



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
MAY 24, 2023**

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair Laura Suesser, John Kenworthy, Vice Chair Sarah Hall, Bill Johnson, Christin Van Dine, John Frontero, Henry Sigg

EX OFFICIO: Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director; Environmental Sustainability Project Manager, Celia Peterson; City Engineer, John Robertson; Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs; City Planner, Olivia Cvetko; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Laura Suesser called the meeting to order at approximately 5:30 p.m. She reported that all Commissioners were present.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration of Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from April 12, 2023.

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from April 12, 2023. Commissioner Hall seconded the motion.

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

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Assistant Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that Staff had no communications for this meeting.

Commissioner Frontero reported that he attended City Tour 2023 in Fort Collins, Colorado. His intention was to learn what a similar community does in terms of mitigating traffic as well as how they handle affordable housing and childcare. He stated that it was a very worthwhile trip and he encouraged the citizens of Park City to try and attend these in the future. He mentioned that Myles Rademan and Paige Galvin organized the tour and did a terrific job. He publicly thanked them for their efforts.

Commissioner Frontero reported that Mayor Nann Worel and Council Member Tana Toly also attended. He reiterated that this event was well done and highlighted Leadership Class 29 as the key to the trip. He mentioned that approximately 30 residents apply for this each year and the City Tour was a highlight of the class. He encouraged all citizens to get involved going forward and stated it was a worthwhile endeavor.

Chair Suesser commented that being part of a Leadership Program used to serve as a prerequisite to getting involved in Commissions and Councils. She was in Leadership Class 21. Commissioner Kenworthy mentioned that he was in Leadership Class 23.

5. CONTINUATIONS

- A. Parcel ASR-1 – Meadows Drive Trailhead and Parking Area Conditional Use Permit – The Applicant Proposes to Construct a Hard-Surfaced Parking Area with Greater than Five Parking Spaces at the Meadows Drive Trailhead. PLD-23-00575.**

Chair Suesser opened the public hearing. There was no public comment. Chair Suesser closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Christin Van Dine moved to CONTINUE Parcel ASR-1 Conditional Use Permit to a date uncertain. Commissioner Henry Sigg seconded the motion.

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

6. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. 2200 Monitor Drive (Holiday Village Apartments) and 2776 Kearns Boulevard (Parkside Apartments) – HOPA Affordable Master Planned Development and Conditional Use Permit – The Applicant Proposes Redevelopment of the Holiday Village and Parkside Apartments to Construct 317 Affordable Units in the Residential Development Zoning District and Frontage Protection Zone Overlay. The Planning Commission will Review the Applicant's Proposed Sustainability Elements and Parking Management Plan.**

Assistant Director Ward reported that the application proposed to subdivide four parcels totaling 7.4 acres into seven Lots. The developer also proposed to build a shared underground parking structure accessed from Monitor Drive. The project would also redevelop the Holiday Village and Parkside Apartments for a total of 317 affordable units. She explained that this project is located southwest of the Park City School District Campus, north of the Park Meadows Subdivision, east of the Holiday Ranchette Subdivision, and north of Kearns Boulevard. Assistant Director Ward reported that the Planning Commission conducted a Work Session on March 22, 2023, for preliminary review. At that time, the Planning Commission provided input regarding the Parking Management Plan. There was also input on the façade and design materials. She reported that the applicant modified the project to change the streetscape along Monitor Drive and removed the fourth story from the two buildings proposed along Kearns Boulevard. She noted there was Planning Commission input on connectivity within the project and to adjacent projects. The applicant updated the internal and external pathways.

With regard to the Commission's request for information and details on bike parking, Assistant Director Ward stated that information will be presented at tonight's meeting. A third-party consultant reviewed the Traffic Impact Study submitted as part of the April 26, 2023 meeting, and further discussion was scheduled for Planning Commission discussion on June 28, 2023.

Assistant Director Ward mentioned that additional discussion during the April meeting touched on the common space square footage for residents. There were requests from the Commission for information regarding the current tenants, the number of vehicles they have, and the number of residents who rely on public transit. She stated that the applicant would present additional information on occupancy for the proposed development. Three topics were scheduled for review during this meeting. The Sustainability elements of the proposal would be addressed. Assistant Director Ward stated that Environmental Sustainability Project Manager, Celia Peterson was present to answer questions. In addition, Significant Vegetation would be presented with input from the Forestry Board and the applicant's proposal. She added that the Parking Management Plan would also be presented to the Commission.

With regard to Sustainability, Assistant Director Ward stated that the applicant proposed to install Electric Vehicle Charging Stations for 20% of the parking spaces. The Code would require the applicant to install 5% of parking spaces and conduit provided for 20% of the spaces. In addition, the applicant proposed all-electric buildings, bioswales, solar PV ready, and would promote a car-free community. Assistant Director Ward stated that the Sustainability Team recommended the applicant consider an Energy Use Intensity that would be less than 25 for the living spaces to help lower utility bills. As far as Significant Vegetation, Assistant Director Ward stated that there was Significant Vegetation on the site. The applicant proposed to remove 104 trees, which would require replacement with like vegetation. The applicant proposed 102 new trees. She explained that the Forestry Board reviewed the proposal and provided input. The applicant submitted an Arborist's evaluation of what is currently on-site and a number of trees were impacted by the bark beetle. The Forestry Board recommended the applicant remove the trees as soon as possible.

The Forestry Board also recommended that the applicant select salt-tolerant trees and filters for the areas near snow storage. They also recommended that the applicant submit a Landscaping Plan for project phasing, which the applicant submitted. The Forestry Board also recommended the applicant establish a three-year review of the health and viability of the new vegetation. With regard to the Parking Study and Management Plan, Assistant Director Ward explained that the Land Management Code ("LMC") requires 330 parking spaces for this project. The applicant proposed 268 parking spaces and submitted a Parking Management Plan. She noted that the Code would allow the applicant to request a parking reduction if certain criteria are met. One of the criteria outlined by the Code was parking in the Right-of-Way ("ROW") along the perimeter, which was unavailable on either Monitor Drive or Kearns Boulevard.

Another criterion would be an agreement with an adjacent property within 1,000 feet of the project. She stated that the applicant would not pursue such an agreement at this time. Assistant Director Ward stated that if the project was within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of a transit stop, that could be taken into consideration in evaluating the requested parking reduction. She stated that the applicant's Parking Study would reduce the parking requirements by 11% because of the proximity to bus stops. She added that the applicant was working with the Engineering, Transportation, and Transit Departments to look at the bus stop along Monitor Drive to explore improvements and amenities in that location. She indicated that there were at least eight transit stops within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile of the Affordable Master Planned Development ("AMPD") and the applicant

would share information on some preliminary surveys they completed with residents to determine how many rely on transit.

Assistant Director Ward stated that the applicant's Parking Study reduced parking by 1% due to 14 on-site motorcycle parking stalls. The applicant increased that to 16 stalls. Another factor that the Commission could consider was that the bicycle parking will exceed that requirement in the Code. At the time the applicant submitted the application, they would be required to install outdoor bike racks for 10% of the required off-street parking, which would be 33 racks. In the initial Parking Study, the applicant provided bike parking for 74 bikes; however, the revised submittal increased the number of bike parking racks to 142. The applicant would also provide the Commission with more information on the sheltered, secured, and indoor bike parking.

Assistant Director Ward stated that the last criteria that could be considered by the Commission were dedicated parking spaces for a resident car share. The applicant's preliminary survey indicated that residents would be interested in something like this. It was not currently part of the applicant's Parking Management Plan. In addition to the 268 parking spaces, Assistant Director Ward reported that the applicant revised their plan for the potential for 20 additional parking spaces that would be accessed from Kearns Boulevard. She presented a graphic showing the Frontage Protection Zone, which was a 100-foot Setback from Kearns Boulevard. There was an area that could potentially be developed through a Conditional Use Permit if it was set back at least 30 feet from Kearns Boulevard. The proposed parking spaces would meet this 30-foot Setback.

Assistant Director Ward stated that one of the questions for consideration was whether the Planning Commission found there was evidence in the record to condition the project to provide an additional 20 parking spaces if the parking demand exceeds the 268 proposed parking spaces upon completion of the project. In addition, because of the unique constraints of the site and the applicant's proposal to develop the site in phases so that residents may remain as the project is developed, this would put the first phase within the parking area for Holiday Village. The applicant submitted a temporary off-site parking proposal for construction and will be providing the Commission with details on this later in the meeting. She added that the applicant proposed using 40 parking stalls at the commercial subdivision to the south. They were currently working to determine the demand for that subdivision to make sure that those 40 parking spaces are available for a Temporary Shared Parking Agreement.

Dave Levine, Executive Director for the applicant, Mountainlands Community Housing Trust, thanked the Commission for conducting further discussions on the HOPA Redevelopment project. He introduced Craig Elliott, AIA from The Elliott Work Group who would provide answers and clarification on a number of design and site plan questions raised during the last Work Session.

