park City did their last housing update, they looked at both employee turnover from both the employer side and the employee side, the cost of employee turnover, and the changes in reduction of the supply of labor. When they begin their next five year planning cycle in 2011, she would be interested to see if some of those issues have been moderated. Ms. Robinson commented on places or employers who have purchased employee housing units to help subsidize some of their work force, particularly seasonal housing. For example, Deer Valley owns quite a bit of their own housing for seasonal employees. She noted that Park City has tried to stay away from seasonal housing and in the last five years has focused on long-term individual housing needs. Recognizing that seasonal housing is an important issue, the City has a service contract with Mountainlands Community Housing Trust and they started the Housing Resource Center twelve years ago to provide assistance to seasonal employees looking for housing.

Ms. Robinson reported on State Housing requirements established under HB295 adopted in 1996 and reaffirmed by Senate Bill 60, adopted in 2005. All cities for their municipalities, and all counties for their unincorporated areas, are required to prepare five year moderate income housing plans. The plan specifically looks at special needs housing, whether the existing housing meets community needs, and whether it will meet expectations of community needs over the next five years. The City is required to provide a progress report to the State every two years. Non-profits such as Habitat for Humanity and Mountainlands cannot apply for funds if the City is not in compliance with State requirements. The last planning cycle was 2005-2010. The City is beginning the planning process and data collection for the next five year cycle beginning 2011. They are primarily waiting on census materials to avoid doing projections off of old projections.

Ms. Robinson stated that when the City projected the five year housing program in 2005, they focused on economic development and the supply and price of housing. It looked at whether the available housing was affordable at some level to a percentage of people in the key industries who contribute to the economy. It also looked at what would occur in the future. The projections assume a set of growth numbers. In 2005-2007 everything moved forward at a faster pace and

then slowed down again towards the end of the decade. She believed the census data would help with those projections in terms of the rate of job growth. The census will also provide information on how far people drive to work. Ms. Robinson stated that historically Park City has been 34-35% location substitution, which is the number of jobs in Park City that are held by people who live in Park City. The goal is to maintain that percentage. The policy is based more towards maintaining rather than pushing the envelope.

Ms. Robinson stated that in 2005 the City had a projected work force housing need of 323 additional units. Since that time, 73 units have come on line and there are 178 units, plus or minus 20-25 units, that are somewhere in the pipeline of development for the next couple of years. She pointed out that the order of magnitude is more important than the exact number because it helps to set the policies. Ms. Robinson explained that 323 units is an order of magnitude and a snapshot of the present time. The unit number does not take into consideration pent-up demand, which are renters who are cost-burden or renters looking for home ownership. Being able to move people out of rental units and into home ownership frees up additional units.

Ms. Robinson reported that the City has strategies that are already in place. The LMC allows a density bonus to a maximum of 20 units per acre for affordable MPDs. She noted that parking, open space and other requirements must be met, but it is a generous LMC policy. The City also provides general fund fee waivers up to 5,000 per unit, such as planning and engineering fees, application fees, plan check fees, etc. Impact fees are not part of this waiver. Ms. Robinson stated that it helps non-profits if they can show a local contribution into a project.

Ms. Robinson stated that over time the City has been providing financial assistance for land acquisition and construction and bridge financing, using both housing funds and the RDA, depending on the project. It is unusual for cities to do that and Park City is fortunate to have a City Council that has been willing to help for the past fifteen years. As they move into the next decade, the question is how to use the funds differently to meet changing needs. Ms. Robinson remarked that the City also has Staff with housing backgrounds that can provide technical assistance to developers and suggest resources.

Ms. Robinson stated that as they begin planning for the next five year cycle, the City contracted with Mountainlands Association of Governments, who was already doing a required consolidated plan, and for an additional fee they broke out each community separately rather than regional. The study was prepared by the Bureau of Economic and Business Research and it is looked forward at household growth over the next five years and what it means for housing needs. It did not look at unfulfilled existing need or unmet pent-up demand. Based on the assessment, they projected 400 housing units based on household growth over the next five years. The study was further broken out to identify the types of units needed. Ms. Robinson reviewed the breakdown. She remarked that Park City is fortunate that Holiday Village and Parkside were built in the 1970's. They would not be able to build them today and they are the best rental housing that exists. The City was able to secure Federal subsidies and at one point Holiday Village was the model for how rural development was working with other resort communities across the country to bring in housing subsidies. Ms. Robinson stated that all the units at Holiday Village have a housing voucher and the tenant never pays more than 30% of their income. Ms. Robinson was surprised that the study identified the need for 120 affordable rental units. She believed a factor was the number of people who remain in rental housing and do not free up additional units.

