



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
September 14, 2022**

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair Laura Suesser, Sarah Hall (attended virtually), John Kenworthy, Bill Johnson, John Frontero, Christin Van Dine

EX OFFICIO: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director; Makena Hawley, Planner II; Spencer Cawley, City Planner; Alexandra Ananth, Senior Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Laura Suesser called the meeting to order at approximately 5:30 p.m.

The following written determination was read:

The Planning Commission of Park City, Utah will hold its regular meeting with an anchor location for public participation at the Marsac Municipal Building, City Council Chambers, 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah 84060 on Wednesday, August 24, 2022. Planning Commission members may participate in person or connect electronically by Zoom or phone. Members of the public may attend in person or participate electronically.

Public comments will also be accepted virtually. To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom through www.parkcity.org/public-meetings. Written comments submitted before or during the meeting will be entered into the public record but will not be read aloud. For more information on attending virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from August 10, 2022.

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from August 10, 2022. Commissioner Van Dine seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

B. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from August 24, 2022.

MOTION: Commissioner Kenworthy moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from August 24, 2022. Commissioner Van Dine seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Megan McKenna reported that she was recently hired as the Housing Advocate for the Housing Resource Center. While technically within the Mountainlands Community Housing Trust, this was a collaborative effort of local affordable housing stakeholders. She would work with New Housing Navigator, Angelica Espinoza, to support affordable housing along the Wasatch Back. Ms. McKenna grew up in Park City. While Park City has shifted from mining to a service-based economy, she believed that labor is still the lifeblood of the mountain town. Her heart was with the workforce. Over the years, she had witnessed many family members and friends being pushed out of Park City due to affordability. From 2000 to 2020, the number of jobs in Park City grew by nearly 75%. However, the number of housing units during that time grew by less than 15%. Only a small fraction of those housing units were considered affordable or attainable.

The workforce housing deficit grew tremendously and continues to grow. It is up to the Council to decide whether it was appropriate to maintain only 15% of the workforce, however, the Planning Commission has a critical role to play in achieving affordable housing goals as well. Ms. McKenna stated that the current goal is 800 to 1,000 units over the next five years. She discussed the Council's objectives. The highest-ranking objective states that, "Park City should develop and construct affordable housing using the private sector or via public/private partnerships." Ms. McKenna explained that her goal was to secure affordable deed-restricted housing for others.

Ms. McKenna explained that there is a housing crisis, but also a community crisis. The Housing Resource Center believes that housing is belonging and belonging is what built a thriving community. By addressing the housing crisis, many of the other mission pillars will also be addressed. For instance, transportation, environment, and equity. Her goal as Housing Advocate was to bring more affordable housing to the Wasatch Back. It is important to educate the community about the current housing crisis and give a voice to those who are often left out of the conversation. She takes her new role very seriously and looked forward to working with the Commission. Residents and Commissioners were welcome to reach out for more information.

There were no further public communications.

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken, presented information related to the Council Retreat that took place earlier that day. The Council was presented with an Action Plan to move forward with a Feasibility Study for the Bonanza Park Art and Cultural District as well as a Bonanza Park/Snow Creek Small Area Plan and an update to the General Plan. The work would start immediately with the Feasibility Study and the Small Area Plan. This would be followed by the General Plan updates in 2023. Positive feedback was received from the Council with a green light to start those initiatives. Director Milliken explained that the Planning Commission would be pulled into those studies and plans in different ways. There will be a significant community engagement piece.

Chair Suesser asked for clarification on the Bonanza Park/Snow Creek Small Area Plan. Director Milliken explained that this is the neighborhood identified in the current General Plan. It encompasses the Bonanza Park area to the Kearns and the Snow Creek area. It also goes over Bonanza Drive and encompasses part of Prospector. She offered to share a map with the Commission. Those were general boundaries but there would likely be some overflow.

Commissioner Kenworthy wondered how many applications would come in before the Small Area Plan is complete. He asked how the Planning Commission should deal with those types of applications. Director Milliken clarified that the Small Area Plan is a Mini General Plan for the neighborhood. It will get into more detail than the General Plan. It will start with a visioning exercise that will establish the goals and identity of the neighborhood. There will be a land use component as well. Additionally, there will be a strong connectivity, circulation, transportation, and parking component. This was an area where there were a lot of needs and opportunities to consider. City Attorney, Mark Harrington informed the Commission that the Small Area Plan will not impact applications. If someone comes in while the plan is being developed, the application would be considered under the existing Code.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked if a moratorium for the area had been discussed. Director Milliken reported that it was discussed but no decision had been made about a moratorium. A moratorium will not impact applications that have already been submitted but it will impact future applications. In that case, there would be a six-month pause. Attorney Harrington noted that there is Pending Ordinance Doctrine, which was another component. This could have an impact on new applications. The City Council asked to further discuss a moratorium. Commissioner Kenworthy expressed concerns about the Master Planned Development ("MPD") that exists but has been dormant for 10 to 20 years. He asked how many MPDs are within the Small Area Plan boundary. Attorney Harrington offered to find out that information for the Commission. He did not believe there were a lot of existing MPDs in the area.

If the majority of the Commission wanted Staff to bring the item back for discussion, that could be done. The item was not on the current Planning Commission Meeting Agenda. The Commissioners felt it would be worthwhile to have further discussion about the Small Area Plan at a future meeting. Commissioner Frontero agreed with the concerns expressed by Commissioner Kenworthy. It seemed that there were large MPDs that would directly impact the area identified for further study. It would be worthwhile to have all of the information beforehand in case the Commission needs to act on those applications. In addition, he felt that a six-month moratorium would make sense. Commissioners Van Dine, Johnson, and Hall agreed. It was confirmed that additional information about the Small Area Plan would go to the Planning Commission for discussion at a future meeting.

Director Milliken reported that there had been a number of applicants for the Planning Commission position. Interviews would be conducted at the next City Council Meeting. Chair Suesser asked about the applicants. Director Milliken stated that five qualified applicants were being considered. Chair Suesser looked forward to the seat being filled.