Applicant Levine stated that through its 45-year history, Holiday Village and Parkside have given Parkites a home, often their very first home in Park City. The residents of these communities have contributed significantly to the growth and prosperity of Park City. He mentioned Bob Wheaton the longtime President of Deer Valley Resort; Pat Platt, the Summit County Community Development Director; and Bonnie Clark, the former Snyderville Basin Recreation District Director.

While all three individuals are highly regarded and well-known within the community, countless others have likewise made significant contributions to the community. Before joining

Mountainlands as its Housing Navigator, Angelica Espinoza was a resident at Holiday Village. While living there with her husband and son, Ms. Espinosa worked for years as a Registered Nurse at the People's Health Clinic. Applicant Levine reported that Ms. Espinosa described to him her many neighbors, many of whom work at Intermountain Health, a local pediatrician, and pediatric dental offices, or as servers or housekeepers in the local hotels. He stressed that it was for these residents that Mountainlands offered a new housing future in a revitalized community where residents will live in beautified, updated, and energy-efficient buildings and units built on a human scale, each with a vibrant and appealing appearance.

Applicant Levine added that Mountainlands will provide units at HOPA that respect the households living there, the neighborhood, and the entire community. Through HOPA, Mountainlands will also help the City realize its goals for affordable housing. More than that, as a unique redevelopment in the heart of Park City, HOPA will stand out for creating walkable and accessible residential living spaces near transit, schools, amenities, and workplaces. He mentioned that in conversations with community members, he heard several inaccurate statements about HOPA and would like to correct some of those misstatements.

Applicant Levine stated that one of the misstatements was that there would be a number of market-rate units located at HOPA. He stressed that HOPA was and will remain 100% affordable. The Average Median Income ("AMI") for residents would be in the range of 45 – 55 percent. Fifty-five percent of the expected HOPA residents who remain on site will continue to benefit from affordability as low as 25% AMI. He reiterated that no market-rate units can be built on the site. When originally constructed 45 years ago, the for-profit owners of Holiday Village and Parkside utilized U.S. Department of Agriculture ("USDA") Rural Development Funding, which kept the building 100% affordable. Both Holiday Village and Parkside were in their current extended use periods, meaning that Holiday Village will remain affordable through 2052 and Parkside through 2104.

Through its existing funding with Rule Development, Mountainlands was the only affordable housing provider and developer that can ensure that the current residents will not be displaced and that their units will remain deeply affordable. Applicant Levine also heard comments that there would be 1,000 occupants and 1,000 cars in the new HOPA. For this meeting, the applicant submitted an estimated occupancy count of 451 residents based on Utah Housing Corporation data and current residency ratios as well as data for Summit County. He explained that their occupancy count methodology was the same used at other housing projects in the City.

He also heard statements that the 1:1 parking ratio was more realistic and will result in a 5.7 times increase in the number of parking spaces for the 317 units. Applicant Levine stated that the submitted Parking Management Plan responded to this concern. The applicant conducted a recent survey of residents, which showed that on a daily basis 58% of residents walk, 26% of residents bike, 4% of residents use a scooter or motorcycle, 70% of residents use public transit, 6.5% use ride-share, and 9% use paratransit. He also reported that one-third of the residents would consider a car or bike share program. He highlighted the many transit options beyond cars that were being considered including e-bike storage, paratransit, and micro-transit. With the addition of 84 studio units, these occupants would be less likely to own cars. He added that they hoped to prioritize occupants without cars throughout HOPA.

Applicant Levine referenced comments regarding the ill effect on families living in high-rise buildings. He responded that HOPA is not Cabrini Green. They would have 20% more open

space for children living at HOPA, and two play areas. They will also have enhanced security with cameras where there are none today. They were also looking into key fob entry for the buildings. The well-lit underground parking garage will have direct access to the buildings, which will also mean additional security. With washers and dryers in each unit, vandalism on the site will be reduced.

Finally, Applicant Levine addressed the comments that neighboring property owners would lose property value. He stated that Holiday Village and Parkside are 45-year-old affordable housing buildings that were constructed years before many of the nearby homes. He challenged any of the nearby homeowners to show where their properties had any negative impact in value from HOPA over the past few years. He referenced an Urban Institute Report from one year ago that found that the only significant change was in the positive direction for the value of homes located near affordable housing units. A 2021 Gardner Institute Report from the University of Utah found that high-density housing in suburban Salt Lake City did not impact nearby housing values. He also mentioned reports from Stanford and New York University that found the same results. He thanked the Commission for the opportunity to address some of the questions and concerns raised during the last Work Session.

Architect Elliott felt a wave of responsibility for a number of Parkites whom he does not know and acknowledged that the Planning Commissioners must feel that all the time. He thanked the Commission for taking part in the process and trying to find the best solution for this affordable housing project. He stated this project means something different to him. He mentioned that there were people in attendance who did not have the benefit of listening to the prior discussions on this project so he recommended he be allowed to walk through the process to date. He reported that the site is located between the high school and a commercial property. The subject property is broken up into two pieces with access along Kearns Boulevard and Monitor Drive. The current property has 122 units with 80 units in Holiday Village and 42 units in Parkside.

Architect Elliott explained that the entries into each site are different but similar. Each enters a parking lot. He presented images of the entrances to both sites and noted that both were giant parking lots abutting the public way that leads to the City's Historic Districts. He explained that the site is in a zone surrounded by four other zones. The High School is in the Open Space Zone and there was Medium-Density Residential to the bottom right of the site as shown on the graphic. In addition, the area highlighted in red was described as General Commercial. There were also two lots of Single-Family zoning adjacent to the site to the west. He stressed that the site is truly a transitional piece between multiple zones. He showed images demonstrating how the site is surrounded by parking lots, three-story buildings, and a parking structure to the south. Architect Elliott explained that they tried to make sure that they followed the zone in terms of the design as well as the heights that were similar to those that surround the property.

Architect Elliott referenced two single-family residences across the street from the project. One home sits up on the hillside and the other is located some distance back behind some vegetation. He understood that the latter home was Historic. He explained that the applicant was looking to make the proposed changes because the existing apartments are 45-year-old buildings that were constructed to a much lower standard. It would be a significant expenditure to bring the buildings up to Code, which would make the project no longer viable.

They looked at what they could do with the property to take advantage of the space and its location and keep the property affordable for years to come. Architect Elliott commented that

this was one of the best affordable housing sites in Park City. Amenities are abundant within walking distance and if they were looking to remove cars from the road, this site was perfect.

Additionally, their task was to find a way to maintain everyone in their units and keep them there during redevelopment. He presented a graphic showing the buildings currently on the site and highlighted the areas where they could build something new. He noted that both of these areas were current parking lots, and added that the parking lot along Kearns Boulevard was in the Frontage Protection Zone. Architect Elliott stated that the applicant could request to put something in that zone but they would have to take 30 feet of the property away, so it was not a viable location. He added that the proposal would also require them to request something that is typically not allowed.

As a result, they chose the parking lot at Holiday Village for Phase 1. The first concept looked at the underlying zoning for the AMPD, which gave a height allowance of up to 45 feet, or four-story buildings in the parking lots. As they will develop them, they will have to build parking lots adjacent to the buildings. The parking would have to be located in the Frontage Protection Zone along Kearns Boulevard.

Architect Elliott reported that with the initial concept, they picked up 180 units. The applicant was challenged to do something to reduce the impacts, eliminate the parking along the perimeter and get more density. The applicant then revisited the design and concluded they still needed to work in the Holiday Village parking lot. The first phase would be to move into Building A at the rear portion of the parking lots. This would allow them to build and move all of the units from the north half of Holiday Village into Building A. They then could construct two new buildings at Buildings B and C. He explained that Buildings B and C would then accommodate the remainder of the residents on the site.

Architect Elliott stated they could then proceed with Building D and Building E, and then finally construct Buildings F and G on the Parkside parcels. He explained this sequence would allow them to maintain people on-site without having to move the residents twice.

With regard to parking, the key was having underground parking for all the buildings. He stated there were four existing bus stops adjacent to this property, and six bus stops within $\frac{1}{4}$ mile. They felt this was significant for the parking on this project, and it showed in the survey. He referenced the studies identified by Applicant Levine and noted that some existing residents have cars but do not have them on the site.

Architect Elliott felt that the percentage of residents who use public transportation had to be one of the highest in the City, and posited that it was partly due to the property's location. He felt this was the data requested by the Commission, and with almost 50% of the residents responding, that was a significant aspect of this plan and part of the reason the applicant requested a parking reduction. He commented that over 32% of residents were interested in ride-share and/or bike-share. He stressed this was a significant number as well, and noted the provision of additional bike parking, motorcycle parking, and e-bike parking on site. He referenced the Site Plan that showed 20 additional available spaces the applicant could park. He represented that they did not feel these additional spaces were necessary, but they felt it was a good idea to locate them and get them approved so that if there was a need, they could add them in the future.

