

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION NOTES
FEBRUARY 9, 2011**

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

Commissioner Strachan arrived late.

Work Session Items

Traffic and Transportation Master Plan - Informational Update

City Engineer, Matt Cassel, reported that on February 15th another stakeholders meeting would be held for the Transportation and Traffic Master Plan. A public meeting would be held on either February 28th or March 1st to discuss the elements presented this evening. Mr. Cassel stated that the goal this evening was to update the Planning Commission on the information that would be taken to the public and the stakeholders. He was not looking for input this evening, but he would come back to the Planning Commission for a more in-depth discussion following the stakeholders and public meetings.

City Engineer Cassel stated that the elements contained in the Staff report were the proposed road cross sections, neighborhood connections, and gateway corridors. He clarified that the Staff was not recommending any of the alternatives. The objective was to present them for discussion. Mr. Cassel assumed that some of the alternatives would not be seen as favorable. However, they were trying to collect as much data as possible and to keep emotions from driving the alternatives. They were applying the alternatives to the model to see which alternatives are viable and which ones need to be eliminated.

Mr. Cassel reviewed the proposed road cross sections being proposed for all streets within Park City, including UDOT arterial roads. He noted that the criteria used for the streets was listed in the Staff report. The biggest criteria was not using a physical separation until it is required by increased speeds, and at the minimum, meet fire code requirements. Mr. Cassel stated that in the 1980's they started putting in wider roads, which resulted in traffic speed issues. The City then tried to control speed by narrowing the roads with bulb-outs and medians. He stated when the roads developed and rebuilt, the goal is to have narrower roads. When speeds are reduced the reaction time increases and the roads become safer.

Mr. Cassel believed that neighborhood connections and gateway corridors would be larger issues with the public.

Commissioner Savage noted that during the visioning meeting, there was a brief discussion regarding development of the computational model that allowed the simulation of traffic flows in Park City. He wanted to know the relationship between that project and the work being done by the transportation committee.

Director Eddington replied that it was all part of the same plan. Commissioner Savage clarified that the elements presented this evening were parameters that could be put into the model to understand the impacts on traffic flow. Mr. Cassel replied that this was correct.

Mr. Cassel reviewed the five neighborhood connections, which included the Solamere connection between Solamere and Chatham Crossing and Three Kings to the Park City Mountain Resort bypass Road. He noted that Bonanza Park is not a connector, but the study looks at how that area can be utilized to intercept traffic before it starts up the hill. Other connections included the Kearns to Meadow Drive connector and the School Frontage Road connector. Those connections will be presented to the stakeholders and the public for their reaction.

Mr. Cassel reported that the study looks at two existing gateway connections, SR224 and SR248, and what can be done on those roads. Possible new gateway connections are Meadow Drive to I-80, Guardsman Pass road, and the tunnel from Deer Valley to US40. Mr. Cassel noted that the tunnel has the potential to decrease traffic on SR248 by 20%, however, the cost is extensive and hinders the idea.

Mr. Cassel stated that UDOT is currently holding public meetings for their long range plan. One of those long range plans is from 2021-2031 is to expand SR224 and SR228 by two additional lanes. If UDOT expands SR224 and SR248, the majority of traffic will go through or around the Bonanza Park Avenue. From a traffic standpoint, Mr. Cassel believes there is the potential to stop or halt traffic in that area and keep it from heading up the hill into Old Town and other areas.

Chair Wintzer commented on the School bypass and Frontage Road. He recommended that Mr. Cassel look at ways for children and parents to get from Park Meadows to the school without going on to Kearns Blvd. If that could be accomplished, it would make a big difference in traffic and safety. He recalled that in the past they had talked about connecting the North 40 road to Prospector. If that was done, they could then put the frontage road on the back side of the school rather than the front side.