Chair Suesser shared a disclosure with those present. She reported that she was at a fundraising dinner for affordable housing on September 9, 2022, and she sat at a table with the applicant that would present the DoubleTree Hotel application during the Work Session. The application was not discussed during that dinner and the interaction would not compromise her review.

Commissioner Kenworthy disclosed that he owns a home at 214 Woodside Avenue. This would not impact his decision on the 455 Woodside Avenue application.

5. CONTINUATIONS

- A. 1201 Stonebridge Circle - Condominium Plat Amendment - The Applicant Proposes Amending the Stonebridge Condominium Plat to Accommodate a 54 Square Foot Addition to Unit 14F For the Purpose of Adding an Exterior Elevator. PL-22-05265**

City Planner, Spencer Cawley reported that the continuation was requested to allow Staff additional time to review the application. It would be discussed at the next meeting.

Chair Suesser opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing remained open.

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to CONTINUE 1201 Stonebridge Circle – Condominium Plat Amendment and the Public Hearing to September 28, 2022. Commissioner Kenworthy seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

6. WORK SESSION

- A. 1800 Park Avenue - Master Planned Development and Affordable Master Planned Development – The Applicant Proposes to Replace the DoubleTree Hotel with a Mixed-Use Residential Project Including 126 Market Rate Condominiums and 147 Deed Restricted Affordable Rental Units in Two Buildings with Parking Below in the General Commercial Zone. PL-22-05254 and PL-22-05255.**

Senior Planner, Alexandra Ananth, commented that this is a complicated application for two separate buildings. One is an MPD and one is an Affordable Master Planned Development (“AMPD”). The MPD and AMPD will have a shared garage and would be located on one lot. However, each application will be reviewed under the respective codes. The MPD, which was on the western side of the site, proposed 100 units of market-rate condominiums. The AMPD proposed 147 affordable rental units as well as 26 market-rate units. In total, the project would have 273 residential units between the two buildings. There would also be approximately 2,500 square feet of commercial space as well as residential amenities.

The site is in the General Commercial (“GC”) Zone and the Frontage Protection Zone Overlay. It is approximately 4.5 acres in size and located at the junction of SR-224 and SR-248. The property is currently improved with a 182-room hotel, restaurant, and meeting space. Planner Ananth shared a Site Plan of the proposed project. The redevelopment was for two buildings with market rate in the MPD building and affordable and market rate in the AMPD building. There would be some ground floor retail over the subterranean shared parking. The applicant was also proposing to introduce two new streets into the neighborhood on the south and east sides of the site. This will increase connectivity and was in keeping with the goals and objectives of the General Plan for the Bonanza Park neighborhood.

The General Plan noted that the Bonanza Park neighborhood is diverse and eclectic. It includes mixed-use with condominiums, multi-family apartments, offices, shopping, restaurants, the Rail Trail, and Olympic Welcome Plaza. Access to transit and trails was good in the neighborhood and there are multiple bus stops surrounding the site. Planner Ananth read the following from the General Plan:

- “By directing higher density redevelopment to this area, the neighborhood has the potential to provide more life-cycle housing opportunities for Parkites, including starter and empty nester (step down) housing. The Area Plan for this neighborhood should include a limit on nightly rentals if this district is to be protected as a local’s neighborhood.”

The applicant was proposing that there be nightly rentals in the MPD building, which are permitted within the General Commercial (“GC”) Zone. The MPD includes 69.63 Unit Equivalents (“UE”), with 56.85 UEs in the MPD building and 12.78 UEs in the AMPD building. The AMPD had 140.90 Affordable Unit Equivalents (“AUE”). The project was found to meet the 50% AEU requirement for AMPDs. Planner Ananth reported that the zone height in the General Commercial (GC) Zone was 35 feet. In the AMPD, building heights of up to 45 feet are permitted when certain requirements are met. That was something that the applicant would look into for the AMPD building. The MPD code is more flexible and allows the Planning Commission to consider an increase in building height based on a site-specific analysis.

AMPDs have a 20% open space requirement and MPDs require 30% open space. Planner Ananth wanted to confirm the numbers before sharing the proposed open space amount with the Commission. The applicant indicated that the numbers may be as high as 30% but there were some areas she was not sure should be counted. Revised calculations were currently underway. Since the Staff Report was published, the applicant submitted a different Parking Summary. It showed that the MPD has a parking requirement of 335 parking stalls. The proposal was to have 340 garage stalls underground as well as 17 surface parking stalls. The applicant would meet the parking requirements for the site, which was not noted in the Staff Report. She explained that a Parking Analysis needed to be submitted. At the current time, the applicant was not proposing any exceptions. The AMPD Code allowed for a reduced parking requirement but the applicant was not currently seeking that reduction.

Planner Ananth asked that the Commission consider the following questions:

- Given the General Plan's acknowledgment that this area is appropriate for high density, does the Planning Commission see a benefit to utilizing the possible exceptions allowed on this site to achieve the goals of 15-6-1? Or would the Commission prefer to caution the applicant against exceeding the underlying zone/Land Management Code standards?
- Does the Planning Commission find benefit in reviewing the two MPDs together versus reviewing the buildings separately but concurrently?
- Does the Planning Commission have any preliminary feedback on the proposed Open Space areas being shared without internal setbacks segregating the two projects?
- Does the Planning Commission have questions or concerns with the Initial Issues Identification List in the Staff Report? Is there other preliminary information the Planning Commission would like to see for evaluation of the applicable criteria?

The Commission discussed the second question. Planner Ananth noted that the Commission could take a holistic look at the site. For instance, the Code is more restrictive with open space

in the MPD code. She wondered if the Commission wanted to use that Code for the entire site or specifically segregate the MPD to meet requirements for that portion of the lot and separately meet the requirements for the AMPD portion of the lot. Chair Suesser asked if the Commission was required to look at the MPD and AMPD separately. Planner Ananth explained that there was some discretion in terms of restrictive codes and looking at the site as a whole.