Architect Elliott stated they proposed 268 parking stalls for 317 units. With 84 studio apartments, he felt they showed a change in the nature of the use.

He presented a graphic of the underground parking, the connections, and how they would work. He explained that every entrance would go through Building A, and the parking would connect with each building as they develop the site.

Architect Elliott explained that the parking design would reduce the left turn from Kearns Boulevard. They ended up with six parking spaces on the Parkside parcel, versus the 90 parking spaces that exist there currently. This would create a significant shift in impact, while also showing how they would improve parts of the site that were the most difficult as they currently exist.

Architect Elliott commented that the Parkside parcel had connections through the General Commercial site adjacent to it.

He mentioned the questions regarding estimated occupancy and presented a graphic showing the estimated occupancy by type of unit. Studio apartments typically have 1.06 inhabitants, one-bedroom units have 1.09, two-bedroom units have 1.79, and three bedrooms units have 2.56. These numbers came from Utah Low Income Housing Tax Credit ("LIHTC") information.

Architect Elliott next turned to Sustainability, and he showed a few of the things they would do on this project. He mentioned installing Solar PV panels on the project, and a bio swale condition to handle the water treatment for the runoff. He noted they were actually using that as a design feature that would go along Building C and between Buildings A and G, and Buildings D and G.

He added they also proposed covered bike parking, and they were still looking for the right product. One product was stacked, and the other was not stacked, and he felt it would depend on the locations and the uses they would have.

Architect Elliott also stated that the exterior walls would be over-insulated, and the performance would be a significant improvement. He mentioned the Electric Vehicle Charging Stations and the design of all-electric buildings. He stated that windows with high U-values were incredibly important in these projects.

Architect Elliott mentioned that he had not specified a building with anything other than low-VOC paints and products in 15 years.

He noted the analysis between the existing project and the proposed project. He presented a graphic comparing the floor plans for a two-bedroom unit. The majority of these buildings would be double-loaded hallways, and the exterior exposure of each unit would be significantly reduced. The existing facilities might have had R-11 insulation in the walls with no vapor barriers or air containment. While they do not know what was in the roof, he stated they were sure it was way under what they would be provided in the new roof insulation systems.

Some existing windows were single-pane. He reported that half of the exterior walls for the lower floors were in the basement without any exterior insulation on the concrete walls. While the mechanical systems had been improved over the years, they would never reach the performance standards that would be reached with the new facilities.

Architect Elliott stated that the new walls would have R-21 insulation in the wall with an additional R-5 at the minimum exterior wall insulation. The proposed windows would be high U-value windows, and all mechanical, electrical, and appliances would be high-performance products. He added that based on the applicant's funding, they would be required to install Energy Star. The Commission could look at the energy consumption, the overall performance from a Sustainability standpoint, how it affects the human being, and the performance of the buildings themselves.

Architect Elliott commented that apart from Sustainability, they looked at maintaining outdoor spaces of quality. There were some nice spaces at the current project, but the overall usability of the property was minimal. The total current landscaped area is 133,000 square feet. The applicant was showing 118,000 square feet of landscaped space and they would provide courtyards with play areas that would be protected by allowing people to see into the space. A safe play space for a child is one where the child can be seen. He stated that they put the play spaces in locations where there would be activity around them so the children could be seen and be protected from the streets. He acknowledged that it was difficult to understand the scale of the proposed space as compared to what exists today.

Architect Elliott noted that the Code only provides constraints for the building components in terms of Building Heights and Setbacks. He presented renderings of the proposed buildings and stressed that they would be developed in the framework of the available space and would be consistent with the Code and the AMPD requirements. He noted they would not be taking up all the volumes and would not be taking any of the top floor space. As far as what the Building Heights look like from the street along Monitor Drive, he presented an image that superimposed the proposed buildings over the existing buildings. He noted the red line that depicted the maximum height allowed in the AMPD in this zone. He highlighted that the proposed buildings were pushed back from the existing building faces, and stated that in some areas they were at 8 feet, while at the south end of the project, they were over 25 feet back from the existing face of the buildings. He also presented streetscape renderings from the perspective of Kearns Boulevard.

Architect Elliott stated that there was a purpose and a meaning to the applicant's decision to lower the buildings to three stories. He stated they also did a study to examine the project's relationship to the adjacent residential structures and presented images showing those structures. He highlighted that this project sits in between parking lots, a church, a commercial space, and a school; he felt it was in the perfect location for those uses and the building's impacts were relatively minor. They worked hard to maintain that by keeping the building heights low.

Architect Elliott presented the updated renderings following the last session on this application. He showed renderings from Monitor Drive, coming up from Park Meadows, and the entrance to the site between Buildings B and E. He explained that Building A was the first building and would be the primary entry. An office would be housed in this building, and the ramp to the underground parking would also be at Building A.

He showed renderings of the courtyard between Building D and Building A. He noted a walkway that would connect the area all the way through, and they increased the size of the walkway to accommodate bikes and pedestrians. The north/south walkway was also shown to the Commission. The rendering showing the courtyard between Buildings A, B, and C also

showed an initial rendering of a covered bike rack; he noted they were still looking at what would be the best system to install at that location. He also showed renderings going into town from Kearns Boulevard and stated that they tried to remove as much parking as possible out of the Frontage Protection Zone. He reiterated the applicant was not asking for anything special from that perspective. The large area at the entrance between Buildings E and F was also presented. The area looking up the bio swale was viewed as a nice space in addition to being a functional component.

Architect Elliott presented a rendering of the building next to the football field and noted that was the one location where they added a fourth-floor amenity for the entire project. This area would house a common indoor lounge area, kitchen space, and an outdoor terrace area with planters and seating spaces. He stressed that this location would have the least impact on all the neighbors, had wonderful southern exposure, and great views back towards the football field. He presented an overall view of the project looking back toward town. Architect Elliott concluded his presentation and offered to answer any questions.

Commissioner Kenworthy observed that the occupancy would be 451, and asked if that was the applicant's estimated occupancy or legal occupancy. Applicant Levine advised that was estimated occupancy based on current data. In response to Commissioner Kenworthy's inquiry regarding the legal occupancy for the entire project, Applicant Levine was unsure but believed that per Code it would be two occupants per bedroom.

Commissioner Kenworthy understood that for other projects they had seen two occupants per bedroom plus one per unit. Senior City Attorney Mark Harrington stated they could get the Building Department to verify that for the Commission. Applicant Levine posited that the living room might be counted as well, to which City Attorney Harrington stated there was likely a nuance where that might be the case in some circumstances.

Applicant Levine reiterated that the requirement was two occupants per bedroom, plus one for the living room. Commissioner Kenworthy believed that was likely accurate, and reiterated that he would like confirmation of that number.

In response to Commissioner Kenworthy's question regarding balconies, Architect Elliott responded that a significant number of the units would have balconies. He did not know the exact number but estimated 80 percent.

With respect to safe courtyards, Commissioner Kenworthy noted some play areas off of Kearns Boulevard might not be considered safe courtyards but would be open space areas for children to play.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked about sound mitigation and noted they had problems with sound mitigation in affordable housing. Architect Elliott explained that they designed the shared walls as two separate wall structures separated by $\frac{1}{2}$ inch or 1 inch, and insulation would be placed between the two separate wall structures. On one side of each wall, there would be drywall, and on the other side a resilient channel and drywall. Architect Elliott stated this design was over and above what is required in the Building Code. Most buildings where residents register sound complaints have single-wall construction that might have insulation and drywall.

Commissioner Kenworthy felt this was a fabulous project on many levels, and mentioned AMI, not displacing tenants, and redevelopment to protect long-term Parkites. He addressed parking

mitigation and noted the City did not currently have community off-site lots. He commented that this year they found that Richardson Flat was used much more than anticipated. As the City grows and solves transportation, the City would have some of these lots, especially given the annexation of the 1,200 acres. He felt this gave the City a lot of opportunity, and hoped that this new City parking would offer the applicant some more bonuses for reduced parking onsite.

Commissioner Kenworthy was thinking that in these community lots, a project could reserve some spaces that would allow a resident with a bike to park offsite. He would like to see something like this that would allow the Commission to reduce parking even further for the applicant. He mentioned that the 84 studio units proposed would likely be less parked according to the data. He also stressed that this project had four bus stops that were essentially onsite, which he felt was fantastic. Commissioner Kenworthy would like to see if they could reduce parking even further with some of these solutions that might not be in the mitigation Codes today but could be considered with a project like this if they know the City would have community parking lots where a certain number of spaces could be assigned to affordable projects.