Commissioner Luskin recalled a previous discussion for a tunnel from Park City to Big Cottonwood Canyon. He asked if that was still being considered. Mr. Cassel stated that the tunnel was briefly discussed but it was not seen as a viable alternative. He explained that one of the goals with the gateway connectors was trying to find or establish a possible third route in and out of town. Connecting to Big Cottonwood Canyon would create more of a problem than it would solve. Commissioner Luskin assumed that the proposed Guardsman Pass connector would go toward Midway as well as Big Cottonwood. Mr. Cassel replied that this was correct.

Mr. Cassel stated that Guardsman Pass is a bigger discussion because of development rights. He noted that Wasatch County has been paving Pine Canyon Road and the power company has been requested to put in a substation up there. Development is more likely to occur and Park City needs to decide what it wants to do from this side of the mountain.

Commissioner Pettit asked Mr. Cassel if there has been further discussion about extending Daly Avenue up in that direction. Mr. Cassel replied that the Daly Avenue extension has not been considered as part of this plan. Daly Avenue is not considered a standard primary road. It is only being looked at as a secondary emergency access.

Commissioner Savage asked Mr. Cassel to provide an overview at a future meeting to demonstrate

how the model operates. Mr. Cassel stated that he intended to meet with the Planning Commission two or three times. At the next meeting he would review the alternatives and discuss the advantages and disadvantages. At the following meeting the Planning Commission would be asked to forward a recommendation to adopt the plan. He will bring the model to one of those meetings, along with all the elements of the master plan.

Commissioner Savage stated that the ability to provide input on recommendations is enhanced by the ability to look at the model prior to the time of approval. Mr. Cassel pointed out that the model is truly a black box. Commissioner Savage remarked that this was the reason why he wanted to see it and understand how it works before making a recommendation. Commissioner Savage pointed out that a discussion at the visioning session talked about the fact that this would be a tool that could be utilized in conjunction with the General Plan in looking at long term vision and traffic flow. He wanted to validate that indication. Commissioner Savage questioned why the City would spend money developing the model if it is not useful. Mr. Cassel explained that the model is used by traffic engineers, but it cannot be taken apart and dissected. It is validated because traffic counts are taken at certain time periods. The model is run during specific time periods to make sure the loads represent the loads they see during those time periods. The model is another tool to help with the process, but there is not exactness to the model.

Director Eddington remarked that one advantage is that a number of scenarios have already been put into the model with regard to peak traffic in winters so they have that information. To help Commissioner Savage, he thought they could program the model to run differently for different scenarios and roads. Commissioner Savage still questioned the merit of the model from a planning perspective. Mr. Cassel explained that the true model is the statistical model, which is a number of Excel spreadsheets and formulas. In addition, they have a visom, which allows you to visually see the cars and the traffic at specific times. Director Eddington clarified that the visom can be modeled to look at different scenarios and he believed that information would be helpful to Commissioner Savage.

Park City Heights - Master Planned Development (Application #PL-10-01028)

Spencer White, representing the applicant, noted that at the last meeting the Planning Commission request a physical model. That model had been prepared and was presented this evening. In addition, graphic presentation boards were available showing perspectives and sections within the project. Mr. White noted that the master plan had also been updated.

Mr. White presented the master plan from the last meeting to show as a comparison to the revised master plan. He noted that one area that was changed was the loop road at the bottom of the project. It was elongated to run more with the contours. It was a utility issue where they could get the sewer to gravity feed and flow. It allowed for more homes along the open space edge that would provide a buffer with Highway 40.

Mr. White stated that additional areas that changed from the last concept plan were the homes on the other side of the power corridor. He indicated an area where the roadways was eliminated due to grade changes and he tried to enhance that area as a trail corridor. They left the 60 foot right-of-

way, which allows them to meander the trail through there and provide a great connection. For anyone who lives mid-block, it is an easy walk to the trail corridor and then links them back down to the community center.

Mr. White reported that they met with Rocky Mountain Power and increased the utility corridor through the project. It was a 50 foot corridor that was increased to a 60 foot corridor, which provides more cushion from the adjacent homes. It also provides potential for future growth in the trail corridor.