Commissioner Johnson asked about increasing the height in the Frontage Protection Zone ("FPZ"). He wondered if that could be granted based on the Land Management Code. Planner Ananth stated that Staff was still looking into that issue. She explained that the FPZ prohibits exceptions from the underlying zoning district, which in this case, would impact the first 100 feet of frontage of Park Avenue and Kearns Boulevard. Based on a strict read of the FPZ, the applicant would not be allowed to have a height exception. However, the MPD Code allows for exceptions. It was important to have a project that met the intent of the codes.

Commissioner Johnson read language related to open space requirements. Planner Ananth noted that the paseo and plazas are open spaces that would be open to the general public as well as residents. Those would count toward the open space requirements. The new internal streets would not count, since that was not beneficial open space. Commissioner Kenworthy asked if the paseo and plazas would be used for both projects. Planner Ananth confirmed this and explained that both buildings have front doors that open onto the paseo. Some of the commercial space would use that area as well. Commissioner Kenworthy stated that he would be looking for open space areas on both sites as required by Code.

Commissioner Kenworthy believed that the reduced setback at the corner was troubling. He had been on a few transportation boards and the 224 Corridor Study included a proposed two-lane roundabout there. Planner Ananth clarified that the applicant was not looking for an exception to the setbacks on Park Avenue or Kearns Boulevard. The proposal was to meet the full FPZ. Commissioner Kenworthy asked if the project will impact the ability to do what is proposed in the 224 Corridor Study. Planner Ananth offered to look into the matter further. Commissioner Kenworthy wanted to keep all of the options open on that corner.

The applicant identified himself as Peter Tomai and stated that the application was for the redevelopment of an existing property. He was joined by members of the ownership and the design team. Mr. Tomai explained that the project was exciting for several reasons. It is a redevelopment project that will bring a substantial amount of housing that is close to services, schools, jobs, and transit. This project will also be socially inclusive because there will be for sale condominiums and affordable long-term rentals. He was excited that it will produce a large amount of housing without sacrificing existing green space or open space in the community. Park City is a resort community and retaining a portion of the hospitality operation will ensure that the jobs at the location are retained.

Rebecca Cocchiola, Senior Vice-President of Singerman Real Estate stated that they have been involved in the Park City community since the property was first purchased nearly one decade ago. The property was purchased in 2013 with over \$12 million invested in renovations. The property is currently performing at peak operating levels. Singerman Real Estate recognized the affordability housing crisis in Park City early on in the investment. Due to the strong performance of the asset and increased investor interest in Park City, they were confident that there would be a favorable outcome. There was a unique opportunity to enhance the site.

Mr. Tomai noted that Planner Ananth presented details related to the project but reiterated that it is a redevelopment that will result in a long-term residential building in the AMPD area with 26 market-rate units and 147 deed-restricted affordable housing units. The plan was for them to average 80% AMI; however, affordability will range between 60% and 120% AMI. There will also be market-rate for-sale condominium units within the MPD building. For-sale condominiums will make affordability possible on the site. Mr. Tomai reported that the existing project includes four curb cuts into Park Avenue and Kearns Boulevard. The four curb cuts preclude a lot of improvements that were contemplated. Pulling the building back and observing the 30-foot setback would eliminate curb cuts from the project. As a result, there could be straight shots into and out of a pedestrian tunnel, if desired by the City.

Mr. Tomai reported that the Singerman Real Estate design team is committed to the sustainability of the project. The design and construction details were contemplated to have low energy use. The preliminary modeling suggested that the residences of 273 families would use 58% less energy than the Yarrow does currently. Mr. Tomai believed this was an example of responsible redevelopment. Currently, the Yarrow is surrounded by asphalt parking lots and dumpsters. The proposed improvements would have the 30-foot protection zone as a landscape buffer. The ground floor units along Park Avenue and Kearns Boulevard will all be walk-up residential units with patios. He hoped the project will start to redefine the Bonanza Park area and create a more pedestrian-friendly environment.

There was an intention to add more bike sharing and accommodate car sharing in the garage. It was important to encourage a vehicle-free lifestyle in this location. The goal was to create a more pedestrian and transit-oriented project. Mr. Tomai explained that the project tried to touch on critical priorities that were outlined in the General Plan. He believed transportation, energy, housing, and social equity were all addressed with the proposal.

Karl Sveinsson from SERA Architects reiterated some of the information about the buildings. He informed the Commission that there will be underground parking. Key public benefits were overviewed. Mr. Sveinsson noted that there will be a public plaza, a public central paseo, two new roads, an extension of the multi-use trail (12 feet), improved traffic flow, and additional affordable units. He shared a map of the area and identified the existing curb cuts. The project envisioned combining one curb cut on Park Avenue and one on Kearns Boulevard, opposite Snow Creek. Mr. Sveinsson discussed transit and connectivity in the area. He explained that many options were being considered for the project.

The property was zoned General Commercial ("GC"). Based on that, the setbacks needed to be 30 feet with the FPZ and 25 feet for the side and rear setbacks. However, 26 feet was needed for the road to accommodate a fire truck and other emergency vehicles. As a result, the proposal was to have a setback of 26 feet from the property line and 15 feet of sidewalk. That totaled 41 feet, which was a greater setback than required. Mr. Sveinsson stated that the greater setback would allow for the proposed road. He believed the project would benefit the community.

The primary exemption request related to height. Mr. Sveinsson reported that under the General Commercial ("GC") Zone, 35 feet of height was permitted. The AMPD allowed for an additional 10 feet so there could be four stories. The desire was for both buildings to be four stories with some limited rooftop amenity access. He explained that the market-rate condominiums would help pay for the affordable units. By providing that fourth floor, it was possible to offset those costs. Given the location of the project, it seemed like a logical place for taller buildings.