Commissioner Hall referenced the Frontage Protection Zone and asked about the existing Setback for the existing structures in the plaza and the parking lot. She felt that the existing parking lot was within the Frontage Protection Zone. Assistant Director Ward confirmed and stated the applicant proposed that the additional parking along Kearns Boulevard would be back from the 30-foot zone. Commissioner Hall understood that the proposed parking in that area would be further back than the current parking lot, and requested these numbers for the next meeting.

Commissioner Van Dine thanked the applicant for the current data she requested and stated it was helpful in knowing the applicant was trying to bring in the same population. She felt it provided more justification for the requested parking reduction. She was agreeable with allowing the 20 additional parking stalls in the Frontage Protection Zone if deemed necessary. She reiterated her earlier comments regarding lowering the building heights and stated that she looked at the vegetation plan and would like to see more trees. She acknowledged that most of the trees along Monitor Drive were dead, and new vegetation with salt-resistant trees would make a huge difference.

Commissioner Van Dine agreed that this project would fit in the area, and would be consistent with the surrounding buildings. She observed that it would create a transition zone between the buildings where Tupelo's and the bank are located. While she understood the concerns from the community about a large project, she felt that the proposal was appropriate for the area and the data from current residents showed that they work in the area, which was consistent with the City's goals.

Commissioner Frontero asked about the intended use of the circle and the road off Kearns Boulevard. Architect Kearns explained that the circle comes off of the General Commercial property on Kearns Boulevard and immediately turns right. He stated there was an easement access to that parking lot through the commercial property. He advised that the applicant did not own the entrance to Kearns Boulevard, and it was controlled by the commercial property.

Commissioner Frontero asked if the applicant expected the residents to access Kearns from that area. Architect Elliott stated they showed six surface parking spaces. All other parking for that parcel came from Monitor Drive through Building A.

With respect to commercial deliveries to the project, Commissioner Frontero asked if those were expected to go through the underground parking lot and the entrance on Monitor Drive. Architect Elliott expected that moving trucks or delivery trucks would access the project through the circle.

Commissioner Frontero noted that the applicant projected the occupancy at 451, and asked if there was a further breakdown of residents under 18 years of age. Applicant Levine stated they could get that information from their consultant.

Commissioner Frontero stated that the child care component would be dependent on the number of children expected to be living at this project, and assumed there would be ample space for the provision of childcare on site. Applicant Levine stated that based on their further discussions on childcare, they could not incorporate childcare into this development. This was partly financial, and partly due to feasibility. He referenced discussions with PC Tots, and the site was not built for the kind of childcare operation that could be maintained there; however, they would have two wings for PC Tots. He related that according to these discussions, PC Tots had two issues: they cannot afford teachers, and the teachers live outside the City. In Park City, there are currently 25 PC Tots teachers, of which 22 commute into the City.

Applicant Levine stated that a solution to this would be to have those teachers living in the development, which would reduce the wage pressures on PC Tots, and the teachers would be in the City. He explained that they felt this was a better solution than looking to actually put in a childcare operation on-site. He stated they were looking at other services and supports they could provide in the community spaces, and would look to activate these spaces for the residents.

Commissioner Frontero was not certain he would be satisfied with sending children to outside childcare facilities but requested to come back to this issue at a later date. Commissioner Van Dine would like it to be known that Park City School District was undergoing a large pre-K expansion. She understood the applicant's point and noted that it was not required pursuant to Code; however, she felt providing access to the people who are already providing daycare would be huge. She added that hopefully, this project would also provide more housing for teachers. Commissioner Van Dine acknowledged that running a daycare was difficult, and she could see how this space was not ideal because there would not be a dedicated play area. She would be agreeable if the applicant were able to partner with community members and other daycare facilities to give preference to residents.

Chair Suesser asked if the applicant would give preference to teachers at PC Tots, and wondered how that would work. Applicant Levine stated they would ideally like to give preference, but he qualified that by stating they still have to evaluate how to set up these priorities for various residents. They would not know that entirely until they get the funding lined up, because it would be driven a lot by the funding. He stated they would try their hardest to give priority to those kinds of workers, but he did not want to make any promises at this point.

Chair Suesser asked if the applicant gave any consideration to reconfiguring any of the common spaces to potentially create an area that could be used for daycare. Applicant Levine stated they looked at that, but it was really challenging. He stated they would continue to explore that issue. Chair Suesser understood that the applicant's surveys of residents were not quite complete and they were still collecting data about public transit, the number of vehicles, and the

like. Applicant Levine reported they received completed surveys from 57% of the residents. Chair Suesser asked if the surveys included input on the amenities the residents would like to see. Applicant Levine stated the survey was focused solely on transportation.

Chair Suesser referenced the public feedback that was submitted to the Commission, and there seemed to be a lot of concern about the increased traffic on Monitor Drive. She felt it might make sense to revisit the idea of the other access to the garage, or a one-way exit onto Kearns Boulevard to reduce some of the traffic on Monitor Drive. She also wondered how far into the project the parking garage would extend underground. Architect Elliott explained that the parking would be located under the buildings, and there would be a tunnel that would connect the buildings, which is the drive aisle. He confirmed that there would be a garage under each building, but they would all be connected.

Commissioner Sigg understood the parking would be underground and not podium parking. Architect Elliott confirmed it would be subterranean. Commissioner Sigg asked if there was a parking plan that showed the foundations of the buildings with the parking layouts and how the circulation within the garages would function. He felt there were potentially some dead-end spaces.

Architect Elliott presented a graphic for the Commission and pointed out that each garage would be connected, but there would not be a connection between the garages for Buildings A and C and Buildings E and B. Commissioner Sigg commented that this could present a security and safety issue.

With respect to the concerns about traffic, Commissioner Sigg also stated that with this much parking, and the fact that most people would be making a left on Monitor Drive, he asked what the crossings would look like. He reiterated that a second access point might be considered, as he felt this would be a lot of parking for one access point. He liked the notion of having easternmost access to the roundabout area.

Commissioner Sigg asked if the tunnels that would connect the buildings would be foundation walls that would be part of each building. He wondered how the waterproofing would be handled, and asked if there had been any storm drain or water table analysis.

Architect Elliott confirmed that a geo-technical report was completed that showed the water table at over 20 feet, which would be well below the parking levels. The building connections would include concrete walls, a concrete lid, and a membrane over the top. They also showed paving over each of those spaces, which would allow them to maintain the space long-term.

Commissioner Sigg asked if potential lenders raised any issues about having connected buildings over common underground parking, and wondered if that would affect financing for workforce housing.

Applicant Levine stated they had not presented this to potential lenders and did not know if that would be an issue; however, the consultants did not believe it would be an issue for the financing.

With regards to the unit mix, Commissioner Sigg asked if the different AMIs would be spread throughout the project. Applicant Levine stated they were looking at an average AMI of 45 – 55% that would be evenly spread throughout the project.

In terms of the Kearns Boulevard intersection access point, Commissioner Johnson assumed there was an existing easement in place with Park Meadows Subdivision. He asked if the applicant had discussed with that property owner improving that access point.

Architect Elliott advised that Kensington Investments owns the property. Applicant Levine stated they had not had a lot of detailed discussions, but they had started those conversations. Commissioner Johnson felt that would be a benefit to understand if there would be flexibility in terms of improving that access point.

Commissioner Johnson asked the applicant if they considered an underground access point from the Parkside side that might provide emergency access or a crash gate that could be made flexible for future improvements should further traffic mitigation be required. Architect Elliott stated the first submittal included an underground parking connection, and he stated it would be easy enough to include. He noted that the drive would go into the 100-foot Setback, which would be allowed. He stated they received pushback on increasing the number of parking counts on Kearns Boulevard, so the discussion was to reduce that by connecting Buildings G and F to the HOPA side of the project. He stated the applicant did not have a problem accommodating emergency access at that location.

Architect Elliott stated that in the past they have created knockout panels to allow for the opportunity for expansion, so creating an emergency access with flexibility for the future would be easy to do.

Chair Suesser noted that if all of the residents were exiting the parking lot onto Monitor Drive, there could be traffic backed up to this project. She felt that a second access point would make a lot of sense.

There was discussion about the access points, and Architect Elliott advised there were two fire lanes on the north and south of the property, and there was one access point on Monitor Drive.

Commissioner Johnson referenced the massing comparison along Monitor Drive and felt it was beneficial for some of the public comments received. Architect Elliott commented that at the north end, the building would be 8 feet back from the existing buildings, and at the south end, the project would be 24 feet back from the existing buildings. He emphasized that they stepped the buildings back along Monitor Drive.

Excluding the elevator shaft, Architect Elliott stated the building heights would increase by 8 feet to a total height of 30 feet. Commissioner Johnson observed that this project would increase the Setbacks by 8 feet, and increase Building Heights by only 8 feet.