Commissioner Luskin asked if the power lines would be underground. Mr. White replied that the lines would be underground within the project. An existing overhead power line within the power corridor would not be buried.

Mr. White stated that the current master plan concept was what they have shown as the preliminary plats. Lots were adjusted and homes, trails and sidewalks were located accurately. This plan is how the project would be developed and what they can do with grades, etc.

Chair Wintzer asked if the engineering had been done on the entire site and they were ready to move forward. Mr. White answered yes. He explained that the last concept plan was engineered and cleaned-up. Using that information, they updated the concept plan to reflect those changes.

Mr. White reviewed the affordable housing plan. The bright pink color indicated the 28 IHC units. The blue color represented the 35 Park City affordable units, which comprises a mix of attached and detached units. The purple color represented the Park City Heights internal affordable housing units. He explained how the affordable units were mixed in with the market rate units.

Mr. White noted that an extensive study was done for snow storage and they met with Park City a number of times. In addition to the snow storage easements on the sides of the road and within the right-of-way, he identified additional snow storage areas where snow could be pile and/or picked up and placed in those areas.

Mr. White briefly reviewed the trail legend. The dark blue color represented the existing trail that goes to the sports complex and the tunnel that goes under SR248. The light blue color identified the future connection. He stated that they are currently working with the City to improve that connection from the tunnel down to the Rail Trail. This would require a bridging of wetland areas and other issues. Mr. White stated that they would provide easements where possible and they are trying to find available funding.

Commissioner Savage questioned why they would not bring the trail over closer to the road to avoid additional bridging over the wetlands. Mr. White replied that most people do not want the trail next to the road. Planner Whetstone pointed out that there is a large ditch next to the road with running water. Mr. White remarked that they were still looking at all the options. The applicant agreed to design the entire trails system to see how it works, and then look at the cost to implement. If it turns out that the best location is next to the road, they would put it there. Mr. White recalled that a concern throughout the process was that the Richardson Flat Road is a busier road and it would be better to take the trails off of that road for safety reasons.

Mr. White reviewed three different trail/sidewalk scenarios within the Park City Heights project. He then reviewed a number of perspectives of the project showing the Park Homes, the Cottage Homes and community gardens, and the Homestead Homes. He noted that the perspectives were created through Google Earth.

The Commissioners left the dias to look at the model.

Mr. White stated that throughout the process they have talked about a commercial component with the project. In going through the engineering process, they added two small parcels. One was on the west side and the other on the east side. One parcel was 10,000 square feet and the other was 16,000 square feet. The intent was to add those two parcels to provide the potential for a future commercial component. Commissioner Savage wanted to know who would own the property and how it would be sold or entitled. Mr. White replied that it would be owned by Park City and the Boyer Company as the co-owners of Park City Heights. If or when those parcels are developed, it would go through the City process and the issues could be addressed at that time.

Mr. White presented a virtual tour through the project that correlated with the physical model.

Commissioner Luskin recalled from previous comments that the idea was to create a visual impression similar to Old Town. However, the first visual entering the project are the larger attached units. He thought it would have been better to have the cottage units in the front on the perimeter as the first visual impression.

Mr. White noted that some of the cottage units front the park. He noted that in several earlier meetings they provided significant details on the attached units. Besides the fact that they are affordable units, one reason for putting the attached units at the entrance was to create density at the entrance and around the amenities. Another reason was to create a street scene with the attached units at the entrance of the project. Commissioner Luskin recalled those previous conversations, but he thought the basic premise was to create a similar impression as Old Town. Seeing the multi-dwelling units gives the same impression as coming in from Kimball Junction, which he personally finds offensive. Commissioner Luskin stated that the plan show was not how he pictured it in his mind from prior discussions.

Mr. White pointed out that besides the reasons he stated, the terrain is flatter at the entrance, which makes it the best location for the attached units. That location is also closest to the trail corridors and the bus stop.