Chair Suesser asked for clarification about the height of the pop-up amenity space. She believed the pop-up amenity space would make the building more than 45 feet. Mr. Sveinsson confirmed this and explained that there would be approximately 12 additional feet and there would also be a bit of elevator overrun space. The total height proposed was 59 feet. The pop-up amenity space would only account for 7.5% of the total roof area. Mr. Tomai noted that some roof access would be required on the building in any scenario. This was for fire access and maintenance of the solar facilities. Elevator penthouses would be required regardless.

Mr. Sveinsson further discussed building height. He stated that the buildings would be positioned to minimize visual impacts on adjacent structures. Park Avenue and Kearns Boulevard are both very wide streets and there is a lot of separation between the project area and adjacent properties. He stated that the project will be adequately landscaped and buffered. The open space calculations need to be confirmed but based on the math so far, the project was over the 30% minimum. He clarified that 30% was required for the MPD and the AMPD only requires 20%. The overall site is over 30%. Chair Suesser wondered if the roads and sidewalks had been included in the open space calculations. Mr. Sveinsson denied this. That number included the paseo, courtyards, and spaces between sidewalks and the buildings.

David Johnson from SERA Architects introduced himself and reported that he led sustainability in the practice. Initial modeling of the energy use for the site had been done. He shared a chart titled, "Total Annual Energy Use," and explained that the two gray bars represent the electrical energy and gas energy on the existing site. When the proposed project was modeled, there was a reduction of 58%. With enhancement toward a LEED equivalent, the energy could be reduced by 70%. Singerman Real Estate was committed to creating a model of sustainability. As for water, on a square footage basis, the hotel used a lot of water. It was designed for a different era. Mr. Johnson shared a chart titled, "Water Use Intensity," and explained that based on modeling, the water demand could be reduced by 60% or 63% with some LEED strategies.

There were give-and-take aspects with an MPD and AMPD. It had been difficult to create affordable housing in Park City but this project would positively contribute to the affordable housing supply. The project provided space for the contemplated pedestrian and active transportation improvements of the area, notably the tunnel. Additionally, the new public plazas would create opportunities for community gathering spaces. Park City has aggressive goals as a community to address sustainability. This project was very focused on sustainability. Mr. Tomai explained that Singerman Real Estate was asking for one additional story of housing on the MPD building. Since there needs to be roof access of some sort anyway, there was a request to use a portion of the rooftops for private gathering space that the long-term residents of the AMPD building could use. Anyone in Park City could access the rooftop of the MPD building. Mr. Tomai acknowledged that this was a complex application and asked for Commissioner feedback.

Commissioner Frontero asked for additional details about the AMPD height exception. Planner Ananth reported that the AMPD allows for 45 feet of building height, assuming that the application met the setback requirements. A certain amount of exception for emergency egress would be allowed, but no expansion of anything above 45 feet would not be allowed. Commissioner Frontero noted that the request was for the AMPD building to be 59 feet. It did not seem that the current code would allow that. Planner Ananth confirmed that the current code would not allow the proposed height and rooftop amenity. Commissioner Frontero asked about the MPD building. Planner Ananth stated that there was more flexibility there, assuming the applicant could meet the requirements of the site-specific analysis.

Commissioner Van Dine felt it was important for the Commission to consider comparable buildings and their heights. The proposed project would be significantly taller than anything nearby since there was nothing in the area that was more than two stories. One of her biggest concerns related to the entry corridor. There was a desire to preserve entry corridors in Park City. Having a four-story building on that corner would not create an ideal entryway. If there was some way to decrease the height or step it back, that would be preferable. At the current time, she was not supportive of the 59-foot height. She did not believe the rooftop amenity was a necessity. Commissioner Van Dine appreciated the sustainability aspect of the building and the reduction of water usage. She asked to see a unit breakdown for AMI during a future presentation. Commissioner Van Dine was opposed to nightly rentals as one of the community goals was to establish primary residents. She did not see nightly rentals being a great use for the area. While affordable units were necessary, she had a difficult time with the proposed height. Additional information was requested to justify the need for the requested building height exceptions.

Commissioner Hall loved the idea of affordable units. The project proposed a lot of affordable units and it was wonderful that there were rentals as well. She agreed that this was a great location for this type of project. In addition, Commissioner Hall liked that the project will not remove greenery, the proposed improvements for circulation, the parking stalls are Code compliant, and sustainability was considered. As for the questions posed by Staff, she wanted to see the buildings presented together. She had a strong preference that the entire application be an AMPD because that would be an easier application to process. It was important that the application not pick and choose which parts of the Land Management Code were more favorable. The Frontage Protection Zone should be kept within the height requirement. If the MPD building went under the Land Management Code for a regular MPD, that height code needed to be applied. Alternatively, if the building is under the AMPD code, the height exceptions would be appropriate. Commissioner Hall asked about the open space calculation. Chair Suesser noted that Staff was still calculating and finalizing that number.

Commissioner Johnson asked that before the next Planning Commission discussion on the item, Staff clarify whether a height increase was appropriate in the FPZ. He also asked that the open space calculation be confirmed. In the context of height, there were two telecommunication facilities in the building. By granting the 59-foot height there could technically be an additional 10 feet to facilitate the telecommunication facilities. He questioned whether it would be safe to have a rooftop amenity if there would be telecommunication facilities on the roof. Mr. Tomai clarified that there was no intention to go beyond the rooftop for cellular facilities. One of the challenges that ownership would have to face related to the relocation of those cellular facilities. He reiterated that no height above 59 feet was requested.

Commissioner Kenworthy agreed with the comments shared by other Commissioners. The massing was his biggest concern. This was a gateway and it was intended to welcome people into the urbanized portion of Park City. He was not certain that a 59-foot building would be an appropriate gateway into that section of Park City.

Chair Suesser agreed with Commissioner Van Dine that nightly rentals would not be appropriate. Additionally, she wanted to see substantial sidewalks around the entire building. She did not see the width of the proposed sidewalks along the new road heading east-west. Chair Suesser wondered if the improvements to the corner had been taken into consideration with the proposed plans. She cautioned the applicant about asking for exceptions, except perhaps the exceptions within the internal setbacks. Chair Suesser asked for additional information about the square footage of the market-rate units and affordable units. The elimination of the two curb cuts would

improve the corner and she appreciated the sustainability aspects of the proposed project. However, she wanted to better understand the retail that would be added.