Applicant Levine advised that the applicant's consultant, Amy Rowland, Community Development Finance Alliance, could help answer Commissioner Sigg's question regarding financing and the parking lot. Ms. Rowland advised that her background was in LIHTC financing. She stated this was a very unique project, and there have been other projects with shared access to parking. She was quite sure that they would be able to work through having each property provide an easement, if necessary, to cross the property. She noted that Mountainlands would control the different ownerships, and getting the investors comfortable would be a product of having the legal documents. Ms. Rowland did not see an issue with the financing and felt that most investors and lenders would love this project.

Chair Suesser opened the public hearing.

Debbie Crandall stated that she lives in the house on the hill across the street from this project. She advised that she supports affordable housing, and was happy that many of her friends that live in this project would have a new home. She expressed concern about the density and the building heights. Speaker Crandall stated it would look like a major Nordstrom and Dillard's next to her home. She mentioned not only the height in a residential area but stated there would be a lot of traffic coming out of the development.

Speaker Crandall suggested lowering the building heights along Monitor Drive. She did not understand why it was all along Monitor Drive, and that more was put along Kearns Boulevard. She felt it was completely backward. Speaker Crandall asked if the design could be changed to allow the residential area to look like a residential area. Kearns Boulevard already has a lot of buildings and schools and wondered why they would want to do this to a residential area. She felt the idea of the project was wonderful; however, it was being done poorly. She felt the City would be unhappy with the project when it is completed and thinks the residents would also be unhappy. There would be a 7 -10 year process of jackhammering and demolition.

Speaker Crandall would like to see a bus go into the project itself where it could pick up residents. She did not think the current residents would necessarily be the residents in the new project. She felt there would be a lot more traffic. Speaker Crandall said she always knew they would do something with this project, but she thought it would be beautiful; this would be a massive elephant and she would like to see it changed. She felt Building B could be in the front, and they could break up Building A. They could beautify it so it could be a win-win for everyone.

Maya Drexler expressed support for this project and has lived at this location for almost 14 years. Speaker Drexler noted there were challenges during this process; however, housing was a big need in this community.

Gary Crandall stated they have Studio Crossings on 25 acres with 208 affordable housing units, 100 market-rate units, and 60,000 square feet of commercial space. He stated Studio Crossings has a total of 368 units or 14.72 units per acre. He noted that was the most the Planning Commission would give them. Speaker Crandall stated they also own an affordable housing project at Kimball Junction, and seven of those units are studio apartments. Of those units, approximately half of the units have two occupants. Based on his calculations using the bedroom count, this project would result in occupancy of 870. He noted the applicant proposed 317 units, and on just the Monitor Drive side, there would be 54 units per acre, which would be nearly 3.5 times more than the Planning Commission approved at Studio Crossings. Speaker Crandall could not justify that in his mind and noted there were no complaints at his project, yet there are complaints for this one. He felt it was disingenuous to talk about the surrounding commercial because they were making it sound like they came right up to Monitor Drive. Instead, there are large parking areas. As a result, this project would put the building right on Kearns Boulevard. He echoed the comments of his wife who questioned why everything was shifted to the Monitor Drive side, with very little on the Kearns Boulevard side. He agreed that this was backward.

Speaker Crandall understood that the zoning was changed a few years back, but felt the Planning Commission could change it back to what it needed to be. As a result, he did not agree that certain areas could not be developed. He mentioned that at Studio Crossing, he was

required to install a bus stop on the property. With the location of the bus stop on Monitor Drive, Speaker Crandall stated that every year the bus drivers drive up onto their yard and break their sprinkler systems. He felt that as good neighbors, the City would want a bus stop in the middle of where it would be needed. With regard to the visuals along Monitor Drive, Speaker Crandall understood there was a 25- foot Setback. There would be a three-story high wall, plus the roof and the elevator shaft. Currently, everything along Monitor Drive was one-story. He stated that Park Meadows/Holiday Ranch had a requirement of one house on a minimum of one-acre. Comparing that with 54 units per acre, this project would not even come close to fitting in.

Speaker Crandall represented that the applicant was having problems getting financing, and was throwing all of this density to make the project pencil out. If they have to build this monstrosity to make the project pencil, it did not make sense. He felt this project should go into another part of town. He understood the City owned a lot of property, and questioned why the applicant did not just remodel the current project and build the new units someplace else.

Speaker Crandall met with Applicant Levine, and he understood that the applicant would keep the residents at this new project. He felt there was a wide range of people, and noted there were some residents who could not even get out of their rooms. Speaker Crandall stated that Applicant Levine also stated that the almost 200 new units would be 70- 80% AMI.

Speaker Crandall had the latest sheets showing the income levels for those people at 80%. One person could make up to \$79,360 per year to qualify. The person who makes that amount of money would be able to afford a car. For a two-resident unit, the income requirement jumps to over \$90,000 per year, for three people \$102,000 per year, for four people \$113,000 annually, for five people \$122,000, and for six people \$131,000. He stated these would probably be two workers supporting a family and would likely have 2 – 3 cars.

Speaker Crandall estimated there would likely be around 675 cars in this project. He reiterated his belief that this was a great project; however, it was an over reach. He would like to see the project reduced by approximately 100 units. He would like to see the project stepped up along Monitor Drive and felt that would be an easy design change.

Speaker Crandall also felt it should be mandatory for the developer to install a bus stop on the property. He felt the applicant's statement that they made some changes was ludicrous because they opened up the Kearns side of the project and provided for six cars to park there. He suggested half of the cars access the site via Kearns Boulevard.

Speaker Crandall commented that people who have cars typically go out a couple of times per day. Two trips per day for 675 cars would amount to approximately 2,800 trips, which would be a lot of car movement.

Kristen Schulz spoke in favor of this development and focused on the way that affordable housing affects children. She stated that growing up in decent, affordable homes provided a very powerful effect on children, and studies drew a straight line between the quality, location, and affordability of housing and the child's ability to thrive. On the flip side, when families do not have access to quality affordable homes, it was linked to poor results for children. She noted particularly the parents who were stressed due to inadequate living conditions, were carried down to their children. They also know that families who are forced to move frequently to search for better affordable living situations also struggle. When parents pay too much for their

home, they often deplete financial resources that would otherwise be invested in their children's health, education, and futures.

Speaker Schulz reiterated that safe, stable affordable housing shows fewer health problems, improved school performance, less psychological stress, and more self-assured parents. She strongly believed that HOPA would help all families in town and she hoped the Commission would support this project.

Nancy Mejia [?] reported that she lives in Holiday Village and supported this project. As a single mother of two children, she stated it was stressful to find a good place to live. Her daughter just finished her second year of college, and when she was in high school, she could just walk to school. She stated it was very important for children to have a safe place to live. She understood there were a lot of changes, but people like her cannot afford to buy a house or move to another place. This speaker has lived in Park City for approximately 20 years and raised her children here. People like her really need projects like this.

Angela Moschetta heard a lot of emotional commentary on this project and noted that the comments on the design were subjective. She felt this was one of the most beautiful designs she has seen in Architect Elliott's portfolio. The project also feels good. Speaker Moschetta felt that some of the concerns about occupancy and cars were issues that should be smartly addressed through policy. If the applicant would not propose them, then she would look to the Planning Commission and ultimately City Council. She felt it was absolutely possible to prioritize people who do not have cars. Speaker Moschetta stated that Rory Murphy made some good points during the Homestake discussions, and it was important to him to ensure that parking was provided for those already living there. As part of this project, anyone who would be relocated who has a car would deserve to maintain his or her current lifestyle.

Speaker Moschetta offered that there were plenty of people who would be willing to work locally and not have a car. She felt one of the goals was to create more live/work opportunities and would encourage people to look at the reduced parking and the proliferation of e-bike users in Park City. She commented that other communities were prioritizing e-bikes as a mode of transportation, which would result in less money spent on traditional parking spaces and more on protected, locked, and covered e-bike storage. She felt that much of the discussion was stuck in a decade ago and no one was looking at examples that were working in small and large cities around the world.

Speaker Moschetta fully supported this project. She commented that Park City had multiple neighborhoods, and in between those neighborhoods, there were transitions. She felt it was a ridiculous notion in this community that has a housing crisis that people who live in transition areas want to talk about preserving things like views or meadows.

Hailee Hernandez advised that she works for the Christian Center of Park City and is the Basic Needs Assistant's Data Coordinator. She reported that in the last year, Summit County had over 40 homeless individuals, and the average stays of homeless were longer than three months. Some families were homeless, as well as elderly individuals and domestically abused women.

She noted that Peace House has transitional housing, but that lasts only two years. In two years, people are still on waiting lists for affordable housing. Speaker Hernandez stressed that this project would open up so many doors for people who work and live in Park City. These

people deserve to have a life that is happy and safe and has housing. She urged the Commission to consider approving this project.