Chair Wintzer recalled going through the process and spending a considerable amount of time talking about the location of the attached unit. He thought they had decided that the entrance was the best location for those units because it was easier for kids and families to access the recreation facility. Commissioner Luskin stated that he was aware of the conversation because he had used the analogy of driving into Yosemite through the tunnel. For that reason, he was looking for the first impression coming into Park City.

Commissioner Peek referred to the principle view points that were designated at the beginning and

thought it would be interesting to see the model from those view points. He believed the initial impression would come from those view points.

Commissioner Pettit remarked that the impression coming in from the SR248 Corridor is consistent with what exists all along SR248 with the affordable housing projects on either side of the road. Commissioner Luskin remarked that his goal was not to replicate the view along SR248.

Mr. White stated that the design guidelines were another topic for discussion. The concept of the attached homes is to them mimic the cottage homes in terms of colors and materials.

Commissioner Peek stated that the model and the views from the designated view points shows the importance of the roof forms and how they would affect the overall project. In looking at the model from down low, it is basically a scene of roof forms. He believed the roof forms mixed together would be the main view of this project from US40 and SR248.

Eric Langvardt, representing the applicant, remarked that the key for both the plan and the design guidelines is the emphasis on the front doors. He noted that front doors face US40 and SR248 so the view from the road does not look at garages or back doors. He pointed out that roof forms are an important element in the design guidelines. In addition, the guidelines stated that no more than three similar massings can be placed together, which requires the roof forms to be broken up.

Commissioner Pettit commented on the use of solar and making sure that the guidelines reflect what is yet to come with solar. She wanted to make sure they were not limiting the ability and flexibility to incorporate those types of products once they become available and affordable. Commissioner Pettit referred to page 83 of the Staff report, page 47 of the design guidelines, and expressed confusion over the concept with respect to ground mounted. She noted that in some cases roof mounted solar is not an option or ground mounted may be a better option. In addition, Commissioner Pettit was concerned about limiting the use of solar on rooftops to flush mounted, given the fact that a lot of tracking systems are being developed to take advantage of solar. Commissioner Pettit understood that the applicant was trying to create guidelines from an aesthetic standpoint, but she did not think it was being consistent with best practices in terms of being proactive and thinking ahead.

Commissioner Hontz thought the trail corridor appeared to be used in the snow storage diagram. It may work but it would limit the months that the trail corridor could be used and the trail would be unusable in the winter. Commissioner Hontz preferred to see clearer language in the exterior section of the guidelines to better clarify what is and is not allowed. She did not believe that pure white and light gray were good main house colors in Park City. Commissioner Hontz concurred with Commissioner Pettit regarding the solar. She would like to see the entire sustainability section beefed up with more explanation and details. Regarding the density, Commissioner Hontz thought the homes could be placed closer together in some areas to create more usable space, or in some cases add more units. She provided examples with the Cottage homes to clarify her comment. Commissioner Hontz concurred with Commissioner Peek regarding the roof forms, and she suggested that the applicants make sure the design guidelines help achieve a mix in roof forms.

Commissioner Luskin complimented the applicants for listening to the concerns and working with

the Commissioners to design this project. If it ends up looking like the renderings, they have all succeeded. Commissioner Luskin stated that he was always hesitant about building a project this large in Quinn's Junction and resistant from the beginning. His heart pounds when he is around Old Town Park City because the rest of the city looks like the rest of America. That was the basis for his original comment about the multi-dwelling units. In his opinion, the multi-dwelling units should be in the center of the project and the cottage units on the periphery so the view is from the cottage home perspective. Aside from that, he appreciated what the applicants have done and their willingness to cooperate.

Commissioner Savage echoed Commission Luskin regarding the idea of putting the cottage homes on the periphery and placing the higher density units on the inside. He believed it would improve the aesthetics. However, he believed the applicants have come a long way and he commended them on the work they have done.