Chair Suesser asked if the paseo would be available to members of the public or if it would largely cater to the residents. In addition, she wanted to know how many parking stalls per unit were proposed as well as the depth of the parking garage. She asked about the connection to the tunnels over to Snow Park. There had been a reference to a 12-foot trail around the entire property but also a reference to 15-foot sidewalks on some parts of the project. She asked for additional clarity about those numbers. The 59 feet for the roof amenity was something that she was struggling with. She suggested a three-story project with a roof amenity instead. Alternatively, the rooftop amenity could be removed. While she understood that the amenity would be beneficial to residents, the height was of concern. Chair Suesser believed this application should be approached with a holistic view rather than as separate projects.

Commissioner Kenworthy wanted to see the occupancy numbers for each of the buildings. Commissioner Frontero was not opposed to the height request. If development was encouraged in more densely populated areas, there was only so much width that was possible. Height was a reasonable request as long as it is done tastefully, there is some protection, there are appropriate setbacks, and the design is thoughtful. He presumed the MPD had been requested to allow for nightly rentals. At the moment, the building is a nightly rental hotel. The proposal would actually reduce the current nightly rentals on that corner. This was actually an improvement in terms of the current use. If some nightly rentals were necessary to make the project profitable, it seemed reasonable. He believed the Commission should consider allowing them.

Commissioner Johnson asked if there would be a phasing plan. Mr. Tomai explained that if the application proceeds, a detailed phasing plan would be created. The garage structure would have to be first since it was the foundation for both buildings. It was contemplated that the AMPD building would be constructed before the MPD building.

Chair Suesser opened the public comment period.

Deb Rentfrow thanked the Commission for their thoughtful questions. She noted that some of the slides in the Staff presentation did not match the information included in the Staff Report. The email she submitted earlier in the day was based on the information included in the Staff Report. Originally, the commercial space was 5,000 square feet and now Staff stated that it would be 2,500 square feet. The composition of the units had also been changed. She used Page 18 of the "Applicant's Project Description and Preliminary Plans," document to calculate what she thought was the total square footage for each building. In the west building, there would be 153,686 square feet and in the east building, there would be 187,918 square feet. Based on that, the total open space requirement would be 83,688 square feet. This may have changed, but she based the numbers on the submitted materials. It was important that the applicant come back with the specific numbers. Ms. Rentfrow pointed out that in the General Plan, this section of Bonanza Park is specified as Resort Gateway. It was not labeled as the Bonanza Park Redevelopment Area. This was a gateway to an important part of the community.

Meeche White thought the application was well presented. This is a gateway to the community and it was important to consider that during the project review. Though the application was excellent, she had concerns about the height request. She believed the additional height would encourage other applicants to ask for, or be granted, additional heights for future projects.

Angela Moschetta identified herself as an Old Town resident. She appreciated the thoughtfulness of the Commissioners' questions. It sounded like there was a real concern that the project support community priorities and goals. As important as the Land Management Code is, the General Plan is superior. Social equity had long been established as a priority for Park City. Diversity, equity, and inclusion were also important to consider. Ms. Moschetta understood that this was just a Work Session and the applicant would come back with additional details and answers to questions. However, she had concerns that the market-rate residents would be in one building with a pool and open corridor and all of the affordable housing residents would be in a different building that didn't have the same sort of views. If inclusion was desired, there should not be such a clear dividing line. She encouraged the developer to integrate the community that would ultimately live within the project area. This was the best way to support community values. Chair Suesser believed there would be market-rate units in the AMPD building as well.

Megan McKenna looked forward to hearing additional information about the unit analysis. She noted that the Planning Commission had an opportunity to use the tools and incentives that were available for affordable housing. The AMPD was there to incentivize developers to increase the affordable housing that was available within a project. She was impressed with the sustainability of the proposed project. No project will be perfect, but this area was a good opportunity to use the density so affordable housing and sustainability would be achieved.

There were no further comments. The public comment period was closed.

Chair Suesser looked forward to hearing more about the application at a future meeting.

B. The Planning Commission Will Conduct a Work Session to Prioritize Land Management Code Amendments for 2022 - 2023.

Assistant Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that the above item relates to the prioritization of Land Management Code amendments for 2022-2023. She shared the first Land Use Regulations for Park City, dated 1968. That document was 44 pages and there were seven zones. Park City now has 21 zones, five overlays, and the Land Management Code is over 300 pages long. Over the years, the Land Management Code had been amended many times to help shape the City as it continues to grow and develop. Assistant Director Ward overviewed some of the long-range planning initiatives, such as Vision 2020, which was a strategic action plan to guide the City through 2030. The goals of that plan related to social equity, environmental leadership, community housing, and transportation innovation.

The City would be issuing a Request for Proposals ("RFP") to focus on a Bonanza Park/Snow Creek Small Area Plan. Assistant Director Ward shared a boundary map of the plan area. It would also take into consideration connections with the adjacent neighborhoods. That was anticipated to be started in the current year and completed by the end of the year or early next year. Another long-range planning initiative was the General Plan update. The current General Plan included a list of strategies and goals for Land Management Code amendments. The Consultant would review the General Plan and Land Management Code in tandem. Several recommendations for amendments and timelines for those amendments would be shared.

Assistant Director Ward reported that there were plans in progress that were scheduled for City Council review. For instance, there was a plan that the Sustainability Department had been working on in coordination with Utah Clean Energy and stakeholders in the community. This was the Strategic Action Plan for Building Decarbonization. That was scheduled for Council review in

the fall. In that plan, there were recommendations related to incentives for road development. Additionally, Park City Forward, the long-range transportation plan was scheduled for Council adoption on September 15, 2022. Once adopted, it would be possible to review the Conditional Use Permit ("CUP") criteria and MPD criteria. Updates could be made to the criteria that the Planning Commission evaluated for pedestrian, bicycling, and transit infrastructure.