Ms. Robinson stated that when incomes were escalating in Park City from year to year, affordable units were renting for approximately \$1300 per month. The result is overcrowding and conditions that are not ideal to the community and to the residents living in those units. Rents have moderated over the past few years, however if the market picks up, Ms. Robinson expects the rents to increase. Ms. Robinson noted that the study also identified another 200 owner-occupied units above median income.

Ms. Robinson stated that the next step is to begin the 2011 update to the five year housing assessment and do another survey of employer and employee housing needs. They will be looking at projections through 2015 of employee generation and housing based on economic growth, not just projected population growth. The City looks at employee generation in conjunction with residential. Both commercial and residential projects are subject to the Housing Resolution.

Ms. Robinson stated that the City will also look at special needs and/or senior housing. A senior housing and special needs survey was done last year and there is defined interest for a senior housing product. It does not need to be an affordable product but there is a definite interest from people who want to stay in the community. Park City needs to look at a continuum to make sure they have a good fit for all stages of life in the community. They have looked at assisted living with a number of developers, but there is not enough land in Park City to make it work from a financial model perspective. Ms. Robinson pointed out that there are other models that provide services for seniors that could be an interesting fit in Park City.

Ms. Robinson stated that the Housing Resolution will be updated, taking a new look at the work force housing wage and in-lieu fees. She noted that in-lieu fees are the least desirable option and the City prefers that the developer be responsible for creating the housing. However, in some circumstances it does not make sense, particularly if the development is small. Ms. Robinson remarked that the City was smart enough to set aside previous in-lieu fees and dedicated funds so when Snow Creek was built those fees were available to subsidize.

Ms. Robinson stated that the last piece is looking at regional coordination of the Snyderville Basin. She noted that the numbers for Park City are separate from the numbers for Snyderville Basin. From a planning perspective they are looking at what makes the most sense in terms of what develops where. The Basin is currently struggling with a lack of rental housing. Ms. Robinson stated that the City has been sensitive to the fact that the solution is not to build housing in Snyderville Basin. At the same time, Park City would not want the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission to approve a project in Park City to meet their housing needs.

Ms. Robinson offered to send Director Eddington a copy of her presentation so he could provide it to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Pettit asked if there has been any discussion about creating a Regional Housing Authority for coordination between the City and the County. She asked if the goals the County is trying to achieve through their affordable housing policy aligns with the Park City goals. Ms. Robinson replied that it has been discussed. Park City has a Housing Authority in place and while they do not do vouchers, they have the ability to do bonds separate from the City's bonding

capacity. Chair Wintzer asked for the housing boundary. Ms. Robinson replied that it is within City limits, but that boundary could be expanded. From time to time the City has discussed the ability to look at another tool. She thought a good solution would be to take housing out of the political process. Groups like Mountainlands are important because they can provide housing with different issues and objectives. Ms. Robinson remarked that the County has a stronger focus on tiering income. The City is different because they believe it is important to have a range of housing available so people can live in Park City. The County is newer into the housing business and only adopted their plan in 2007.

Commissioner Hontz asked if the full report from Mountainland Association of Governments would also be available to the Planning Commission. Ms. Robinson answered yes and offered to email a copy to the Commissioners.

Chair Wintzer remarked that a common problem is that everyone favors affordable housing, but not in their backyard. He cautioned the City to keep that in mind when they accept in-lieu fees. Chair Wintzer felt it was nearly impossible to put an affordable housing project next door to existing residents.

City Council member, Alex Butwinski, clarified that currently the City Council is not taking in-lieu fees and at this point there is no plan to begin taking them again.