John Greenfield talked about some of his travels and mentioned areas near Phoenix. He had heard of this project and noted that these apartments were not great and people were living in basements with children. He agreed these apartments needed to be redone. Speaker Greenfield noted there would be 14% less parking, improved transit infrastructure, and more bike parking. Car share would mean fewer cars on the road. The building would also be energy efficient and would improve the lives of families. This speaker noted the AMI of 45 – 50%, and as low as 25% AMI, which was unheard of. There would be no market-rate units and the project would be totally affordable. He also understood that residents would not be displaced during construction. He mentioned the 84 studio units, which were desperately needed, and noted the potential of prioritizing occupants without cars. Improved security and washers/dryers in the units would be a step up in dignity for the neighbors.

Speaker Greenfield stated that property values would not be affected by affordable housing, and studies confirm that fact. Better housing would increase property values. He stated the playgrounds would be safer and the volume would be below that allowed by Code. The nominal height increase of 8 feet and the increased Setback would be below Code. The fourth-floor amenities would really help create a community within that village and he felt it would transform lives. He felt that improving the ingress and egress made sense.

Speaker Greenfield pointed out that no one asked the Film Studio for a childcare requirement. This speaker expressed confusion about the comments regarding buses and damaging property but felt that the bus stops were closer than ¼ mile. The difference between the Film Studio penciling at 80% AMI and Mountainlands penciling at 45 – 55% AMI is that this would be a completely affordable housing project. The Film Studio was not completely affordable and has 60,000 square feet of commercial which serves as an annuity for anyone who owns that property. There would not be 675 cars parked because there would only be 200-something parking spaces.

Bonnie Park has been a resident of Park City since the late 1970s, and Holiday Village was her first home. She began Basin Recreation in her laundry room in 1996. Speaker Park stated that she has been known as a staunch opponent of the Dakota Pacific project at Kimball Junction. Through that exercise, she studied the value and the need for workforce and affordable housing in Summit County, particularly in Park City. She noted the traffic problems on S.R. 224 and S.R. 248. When she heard about the redevelopment of Holiday Village, she thought it was a great idea. She drives Monitor Drive twice daily and has not witnessed any traffic problems for those coming from Holiday Village onto Monitor Drive.

Speaker Park agreed with Commissioner Kenworthy's comment that this was a fabulous project on many levels. Like Architect Elliott, she tends to carry some of the weight of the community on her shoulders and she has worked with him on other projects. She offered that Architect Elliott has the community at heart and would do the best he could to make this the best project it could be.

Because she drives by this project every day, she could attest to the use of public transit and walkability. The bicycle racks are full. She felt that being bordered by commercial and institutional uses, there was no better place for this project. When she first heard of this project, she felt it would be great if they could increase the density to increase affordable housing.

Speaker Park stated this project was needed, and the City needs this type of housing for the benefit of the real people and the fabric of this community. She liked the creativity of the phasing plan to avoid displacing residents. Speaker Park offered that they should not underestimate the potential for in-home daycare provided by the residents themselves. In the past, she could not afford daycare and worked with other mothers to provide daycare amongst themselves.

Flor Ambario expressed support for this project. She felt that everyone could agree that Park City was heaven on earth; however, for some members of this community, it has not always felt that way. Her earliest memory of Holiday Village was when she was 7 years old and had to climb out of a window in the winter with two trash bags after her family was kicked out because they were not allowed to live there. Because her mother was single and was a young immigrant, her mother spent time couch surfing in Park City and was unable to take care of her for 7 years. The speaker stated that a similar transition happened when her younger sister was born, and their mother had to sleep in her car during the winter.

Speaker Ambario stressed that affordable housing was invaluable and important. Knowing that this property would be affordable for years to come, and hold people and families together was very important. Many of these families come from a trauma-based background, and to be able to live in a city that feels safe and surrounded by nature was very important and shows future generations there is an opportunity to grow.

Sophie Elliott stated she has lived in Park City since she was a little girl, and has been teaching in Park City for over 10 years. She has a background in early childhood development. She expressed support for this project. Speaker Elliott has spent a lot of time in this complex over the past 20 years. She mentioned Lisa and Shay Stickrod as one of the original residents of Holiday Village. She was blown away that anyone in the community would oppose this project. As far as childcare, she did not believe it made sense to focus on having in-house childcare available and felt it would not be the best utilization of the space. She felt the space should be focused on maximizing the number of people who could live there in a comfortable way.

Speaker Elliott felt the discussion about the road missed the point because that was not where the traffic was coming from. She questioned why they would try to cut vehicles for this demographic. Based on her years of driving in and out of this project, it was not an issue for traffic. With regard to the building heights, she also questioned those concerns. She noted that they have been blowing up the mountains and taking the trailheads to put in hotels. When it comes to the most marginalized people in Park City, some people now want to raise these concerns.

Speaker Elliott stated the traffic and the number of cars were not the problem. By putting a bus on site, they would take away space for apartments and open space. If they want the housecleaners, teachers, waiters, and ski patrollers who serve the community, she questioned why anyone would oppose this project. She understood that the current residents were all very excited about this project.

Diego Zegarra expressed support for this project and echoed the comments of others who support this project.

Megan McKenna advised that she is the Housing Advocate for the Housing Resources Center at Mountainlands Community Housing Trust. She supported the project and mentioned that she

attended the Wasatch Back Economic Summit, and the theme that kept coming up was housing, the workforce, and childcare. At the Housing Resource Center, they believe that housing solutions were childcare solutions, traffic solutions, workforce solutions, and climate solutions. Speaker McKenna stressed that this project highlighted all of those points. She commented that this was the prime location for density in the community. When she is asked to support projects, she weighs the community benefit versus the cost. She stated it was refreshing to support a project that she 100% supports.

Speaker McKenna actually pushed for more density and having the fourth floor. She thanked the Planning Department for providing a sign language interpreter for one of the residents at Holiday Village.

Jeff Ladd reported that he is a resident of Park Meadows. He appreciated the Commission's concern for safety and traffic flow. He also appreciated the developer's responsiveness to the concerns expressed by the Commissioners and the community. This speaker commutes to work every day on Monitor Drive and has not waited for more than one light cycle. This project was such an incredible community need and felt that if he was put out even slightly by this project, it was worth it. Sometimes other community members need to step up to create the type of community they all want to live in.

Andre Dumas expressed support for this project. He stated that affordable housing would not negatively impact property values. With respect to the absence of safe courtyards along Kearns Boulevard, he mentioned Treasure Mountain. He commented that the applicant was not hitting the maximum capacity, and did not request any exceptions. With regards to the AMI, people in Park City have to make at least \$220,000 per year to afford a house. He suggested entering the project from Monitor Drive and exiting onto Kearns Boulevard.

Ed Parigian could not connect via Zoom.

Angelica Espinoza stated she is a long-time member of Park City. She supported the redevelopment project, and she felt that promoting affordable housing would achieve several outcomes such as allowing people to live closer to their workplace, reducing commute times, and improving work/life balance. Speaker Espinoza also felt it would create a more equitable and inclusive community. She was a resident of Holiday Village for over 10 years and felt it was a needed housing development. She asked the Commission to support the HOPA project and pay it forward in strengthening the community as a whole and improving the quality of life for everyone in the city.

Sue Banerjee supported the project. She is the Executive Director of PC Tots and employs 25 people in Park City. Only three of their teachers live in Park City and Summit County, and the others commute from the valley or neighboring counties. She felt it would be helpful for the workforce to have housing so they would not need to commute and add to traffic. Speaker Banerjee did not want the perfect to be the enemy of the good and felt there was no place where everyone would support the project. She felt this was a good thing for the workforce. Housing, childcare, and transportation are all issues that go hand in hand and affect the community.

There was no further public comment. Chair Suesser closed the public hearing.

After a short recess, Chair Suesser asked applicant Levine if he wanted to respond to any of the public comments. Applicant Levine stated he had no comments on the public input.

Chair Suesser would like to see the plans for the bus pull out for both sides of the street on Monitor Drive. She felt it was important and should be incorporated into this project. She felt it would encourage bus ridership. She expressed disappointment that the applicant had not entered into an agreement with the commercial businesses on Kearns Boulevard regarding overflow parking. She felt that if they had overflow parking available during construction, she could not see why it could not be made available in the event it would be needed in the future.

Chair Suesser wanted to know the location of the four bus stops nearby. Architect Elliott stated there were two stops on Monitor Drive and two on Kearns Boulevard on the same side of the street as the project. With respect to the driveway that comes in off Kearns Boulevard, Architect Elliott advised that the driveway goes into the parking structure for the Kensington Investments property. Chair Suesser echoed the prior comments about having a second access off or onto Kearns Boulevard to help alleviate the traffic on Monitor Drive.

Chair Suesser asked if the City bike-share program would be incorporated near this project.

Commissioner Van Dine followed Chair Suesser's comments regarding the entrance on Kearns Boulevard and agreed with Commissioner Johnson's suggestion of having an access way that could be used in the future. She wondered about the Utah Department of Transportation's ("UDOT") requirements for ingress and egress to the project via Kearns Boulevard and imagined that UDOT would not allow left turns out of the project.