A series of amendments were already in progress, which included the following:

- Fractional Ownership of Single-Family Dwellings (the item was scheduled for City Council review on October 6, 2022);
- Winter Balcony Enclosure Pilot Program (the program was scheduled to end in 2023 and needed to be reevaluated. The Historic Preservation Board had a Work Session discussion on the item on September 7, 2022. It would be discussed by the Planning Commission on October 12, 2022. The pilot program required Land Management Code amendments. The Commission would decide whether those should remain);
- Waterwise Landscaping (the Planning Commission had already conducted a Work Session on the amendments and the item would come back on October 12, 2022);
- Sensitive Land Overlay (this included new and updated vantage points and the addition of new ridgelines. A GIS analyst was assisting Staff with updates to the online zoning map so it would show the additional ridgelines and vantage points);
- Accessory Uses in Master Planned Developments (the item was scheduled to be discussed later in the fall. It was a second phase to the MPD amendments. The Planning Commission already enacted the first phase, which was to separate the MPD review from the CUP review. This would clarify accessory use exceptions for MPDs. There would be a Work Session discussion in the future);
- Secure Bicycle Parking Requirements (this was to support bicycling infrastructure and would be brought forward for a Work Session at the Planning Commission level).

Chair Suesser asked about accessory uses in MPDs. She wondered if this had to do with the support commercial. Assistant Director Ward stated that it had to do with accessory uses that are exempt from density. There was discussion regarding the known MPDs in the Bonanza Park Area Plan. Commissioner Kenworthy asked about Hotel Park City. Attorney Harrington clarified that additional density was requested in exchange for building parking but he did not believe that application was ever submitted. He explained that there was room to address boundaries. Additional information could be shared with the Commission related to the existing area and what was on the border. Chair Suesser wanted to understand where the eastern boundary was. Assistant Director Ward stated that it was by the Fireside and Iron Horse Condominiums. The Commission further discussed the boundaries shown on the map.

Assistant Director Ward reported that there were amendments in progress for early next year:

- Lot Combinations in Historic Districts (the new Historic Preservation Planner would go to the Historic Preservation Board early next year to discuss this);
- Driveway and Parking Standards in Historic Districts (this was planned to be discussed by the Historic Preservation Board and then the Planning Commission);
- Updates to Align with State Requirements (this related to appeals and architectural regulations for single-family homes and duplexes).

Chair Suesser wondered if Lot Combinations in Historic Districts had to do with restrictions. Assistant Director Ward confirmed this and explained that it was outlined in the Staff Report. The amendments would look at restrictions but would also look at criteria for steep slopes and other encroachments. Chair Suesser appreciated that the new Historic Preservation Planner would review that and speak to the Historic Preservation Board. However, she noted that the Historic Preservation Board recommended a driveway across a right-of-way last year. The Planning Commission voted against that. She hoped that when Driveway and Parking Standards in Historic Districts are discussed, it does not have to do with developing the current existing undeveloped right-of-ways. Assistant Director Ward reported that there used to be a section in the Land Management Code that allowed property owners with a historic home to apply for a CUP to build a private driveway on a platted unbuilt right-of-way. Based on Planning Commission and City Council feedback, that was removed and was no longer in the Land Management Code. The driveway and parking standards would be reviewed for consistency.

In 2020, the Planning Commission identified priorities for Land Management Code amendments. This included incentivizing affordable housing development. Since then, the AMPD was adopted into the Land Management Code. That process began in 2018 and was a three-year process. There are now two AMPDs currently under review. Staff anticipated two additional applications would be submitted in the fall. Those applications would provide additional opportunities to evaluate and refine the code. Chair Suesser wondered what the percentage of affordable homes needed to be in an AMPD. Assistant Director Ward explained that it is based on the residential unit equivalents. At least 50% of the square footage needs to be deed-restricted affordable housing. Chair Suesser encouraged the Planning Department and City Council to consider raising that percentage so it is higher than 50%.

Another priority that was identified by the Planning Commission in 2020 was the encouragement of sustainability. The Commission wanted to improve transit, trail, and active transportation connectivity. Assistant Director Ward reminded the Commission that Park City Forward was scheduled for adoption on September 15, 2022. She noted that another priority for the Commission was amending the transfer of development rights. Last, the Commission wanted to prioritize evaluating lot combinations in the Historic Districts. The Planning Commission and City Council recently reviewed the Five-Year Moderate Income Housing Plan. The plan looked for opportunities to increase height and density allowances for affordable housing developments, where appropriate. Assistant Director Ward explained that those discussions went back to 2020 when there was Planning Commission input on the transfer of development rights.

The Housing, Transportation, and Planning teams applied for a grant for a study that could inform potential amendments. Unfortunately, the grant was not awarded to the City. As for the goal to encourage sustainability, the Waterwise Landscape amendments were in progress as well as the Strategic Action Plan for Building Decarbonization. There were opportunities to incentivize more sustainable development. Assistant Director Ward noted that the Strategic Action Plan had strategies that Staff would bring back to the Planning Commission for review.

Assistant Director Ward discussed the desire to improve transit, trail, and active transportation connectivity. With Park City Forward, there were some opportunities to update the CUP and MPD criteria. The Transit, Transportation, and Engineering Departments had been evaluating and recommending potential amendments that would establish standards for the traffic studies that the Planning Commission would require and review. Additionally, those departments had been looking at Transportation Demand Management recommendations.

Many of the upcoming Planning Commission Meeting Agendas were quite full, but Staff planned to bring forward the following topics for discussion in the fall:

- Winter Balcony Enclosure Pilot Program and Waterwise Landscaping Work Sessions (October 12, 2022);
- Waterwise Landscaping Public Hearing and Recommendation (October 26, 2022);
- Sensitive Land Overlay Work Session and Accessory Uses in Master Planned Developments Work Sessions (November 9, 2022);
- Secure Bicycle Parking Requirements Work Session and Sensitive Land Overlay Public Hearing (December 14, 2022).