### **General Plan - Long Range Planning for Bonanza Park - Informational Discussion**

Chair Wintzer disclosed that he owns property in the Bonanza Park area. Planning Director Thomas Eddington stated that the Planning Department had devised a new plan for how to approach the General Plan, and they wanted to resume discussions with the Planning Commission after a delay of the past few months. The Staff recently held a retreat to discuss the General Plan process and to re-affirm their commitment. The Staff set parameters and percentages of time as part of their commitment.

Director Eddington stated that the Staff wanted to update the Planning Commission on what they believe is important for the Bonanza Park District. The Staff has been in contact with some of the residents and property owners in that area to discuss Bonanza Park. Director Eddington stated that the objective is to take the initial concept to the next level and effectuate the plan with the property owners who live in that area.

Director Eddington stated that Craig Elliott and Mark Fischer had put together opportunities to meet the General Plan concepts that the Planning Commission and the Staff put forward. Rather than coming in with a typical MPD application, Mr. Elliott and Mr. Fischer had prepared a concept plan for the area to see if it is in line with what the Planning Commission and Staff would like to see for the Bonanza Park District.

Chair Wintzer clarified that Mr. Elliott and Mr. Fischer were in agreement with the new General Plan concept and not the existing Bonanza Park Supplement. Director Eddington replied that this was correct.

Director Eddington noted that the Staff report outlined issues relative to street pattern, the grid pattern, density, variations in building heights, zero lot lines and mixed-use, mixed-income, and mixed age appeal in this area. Director Eddington pointed out that the current zoning bifurcates everything and does not allow them to do what they have suggested individually or qualitatively. Part of the appeal of Bonanza Park is the ability to look at this type of re-development area and the opportunity to mix the uses in the village center that everyone says they like. Director Eddington noted that Craig Elliott had done work with regard to massing, design, and layout that ties into the plan presented this evening.

Craig Elliott stated that he did not believe there was any reason to jump into a high level of architectural detail before they understood the massing and relations, and for that reason the computer drawings presented this evening were a general, broad brush concept.

Mr. Elliott presented the original aerial site plan with an overlay of the newer concept to show the buildings. He indicated the footprints and all the different property boundaries and lines. The next step was how to merge all the concepts and blend them with the existing property lines so they make sense with minimal impact. Mr. Elliott stated that they collaborated with the City and met with the Staff to look at different solutions. Based on those discussion, he presented a first blush right-of-way plan. Mr. Elliott remarked that he started adding skin around the perimeter to understand the texture of the spaces.

Mr. Elliott remarked that one of the issues is utilities. He pointed out the existing substation and noted that the utility company would like to have something close to 150 x 150 in size. In looking at how the plan expands moving to the west, Mr. Elliott believed that it could become a possibility if they can work closer with the property lines and existing boundaries along each side. He presented the idea of creating a buffer around the perimeter to create an internal core with green space.

Mr. Elliott stated that the primary focus this evening was the area of the Fischer and Dejoria properties, including PCMR properties and some Park City property. Transportation is a key piece that is frequently discussed. He pointed out the primary arterials as they exist today, which include Kearns, Bonanza and Park Avenue. Mr. Elliott noted that they looked at how to promote use on the perimeters of those as primary arterials and still have other access use. He promoted a concept that provides perimeter circulation that creates a boulevard system. That is a system where you have a primary arterial with a secondary form of transportation that allows access to the property.

Mr. Elliott stated that the next level of detail was where to locate the prime commercial streets in the first phases. He identified places where it made sense to have the first commercial streets. Mr. Elliott remarked that the secondary commercial streets come into play in terms of where to place them and how to use them for service and commercial activity. At that point they started to blend in the primary transportation for mass transit. He noted that it was close to the scheme Director Eddington was looking at, and more detail would come forth in future studies to determine if it would actually work. Mr. Elliott stated that the next evolution is to consider this as a possible location for intermodal transportation or a transit center because it has relationship to the rail trail, the automobile and future mass transit.