Commissioner Pettit asked if heated driveways were prohibited in the design guidelines. Mr. White was unsure if heated driveways had been addressed. Commissioner Pettit noted that heated driveways could be allowed if they were heated through solar power. In her opinion, it is a big issue that needs to be addressed from a sustainability perspective.

Mr. White did not think heated driveways would be an issue based on the price points they are anticipating, as well as the cost of installing a heated driveway. He offered to look into the matter as a sustainability component.

Planner Whetstone explained that the design guidelines would be a guide for development, but anything required would be a condition of approval of the master plan and the plat. Director Eddington stated that the Planning Staff is working with other City Departments to make sure the guidelines are reviewed by Staff and all the ideas are incorporated.

Commissioner Peek agreed with Commissioners Luskin and Savage regarding the placement of the multi-family units. He would like to see that from the view corridors. The entry experience of the tourists would be from US40 and SR248 and he wanted to know how the massing works.

Director Eddington noted the Staff received comments on the guidelines with regard to repetition. He believed that addressing those comments would answer some of the questions related to style, color, materials, fenestration and articulation. He would work with the applicants to address those concerns.

Chair Wintzer noted that page 5 of the guidelines refers to a basement as defined by the Building Code. He suggested that the language in the guidelines be more specific because the Building Code could change. Chair Wintzer pointed out that a periodic phrase in the guidelines is, "strongly advised". He recommended that they remove that phrase and specify what they want to avoid problems with interpretation. Chair Wintzer commented on the reference to skylights. In some cases skylights can be big and obnoxious at night and he thought that section should be better defined. Chair Wintzer thought Park City Heights was a good place to prohibit wood burning fireplaces. Mr. White pointed out that wood burning fireplaces were addressed in the guidelines. Chair Wintzer referred to language in the guidelines that talks about 6 foot high fences to screen a pool or to contain pets. He thought the idea would be to have open fences that could be seen through rather than a six foot solid fence. The pictures represented open fences but it was not

reflected in the language.

Chair Wintzer was impressed with the presentation and the model. He encouraged the Commissioners to continue asking for this information. He thanked the applicants for their efforts and encouraged the Planning Commission to push for this type of information on other projects.

Mr. White commented on the amount of work involved to bring this presentation to the Planning Commission. The goal is to move forward to an approval. He asked when they could expect to have all the comments back from the City so they can respond and come back for the next meeting. Planner Whetstone assumed the comments would be available the end of next week.

Commissioner Peek commented on various places in the guidelines where the language was inconsistent. He wanted to know who would be on the design review committee. Mr. White replied that it would be determined at a future date. He assumed it would be three to five members chosen by the owners. Commissioner Peek indicated language stating that shared driveways are allowed. He suggested that shared driveways should be discouraged or limited in width. Commissioner Peek asked if the photos could be captioned to indicate what example the picture was showing. Commissioner Peek asked if LEEDS would be the standard during the build out of this project. Mr. White answered yes. He noted that a previous rendition of the annexation agreement had Build Green Utah 100 points or Silver Leeds standard. The Build Green is basically defunct and in order to be clear, they strictly using the LEED Silver rating on all homes. He clarified that LEEDs or an equivalent was specified as part of the annexation agreement. Commissioner Peek noted that the guidelines emphasize the desirability of maintaining an east/west access to the roof lines. He wanted to know what percentage of homes have that orientation. Regarding architectural sustainability and construction waste recycling, Commissioner Peek thought they should specify a time in the course of development that the developer must provide a construction waste recycling facility to centralize the recycling for a period of time. Commissioner Peek requested a high resolution PDF of the plat with topo overlay for the next meeting.

Planner Whetstone suggested that the Planning Commission continue this item to February 23rd for a public hearing and further discussion. If no further information is needed at that time, it could be continued to March 9th for possible action. The motion for a continuation would be made during the regular meeting.

The work session was adjourned.