Assistant Director Ward asked for input from the Commission regarding the schedule and the amendments. Staff would return on October 12, 2022, with a proposed schedule for next year. She noted that the Commission previously mentioned having Commission Liaisons, who may be interested in working with Staff as the amendments moved forward.

Chair Suesser asked for clarification about the Sensitive Land Overlay amendments. Assistant Director Ward explained that when the City annexed the southeast Quinn's Junction area, the area was annexed into the Sensitive Land Overlay. It required the identification of ridgelines and vantage points so that when developments were being considered, this could be done from certain vantage points in the City. The General Plan recommended reevaluation to make sure all ridgelines were identified. It was also recommended that the vantage points be updated City-wide. Those were included in the amendments. Chair Suesser wondered whether steep slopes were included in sensitive lands. Assistant Director Ward explained that the Sensitive Land Overlay defined steep slopes and very steep slopes. It also outlined the regulations for properties that were impacted by those slopes.

Commissioner Kenworthy offered to be a Commission Liaison for the Transfer of Development Rights and Transportation Demand Management. Chair Suesser wanted to be the Commission Liaison for Accessory Uses in MPDs and Evaluating Lot Combinations in Historic Districts. Commissioner Van Dine wanted Transit and Trails. Commissioner Johnson offered to focus on Sensitive Lands and Affordable Housing and Commissioner Hall wanted to work on Sustainability and Transportation. Commissioner Frontero wanted to focus on the Encouragement of Sustainability and Evaluating Lot Combinations in Historic Districts. It was noted that the transfer of development rights was not on the list for the current year. Assistant Director Ward confirmed this. A Work Session discussion would be scheduled in 2023. It was noted that the City Council would also have a liaison for the amendment-related work.

Chair Suesser wondered if there could be discussion about excavation limits in the Land Management Code. Assistant Director Ward asked the Commission for other amendment suggestions. Chair Suesser wanted to see a review of the steep slope standards City-wide. She wondered if the Planning Commission has Final Action authority on Land Management Code amendments. Assistant Director Ward clarified that the Planning Commission would make a recommendation to the City Council.

The General Plan and Bonanza Park/Snow Creek Small Area Plan both require a Planning Commission recommendation to the City Council for adoption. She wondered if the Planning Commission would be open to reserving the first or the last meeting of each month for those Work Sessions. Public hearings could be scheduled more than once per month as the Code

amendments progress. The Commission was in support of that suggestion. Assistant Director Ward reported that Staff would come back on October 12, 2022, and summarize the input from the current meeting. A proposed timeline for 2023 would also be shared. Discussions were had about the timeline and how it would work with the General Plan updates. Assistant Director Ward explained that the code was being updated based on what was in place, through the lens of the current priorities. When the General Plan was updated, a new list of recommended amendments would be considered. This would trigger a new review process of the code.

Chair Suesser noted that when an application comes in, the application is required to comply with the Code that is in place at the time that the application is filed. She expressed concerns about how the amendment process will impact applications. Attorney Harrington explained that all expectations will be made clear in future Staff Reports and communicated in advance.

7. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 455 Woodside Avenue - Heimpel Plat Amendment - The Applicant Proposes Removing the Internal Lot Line Common to Lots 10 and Half of Lot 11 of Block 29, Park City Survey, to Create A Single Lot-of-Record. PL-22-05278.

Planner II, Makena Hawley presented the Staff Report and explained that the application was for a Plat Amendment for property located at 455 Woodside Avenue. The property owner was requesting to combine all of Lot 10 with half of Lot 11 of Block 29, Park City Survey. The intention was to create a single Lot of Record to build a single-family home. Both of the lots are currently vacant. Planner Hawley shared a picture of the property and reported that it is in the HR-1 Zoning District. There was no significant vegetation on the lot. She noted that there is an existing retaining wall that will be removed when the proposed home is constructed.

There is an active Historic District Design Review ("HDDR") application being reviewed concurrently. It had not been approved yet. The existing plat was shared with the Commission. Staff found that the proposal complies with the HR-1 Zoning District as well as the general subdivision requirements, outlined in 15-7.1-3. Staff also found that the Plat Amendment preserves the current land use and character of the historic residential area in Park City. It would not vacate or amend any portion of the platted row. No easements were being vacated or amended. Planner Hawley reported that no public input had been received. As a result, Staff recommended that the Commission open a public hearing and consider forwarding a positive recommendation for City Council consideration on October 27, 2022. The owner of the property, Ryan Heimpel was available to answer any outstanding Commissioner questions.

Commissioner Frontero asked where the other half of Lot 11 is located. Planner Hawley explained that the subject property is surrounded by other single-family homes and condominiums. Commissioner Frontero pointed out that the request was to combine Lot 10 and half of Lot 11. He wanted to understand where the other half of Lot 11 was. Mr. Heimpel explained that to the north, someone started to build on lot lines and the result was that Lot 11 had become half of a lot. Commissioner Frontero believed the intention was essentially to add 12.5-feet to a standard Old Town lot. Planner Hawley confirmed this.

Chair Suesser wondered if there were stairs or pedestrian accesses through the lot. This was denied. Some images of the subject property were shared with the Commission for reference. There was no significant vegetation but there was a steep slope, which would require a Steep Slope CUP. That had not been submitted yet but would be a requirement.

Chair Suesser opened the public hearing.

Angela Moschetta shared comments related to lot combinations. For a long time, the City signed off on lot combinations and additions to houses. Now, there was a situation where Old Town in particular was a ghost town. People are sitting on a lot of beautiful historic real estate that want to modernize or expand the homes. She recently attended a Historic Preservation Board Meeting to discuss one of the applications. The historic preservation guidelines specifically talked about upholding the character of the mining era. This was not just about aesthetics, but also lifestyle. The purpose of lot combinations was to build, increase the potential square footage of a build, or add onto an existing home. A lot of times, those builds or additions are not necessarily in keeping with the mining era character. While she was not suggesting that the Commission deny this lot combination, it was something for the Planning Commission to consider moving forward. It was important to think about community values.