Mr. Elliott moved into other studies that showed what the streets would look like. In planning for transportation, it is important to understand what the street looks like and how it is used. He presented a cut-through of what they call the Mountain Boulevard scenario. Mr. Elliott stated that the next step was to look at a commercial core. He showed buildings on both sides to help them visualize the appearance of the commercial street. He indicated a 24 foot drive lane for two lanes of traffic. The intent is to keep it narrow with parallel parking on each end and 15 foot sidewalks on the outside.

Mr. Elliott stated that a continual discussion is how to create life in this area. He commented on opportunities that would draw people to the center and expands the internal spaces where people can gather along the street fronts. Mr. Elliott remarked that civic type structures could be used for events such as meetings or conferences, and the relationship to those civic areas could be very interesting.

Mr. Elliott identified the areas they would see as being consumed by the Fischer/Dejoria properties that would take right-of-way space. There are different ways to approach it, however if someone submits an MPD, that would require a site suitability analysis. In that analysis you take all the individual properties and figure out the square footages for each building. Once that analysis is completed, all the pieces are put together and the setbacks are determined based on the Code. At that point the maximum footprints are developed. Based on that formula, a three story structure would have a maximum above grade of 350,000 square feet. Putting that same 350,000 square feet on the property showed five stories using the same amount of density and eliminating the areas for the right-of-ways.

Mr. Elliott referred to the Yard parcel and commented on the number of pieces to that parcel. There is long term history on how the pieces were carved up. Mr. Elliott stated that he did not try to take advantage of the height exceptions and instead chose to balance those between the height exceptions on the roof forms with any kind of perimeter variation. That was how they calculated the initial baselines. Mr. Elliott showed various configurations using the same 350,000 square feet to give an idea of what the analysis might look like to understand the scope.

Mr. Elliott remarked that the next step in the study was how to look at the uses. After meeting with Powder Corp. he had included areas that added an additional 200,000 to 300,000 square feet based on preliminary analysis. Mark Fischer stated that yesterday he had received authority from Powder Corp. to include their property in this conceptual study.

Mr. Elliott noted that the buildings shown in yellow were three to four story mixed-use buildings with first level retail and office and residential on the upper levels. The buildings in dark purple were residential all the way to the ground. The buildings shown in light purple represented institutional type uses. Mr. Elliott stated that the lower mixed-use commercial buildings is important to create the livelihood on the commercial streets. Moving density to the perimeter on the north allows solar access into all the structures.

Mr. Elliott presented a video that rotated the plan to help the Commissioners understand the scale of the buildings and textures of the space. Mr. Elliott stated that the next step is to start processing underneath this new concept and to begin what might be phase one of the Yard. He reiterated that this concept provides a rough, broad stroke vision of underlying zoning densities, potential layouts,

certain ways to think about space, and how the streets might interact.

Commissioner Peek asked if the left hand street going up to the upper left was Iron Horse. Mr. Elliott answered yes. He believed there was an opportunity to develop off of the Mountain Boulevard service area into another street that could have commercial aspects that front on the other side. From a transportation perspective it makes sense because it lines up in the right places.

Chair Wintzer referred to Mr. Elliott's comment that they were only looking at the Yard area first. He noted that if they change the General Plan, it needs to fit the entire Park Bonanza area. Chair Wintzer thought they needed to look at including the whole boundary and assume that whatever is approved for the first site would eventually come through the whole area. Mr. Elliott clarified that he had not developed the other areas due to time constraints. Chair Wintzer felt the presentation this evening showed the amount of surface parking that currently exists at the entrance corridor. Mr. Elliott agreed. In working through this plan, he was amazed at the impacts. Chair Wintzer pointed out that during the 1980's, people thought that if parking was not visible, people would not shop at their establishment. He was unsure of the basis for that logic, but the logic prevailed.

Chair Wintzer asked about the next phase in the procedure. He noted that the last time the Planning Commission revised the General Plan for this area they were forced into doing it. The result was that the General Plan was done in defensive mode rather than offensive mode. He believed that the concept plan proposed this evening would change the character of Park City and it would change the traffic patterns and shopping habits. It would change Park City so significantly that he questioned how they would go into the next phase.