Based on her experience, Commissioner Van Dine stated that there was not a traffic issue on Monitor Drive. She felt that many cars stayed at the project.

Commissioner Hall assumed about the parking in the Frontage Protection Zone along Kearns Boulevard during construction. Assistant Director Ward stated that during the first phase of construction, that parking would be used. She noted that the question in the Staff Report was whether the Commission found a basis in the record for requiring the additional 20 parking spaces. She explained that if those spaces were required, they complied with the Frontage Protection Zone.

Commissioner Hall stated that considering there was an existing parking lot, that would support not requiring a Conditional Use Permit as an exception per the LMC for a minor improvement. She was agreeable with more use of the Frontage Protection Zone, because there were structures within the 100 feet adjacent to it, and it was currently a parking lot. She would support a community garden as suggested by Commissioner Johnson during the last meeting. Assuming the bullet points for the Sustainability measures and Significant Vegetation were incorporated as Conditions of Approval, she was satisfied with those two components.

Commissioner Hall felt a reduction in parking was warranted based on the Staff Report, the Traffic Study, and the Parking Plan. She felt the applicant could have been more aggressive in terms of requesting a parking reduction based on the number of bike stalls, the car share and motorcycle parking, use of transit and paratransit, the demographic, and the focus on prioritizing non-car occupants. She felt the parking reduction met LMC criteria. She would like more information from the City Engineer on the access off Kearns Boulevard. Commissioner Hall

liked Commissioner Johnson's suggestion and noted that most would likely prefer to use the Monitor Drive exit.

Commissioner Hall asked about a bus pull-out along Monitor Drive. Architect Elliott stated that they were not currently showing a bus pull out, but was showing a place for the installation of an improved bus shelter. They pulled the sidewalk back from the edge of the street to make it safer along that edge. He added that they have had preliminary discussions with Transit and Public Works, and the City had not moved forward with pullouts. Assistant Director Ward confirmed there was a follow-up meeting on this issue. Commissioner Hall suggested putting the bus stop in front of Building E as there was potentially more space in that location. Commissioner Hall asked about the height of The Mark. She would like to see a designated child or community room that was geared towards children as an alternative to having an onsite childcare provider.

Commissioner Frontero thought through his comments on childcare and asked the applicant to provide the closest 4 – 5 childcare providers. He would like to solve it on-site but understood the complications in doing so. He wanted to understand what facilities would be close by. He was agreeable with reduced parking and felt the mitigations provided supported the reduction. Aside from the current residents, he understood that there would be a priority for those who do not own a car.

Commissioner Frontero felt the Sustainability was terrific if it were completed and part of the Conditions of Approval. He sought clarification on the Energy Use Intensity and the goal of 25 for these units. Architect Elliott stated he would confer with the mechanical group regarding that specific requirement. He noted that the buildings they design always come in under the requirements. Architect Elliott stated the submittal requires the project to meet Energy Star and all of the underlying Code requirements, and they almost always surpass them.

Commissioner Frontero understood it would not be a burden to Condition this project to be all-electric buildings, since the applicant was already implementing that.

Commissioner Kenworthy liked to look at these projects from both the LMC, but also the return on investment for the community. He felt the financial component was one of the easiest things to compare. He focused on the quality of life and felt that the quality of life in this project had the potential to be wonderful. He liked the discussion regarding the parking mitigations, but he could not yet comment on the additional 20 parking spaces because the occupancy was still fuzzy. He noted on Homestake, the issue of occupancy was fuzzy until the last day.

Commissioner Kenworthy urged the applicant to be honest about occupancy and questioned whether the LMC provided the Planning Commission the authority to Condition the project. He stressed that these were issues they had to address transparently and wanted to know if the mitigations were for occupancy of 400 or 800.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated that based on the mitigation and the occupancy presented, he would not need the extra 20 spaces. He wanted them to be more transparent with the holistic picture. The other mitigations that are not in the LMC, such as Richardson Flat or what could be coming at Iron Horse, he felt a community parking lot could solve a lot of different problems. The community solutions could affect so many developments, and he would like to be aware of the temperature of the City Council for these types of solutions that could serve the City well.

With regard to in-home daycare, Commissioner Kenworthy felt that a community space would be critical. There would likely be a substantial number of children and a substantial number of adults who could spend some time watching not only their children but others as well. He referenced the comments about sharing childcare within the community. He felt there was plenty of space to have a roomful of toys and an area where children could be supervised.

Commissioner Kenworthy suggested they work together as a community and figure this out. He stated he would not give up on trying to figure out a way to help with daycare when they would be adding substantial numbers to the community. With the other projects, they would be a community of 8,500 people, which would be a substantial primary resident mover. He commented that three projects would result in a 25% increase in primary residents. He asked if City Council had those discussions with the public, and stressed they would have 7 -10 projects coming before them that would pencil. These projects must go side by side with transportation.

Commissioner Kenworthy agreed with looking at an entrance/exit on Kearns Boulevard. He referenced the discussions with Commissioner Sigg from six months ago that they wanted to make sure that the Traffic Studies had a baseline. He wanted to see this applicant address those baselines.

City Engineer, John Robertson stated they received the draft of the Traffic Study Guidelines and would bring it to the Planning Commission at the end of June. He noted they would be discussing Transportation on this project during that meeting. He stated that they had given the applicant the counts they proposed to use as a standard, and he understood that their proposal would be consistent with what Staff would present on June 28th. Commissioner Kenworthy requested to see that information before he leaves.

Commissioner Kenworthy expressed his belief that Architect Elliott gets the importance of this project, and it shows. He felt this project would be tremendous and where they can be more sensitive to the neighbors, they should be. He wanted to see the real occupancy numbers from a legal standpoint and then see what they could do with Conditions of Approval.

Chair Suesser agreed that she would like an understanding regarding the occupancy and how it compared with occupancy projections in a resort town in a multi-family unit development. She wanted to make sure the data would apply to Park City, its seasonal workers, and winter resort living.

In response to an inquiry regarding Traffic discussions, Assistant Director Ward advised that the Traffic Study was included as an exhibit as part of the April 26th packet. In the preparation of that Traffic Study, they did work to obtain the baseline numbers. She added that the City hired a third-party consultant to review the Traffic Study and provide input during the June 28th public hearing. She commented that Hales Engineering prepared the Traffic Study, but she was unaware of the third-party consultant. It was noted that the City for the third party review hired WCG.

Given the volume of people added to this development, Chair Suesser kept looking at the corner of Kearns Boulevard and wondered whether they would need improved pedestrian crossings or potentially a tunnel at that location to connect to Prospector. She hears frequently that buses stopping in the street cause a lot of congestion, and this project would be a prime location where a pull-out would be appropriate. Architect Elliott reiterated that they showed it initially, but had not yet heard back from the City.

Commissioner Sigg commented that this was a project that everyone has become used to being there, and he applauded the applicant for their responsiveness and collaboration to address the concerns expressed by the Commission. He referenced the applicant's willingness to address some of the issues such as occupancy, and the potential for a second layout for the garage. With regards to the Frontage Protection Zone, he liked backing things off of Kearns Boulevard, but he was not opposed to parking or other utility in that area.

Commissioner Sigg observed that many times they were in a situation where they are compromising and horse-trading things that they do not want to give for things that they need to get. He felt this was a rare example where they were not being forced into a position to do that. He stressed that this project was 100% what the community needed and the applicant has done a good job in creating green space through the subterranean parking. He also felt the bio-swale feature was a fantastic idea. There was a sense of place and gathering. Commissioner Sigg felt that access onto Kearns Boulevard by a right turn would help people get out of the project in the morning. He asked the applicant if they obtained approval from the Fire Marshal on the plan. Architect Elliott reported that they met with the Fire District 2 – 3 times, which helped to shape this version of the plan. He explained that by reducing the height, they would not need the drive lanes around the buildings.

Commissioner Sigg observed that they were in a position of some degree of comfort because they are not horse-trading for something that they do not ideologically believe in, such as Nightly Rentals. He expressed that he could stand behind this project, and described it as a “feel good” project. Commissioner Sigg highlighted that this project was in a transitional zone and made sense in terms of walkability and reduction in parking. He also liked the fact there were no parking lots and felt that they would not see the impacts of the cars. He felt the buildings were providing a need and would improve the green space through that area.

Commissioner Johnson echoed many of the prior comments and asked to see more bike parking or more equitable bike parking between buildings. He noted Buildings A and D only had 8, whereas Buildings F and G had 30 spaces. He felt that the bike parking would help them with the parking reduction. He reiterated his suggestion of a community garden. Commissioner Johnson felt the project was moving along nicely.

Chair Suesser stated she would not oppose a reduction in the height of Buildings B and E, and an increase in height for Building F. She felt that could appease public concerns. Commissioner Hall felt they could add density to Building F without making it higher because they were already providing more than the required open space per the LMC.