Commissioner Kenworthy believed that the lot combination, in this case, made sense because the 12.5 feet would be landlocked if the Commission did not allow the combination. A lot of properties on Woodside Avenue were 37.5 feet. However, he understood the general concerns. Attorney Harrington noted that additional information could be brought to the Commission for future consideration. It was important to consider the history of Old Town when making decisions.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

Chair Suesser asked about the width of Lot 10. Planner Hawley reported that it was 25' x 75'. Chair Suesser wondered what the good cause was to allow the lot combination, which would result in a larger single-family home being built. Planner Hawley explained that the use is compatible with the neighborhood and does not differentiate it from the surrounding character. Additionally, since 1979, the two lots have been owned together. Commissioner Kenworthy pointed out that if the lots were not combined, there would be a useless 12.5-foot lot. Chair Suesser stated that the 12.5 feet could create a buffer between the single-family home and the condominium. Mr. Heimpel clarified that the condominium building was in the other direction.

Chair Suesser was not in support of combining the lot because there is a developable lot that is owned by the applicant. She did not believe the combination was necessary. Commissioner Kenworthy was in support of the application. Commissioner Van Dine pointed out that the lot combination would still fit the character of the neighborhood. Having a 12.5-foot plot of land would not keep with the rowhouse character of the neighborhood. The Commission further discussed the application. The retaining wall would be removed, but a house would be in that location in the future. Mr. Heimpel stated that the house would be to the north so it was not as close to the condominium building to the south. The rowhouse character would be continued. A single-family home was consistent with those designs but not with the condominium building.

Commissioner Frontero wondered if there could be a compromise. He understood the arguments on both sides and wondered if the application could be amended to build out 6.25 feet rather than 12.5 feet. This would ensure that a 6.25-foot buffer remains. Mr. Heimpel stated that he could speak to the architect. He explained that he was doing this on behalf of his parents. His father is handicapped and access is needed. He would need to speak to the architect to determine whether 6.25 feet would be enough space for the property to be ADA-compatible. Commissioner Van Dine was supportive of the application as presented. Commissioner Johnson wondered if it

would be possible to increase the side setback. Chair Suesser believed the compromise was something that should be considered.

Chair Suesser did not believe there was good cause to allow the lot line adjustment to expand the lot. Commissioner Van Dine noted that the applicant had mentioned speaking to an architect about whether the compromise made sense. She wondered whether a continuation would be appropriate. Commissioner Kenworthy found that there was good cause for the application.

MOTION: Commissioner Kenworthy moved to forward a positive recommendation for City Council consideration on October 27, 2022, for the 455 Woodside Avenue Heimpel Plat Amendment application, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval as outlined in the Draft Ordinance as follows:

Findings of Fact

Background:

1. The property is located at 455 Woodside Avenue.
2. The property is listed with Summit County as Parcel number PC-356 and consists of Lot 10 and half of Lot 11 of Block 29, Park City Survey.
3. The Applicant owns Lot 10 and half of Lot 11.
4. The property is in the Historic Residential (HR-1) Zoning District.
5. The Site is vacant.
6. Historically, 455 Woodside Avenue contained a Single-Family Dwelling which was demolished in 2000.
7. The owner of 455 Woodside Avenue submitted for an HDDR on August 10, 2022, which is currently being processed by the Planning Department.
8. The Lot of 455 Woodside Avenue will require to a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit.
9. The LMC regulates Lot and Site Requirements per LMC § 15-2.2-3.
10. A Single-Family Dwelling is an allowed Use in the HR-1 Zoning District and requires a minimum Lot size of 1,875 square feet. The proposed Lot size is 2,812 square feet.
11. The minimum Lot width in the HR-1 Zoning District is 25 feet. The proposed Lot width is 37.5 feet.
12. The required front Setback for Lot depths of 75 feet is ten feet (10').
13. The required Side Setback is three feet (3').

14. In the HR-1 Zoning District, the Maximum Building Footprint = (Lot Area/2) x 0.9 Lot Area/1875. The Maximum Building Footprint for the proposed Lot is 1,201 square feet.
15. The building Height in the HR-1 Zoning District is 27 feet.
16. The findings in the Analysis section of the Staff Report are incorporated herein.
17. There is Good Cause for combining Lot 10 and half of Lot 11 because the proposal is consistent with the character of residential development and will be required to comply with the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts.
18. The plat amendment does not vacate or amend any portion of the platted Right of Way.
19. No easement is vacated or amended as a result of the plat amendment.

Conclusions of Law

1. The Plat Amendment is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code, including LMC Chapter 15-2.2, Historic Residential (HR-1) Zoning District, and LMC § 15-7.1-6, Final Subdivision Plat.
2. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed Plat Amendment.
3. Approval of the Plat Amendment, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval

1. The City Planner, City Attorney's Office, and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the Plat for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The Applicant shall record the plat at the County within one (1) year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one (1) year's time, this Plat approval will be void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.
3. The plat shall note that fire sprinklers are required for all new construction, to be approved by the Chief Building Official.
4. Any new development must comply with the Land Management Code and requires Historic District Design Review.

5. City Engineer review and approval of all Lot grading, utility installation, public improvement, and drainage plans for compliance with City standards is required prior to issuance of any building permits.
6. No remnant portion of Lot 12 is separately developable.

Commissioner Van Dine seconded the motion.

VOTE: Commissioner Kenworthy-Aye; Commissioner Van Dine-Aye; Commissioner Johnson-Aye; Commissioner Hall-Aye; Commissioner Frontero-Nay; Chair Suesser-Nay. The motion passed 4-to-2.

8. ADJOURN

MOTION: Commissioner Van Dine moved to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:40 p.m.

APPROVED 09.28.2022