Director Eddington agreed that from a functional standpoint it would change the entry corridor to the City. Currently the entry corridor is car dominated and it is not pedestrian or user friendly. The approach would be through a recommendation to the General Plan. Director Eddington assumed they would end up changing the zoning or adding an overlay zone. It could be an overlay form based code or an overlay new code. They would need to create a zone that allows a mixed concept.

Director Eddington remarked that the Planning Commission is on the offense with this revision. They talked about doing this type of sub-area planning as part of the General Plan and he felt they were lucky to have property owners and others who were interested in this concept. Rather than have individual owners come forward with a typical MPD that would fit in the General Commercial zone and have areas of parking and open space that may or may not be useful, they are instead talking about tying into a system of walkable streets.

Director Eddington summarized that the steps in the next phase would be a General Plan recommendation, zone changes and zone overlay. At that point, Mr. Elliott and others could move forward based on the zoning. Chair Wintzer noted that ten years ago no one would have considered this concept plan because it is so radical. He felt it was important to get the community to accept this plan and to get involved before it goes too far into the process. Chair Wintzer wanted to make sure that they look at the whole neighborhood and not just individual pieces, since other property owners will realize this is what they are getting.

Director Eddington stated that the area by the bank and the Christian Center would probably be the final phase of the Bonanza Park plan, and he agreed with Chair Wintzer that those property owners will look at it from the standpoint of “this is what we get”. However, from the Planning standpoint, they look at it as, “this is what we want.” Director Eddington stated that people will only build what the market dictates. He felt it was incumbent upon the City and the residents to help towards making this successful. It has to be something they want not something they fear, and everyone will have to buy into it. Those are some of the issues that need to be addressed with regard to a new design layout.

Commissioner Pettit was concerned that they may be putting the cart before the horse. She liked having visualization in terms of the “ifs” and “what can be”. However, she thought they were still unclear on their vision for this particular part of town and how it interacts or relates to Historic Main Street in Old Town and other parts of the City from a holistic standpoint. Commissioner Pettit felt this discussion was important in the context of the General Plan, because the General Plan encompasses the entire community. She thought they should have a distinct general idea that is specific enough to understand the vision. From there, they can begin to identify visions for specific areas and what changes need to be made to facilitate that vision. Commissioner Pettit stated that in terms of how this concept is radically different from the current vision for Park Bonanza, she questioned the height of the buildings on the north side of the project. She recalled that the Planning Commission had initially discussed bearing the height on the internal part of this particular part of town. This concept is a dramatic change and it goes to the question of what they would be creating for the view shed corridor and any unintended consequences. Commissioner Pettit believed there was much to talk about and she liked the fact that they were looking at it visually and then thinking about putting it into words. She reiterated the importance of finding ways to connect these different parts of town in terms of the overall planning process.

Chair Wintzer believed it also comes down to traffic plans and alternative routes. If this plan brings more people and traffic into town, who would be responsible for taking care of that. Chair Wintzer pointed out that if you add the number of units or total square footage proposed for the Bonanza Park area and laid it over town, it would cover a very large area.

Director Eddington agreed that the density is significant and that issue would need to be confronted. The vision for this area is a discussion he would like to have with the Planning Commission on a more specific basis. The objective this evening was to get an understanding of what could be under an old MPD that no longer meets their vision and what should be considered under the new concepts. Director Eddington envisioned the Bonanza Park area as a type of mountain town village. It will have the opportunity to serve as new office development, it will have affordable mixed-income housing, and it has the opportunity to create a better connection for this area over to PCMR. Director Eddington remarked that the Bonanza Park area will define itself and it can be independent to a certain degree. He noted that Old Town is independent of Park Meadows. They are distinct and different and that makes both areas enjoyable in their own unique way. Looking at its connectivity to other areas is good, but Bonanza Park should be allowed to be independent and unique and funky. It needs to grow with each phase, because the area will not develop all at one time. Director Eddington believed Bonanza Park would grow piecemeal, which is how cities used to grow before they were too planned out.

Chair Wintzer pointed out that Park City has never grown piecemeal and without planning. Director Eddington stated that Main Street naturally developed in a grid pattern and it developed one building at a time. Chair Wintzer remarked that this concept was exciting to look at and he felt it was important to make a similar presentation to the community. He was unsure how the public would react, but they should all have the opportunity to see this plan and respond because everyone would be affected.

Commissioner Hontz liked the presentation because it would stimulate better conversations. She hoped the issues were connecting for everyone, regardless of whether or not they liked what they saw. She personally liked what she saw and found it fascinating. Commissioner Hontz would like to encourage more people to do what Craig Elliott and Mark Fischer have done and come to the Planning Commission with their ideas. It would help the Planning Commission put input into words in a better form for the General Plan in terms of what the community sees for this area.

Commissioner Hontz referred to the details on each of the parcels that were highlighted in purple, and asked if that was under the existing Code and the allowed square footage. Mr. Elliott replied that the intent was to use the existing LMC for each individual parcel. For an MPD, each parcel is calculated to get the baseline density and that is used in developing the MPD. Commissioner Hontz asked if Park Bonanza already has a density. After meeting with the City Council, she hoped they would see an analysis that would support more density in that area to create the market for affordable housing and to create places where they can transfer density from other areas where they want less density. After seeing the presentation, Commissioner Hontz believed that it was probably densified into a level she was comfortable with, without a huge uptick that people in the community would not want to see. She found that to be insightful. Commissioner Hontz assumed that if they could see the entire area developed, there would probably be less density.

Chair Wintzer stated that Mr. Elliott had done enough of the parcels to know the density per square foot or per acre. Based on that calculations, he should be able to calculate the density of everything in Bonanza Park. Director Eddington stated that when the Staff proposed a form-based code and four-stories give or take, they ended up with approximately 4-1/2 million square feet in this area for all of Bonanza Park. However, under the current zoning, they could do up to 5.81 million square feet if parking is located underground. Director Eddington remarked that more density could be obtained with the current zoning, however, the layout would not be as good.

Chair Wintzer suggested that the City take the 5.81 million square feet and assume that within the next 30 years all that ground would be developed. That needs to be looked at in long range planning in terms of transportation and other services, and how Park City can function with that much additional density.

Brooks Robinson stated that the City is going through that process and they will provide updates to the Planning Commission. They are starting a model of the town, including the Basin and the surrounding counties and region, and how that would affect Park City. He noted that the Bonanza Park area will play a role in that model. He remarked that the stakeholder groups working on the master transportation model have discussed which corridors to keep and how they want to potentially use them. Mr. Robinson stated that it tends to be social engineering in terms of finding ways to get people out of their cars.

Chair Wintzer remarked that the allowed use is a scary number and he hoped that number was considered in the transportation plan. Chair Wintzer pointed out that transferring density from one side to the other still creates the same amount of traffic.

Planner Francisco Astorga noted that the 5.81 million square feet allowed under the current zoning is without the grid system network. He asked the Planning Commission to think about how that much density could be accommodated without the appropriate street system. Director Eddington stated that the development of Bonanza Park needs to be viewed as a node within Park City. Old Town will always be a node and the question is how to transfer people back and forth between the two places. Director Eddington remarked that there are other nodes the City does not control. Kimball Junction is a powerful node that the City will have to deal with in the future, specifically as the new Summit County Research Park comes on line. He stated that nodal development is an issue to be addressed. A major challenger will be tying the transportation together and creating a sense of place, without making it so unique that it does not fit into Park City.

Chair Wintzer requested that Director Eddington outline an order of how this would progress so the Planning Commission would have a timeline to work from. He applauded Director Eddington for this approach to the planning process.

Planner Katie Cattan requested that the Planning Commission encourage the public to attend the General Plan Outreach being held the next evening.

Planner Astorga thanked Craig Elliott and Mark Fischer for the time and effort they put into their presentation.

Planner Cattan noted that the Staff has re-committed to the General Plan and every Friday they spend the day working on the General Plan. She invited the Commissioners to drop by any time during the day and participate in their discussions. Director Eddington invited the public to come by as well, or to email the Staff with any ideas or suggestions.

Mark Fischer asked if the Staff had a goal for completing the General Plan. Director Eddington stated that they hoped to be finished in 12-15 months. Planner Cattan recalled a projected completion date of March 2012.

The work session was adjourned.