MOTION: Commissioner Hall moved to CONTINUE the public hearing on 2200 Monitor Drive to June 28, 2023. Commissioner Kenworthy seconded the motion.

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

- B. Land Management Code Amendments – Lot Combinations – The Planning Commission will Review Pending Ordinance on Lot Combinations for Residential Development in the Historic Residential-1, Historic Residential-2, Historic Residential Low-Density, and Historic Residential Medium Zoning Districts.**

There was discussion regarding continuing the next item to a date uncertain. Commissioner Van Dine moved to continue to a date uncertain.

Assistant Director Ward introduced Senior Historic Preservation Planner, Caitlyn Tubbs and City Planner, Olivia Cvetko. She advised that for this meeting, they would provide the Commission with a background on what was in the Code, what modifications were made, what was in the General Plan, and what was issued for the Pending Ordinance.

Assistant Director Ward explained that they issued a Pending Ordinance on May 10, 2023, that established a Maximum Lot Size for residential development in the Historic Residential Zoning Districts. The Maximum Lot Size for a Single-Family Dwelling was two Old Town Lots, with an exception for Historic Sites. There were also minimums in those zones that allow for Duplexes and Triplexes. She stated that applications submitted before May 10th were subject to the current Code. Applications submitted during the Pending Ordinance would be subject to the two-Lot Maximum for a Single Family Dwelling.

When this item was first presented to the Historic Preservation Board ("HPB") in a Work Session, there was a lot of community interest in these amendments. There have been some meetings with stakeholders, community members, and property owners, and some of the initial input was to consider criteria for compatible infill that would reflect modern living, mitigating impacts like increased vehicles in neighborhoods, parking, and snow shedding.

Additionally, the input included addressing existing Master Planned Developments and Subdivisions, and the resulting Non-Conforming status of Lots previously combined. Additionally, there was discussion of taking into consideration construction impacts and staging and allowing for flexibility for unusual Lot configurations and Rights-of-Way.

Assistant Director Ward explained that in the 1990 Code, there was a Floor Area Ratio established, and in 1995 the Floor Area Ratio was revised. At that time, some of the impacts they were looking to mitigate included encouraging the construction of structures that were in keeping with the historic scale of other structures within the district and providing disincentives for structures that are out of scale.

With regard to the Floor Area Ratio, there were concerns about design limitations that could lead to prominent garages along the street front, snow-shedding issues between properties, height, parking, and construction impacts. She stated there was a two-year period where the Historic District Commission and Planning Commission worked through revisions to the Code and refined the Floor Area Ratio. In 1995, revisions were enacted that led to the current Code, which established a Maximum Building Footprint formula that is applied to the square footage of the Lot.

Assistant Director Ward explained that as the Lot size increases, the Maximum Building Footprint decreases as shown in the table presented to the Commission. She expressed that the LMC provided examples of Maximum Building Footprint for a combination of various Lot sizes. The table presented showed examples of Lot Width, Lot Area Square Footage, and Maximum Building Footprint. There is a current cap of not exceeding 18,750 square feet. She explained that in the Historic Residential Zones, the Code does not just allow residential uses, and some outlier properties for municipal facilities would be on larger Lots.

Planner Tubbs stated that historically, the development pattern in Old Town was much smaller homes on much smaller lots than they typically see in new construction areas. When miners came into Park City, they would come into work, and work quickly. As a result, homes were constructed quickly and often would just sit on the dirt or stack stone foundations. They were typically only one or two rooms. That is not the prevailing building pattern they see today.

The LMC and the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites look to preserve that development pattern and encourage buildings of a much smaller scale and massing than the typical infill construction they see in other parts of the City. Planner Tubbs stated the first standards listed in the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and within the Universal Guidelines have to do with mass, scale, and prevailing development patterns along the streetscape.

Additionally, in the General Plan adopted in 2014, Planner Tubbs advised that it encouraged the preservation of mass and scaling in these neighborhoods, as well as basing the development patterns of infill construction on the historic development patterns. Both goals and objectives were outlined in the General Plan and were intended to preserve this historic development pattern.

Planner Tubbs noted that the Community Planning Strategy encourages the City to consider Maximum Lot Sizes in Old Town to support the development of new structures of a comparable and compatible mass and scale.

Planner Tubbs explained that through the Sanborn Maps, from 1889 through 2012 they started with narrow Lots whose depth extended three times the width. These resulted in the standard Park City Lot of 25' x 75'. As time went on, lots and parcels under the same ownership were allowed to be combined and homes would often encroach or straddle property lines if the two Lots were held in common ownership.

Planner Cvetko explained that they looked at Summit County Parcel Data to look at what existed on the ground today. When they pulled all of the Historic and Landmark residential parcels in each of the zones, the average parcel size across all districts was approximately 2.36 Old Town Lots.

The non-Historic designated Lots located in the Historic Districts decreased to an overall average of 2.23 Old Town Lots. Assistant Director Ward reported that when this went before the HPB, there were community members who attended the City Council meeting the following evening to provide input. The City Council directed Staff to look for opportunities for incentives or some other way to require an affordable Accessory Apartment when Lot Combinations exceeded a certain size. For example, they could potentially allow for a three-Lot Combination, if there was some sort of deed-restricted affordable unit required as part of that approval. She explained that Staff requested input on any additional information that would be helpful for the Commission in the evaluation of Lot Combinations, the issues the Commission was looking to address through these amendments and additional considerations the Commission would like to discuss in future meetings.

Assistant Director Ward advised that this item was scheduled for a public hearing this evening. Another public hearing was scheduled for July 12th, and a third public hearing was scheduled for August 23, 2023.

Chair Suesser opened the public hearing.

Angela Moschetta stated that she was not sure that anyone appeared before the Planning Commission or City Council specifically to oppose Lot Combinations and Plat Amendments as consistently as she has. She wondered who the community members and stakeholders identified in the Staff Report as having been consulted in support of the proposed ordinance. She offered that surely, no one was consulted who had the necessary understanding of effective Zoning and Land Use Policy, as it fails locally and worked elsewhere. She noted that this Commission recently demanded to prioritize Lot Combination LMC Amendments. She was disappointed that the entire foundation provided for the Commission's discussion was inadequate, outdated, and devoid of high-level policy thinking.

Speaker Moschetta referenced Goal 15 in the Park City General Plan which was to "preserve the integrity, mass, scale, compatibility, and historic fabric of the nationally and locally designated historic resources and districts for future generations." She added that the General Plan stated "While the uses within these districts may evolve, the built-in environment of the local Historic Districts should stay true to its architectural roots, specifically relative to the integrity, mass, scale, and historic fabric of the Mining Boom Era."

Speaker Moschetta stated that discussion of character was both dangerous and subjective, and would also miss the mark, starting with the failures of the HPB and Code. She stated that one only needed to walk on Deer Valley Drive to witness the abominations classified as historic preservation. Historic preservation is this community's euphemism for gentrification. To understand the impacts of gentrification, she stated that one only needed to walk Historic Residential Districts 1, 2, and Low. She commented that historic façades now front McMansions, infill development was gargantuan, and on top of neighbors, causing snow shed issues.

Speaker Moschetta added that few residents live year-round, and neither current nor future Park City generations without the benefit of generational wealth could even dream of affording life in Old Town the way Mining Boom Era laborers once did. She commented that every awarded Lot Combination and Plat Amendment was immediately followed by a development application or "for sale" listing. Lot Combinations promoted luxury development; they do not support the historical character, nature, or lifestyle of the Mining Era. She stated that the character of this community and others like it had been eroded because of real estate speculation as people of means decided to make real estate their wealth accumulation strategy.

The character of the Mining Boom Era that they ought to protect in Old Town was not limited to porches, gables, paint colors, and building size; rather, it should include a way of life where people walked to work, and their friends, their mail, the bar, and the corner grocer. Speaker Moschetta observed that the Staff Report cited the Floor Area Ratio Ordinance created in 1990, and amended in 1995, almost 40 years ago. On account of parasitic real estate practices, including Nightly Rentals, Timeshares, and Fractional Ownership, as well as ski resort consolidation, past programs, inflation, and a pandemic, there was an undeniable housing crisis of epic proportions.

She stated that the last version of the General Plan perhaps could not have foreseen some of these forces, but they could see them now. She wondered why anyone would think the Land Use Regulations do not need to be entirely overhauled in Old Town. She stressed that Floor

Area Ratio limits were not enough; they needed to cap overall square footage and promote more small development on smaller lots.

Speaker Moschetta referenced page 4 of the Staff Report that “current Land Use Regulations encourage Lot Combinations to reduce overall density in the Historic Residential 1, 2 and Low Districts.” She noted that in July 2006, the City Council adopted an ordinance to encourage Lot Combinations and to mitigate infill development on larger Lots. She stated the housing crisis was the product of a supply and demand problem in that demand for rich people’s income-generating housing far exceeds the workforce’s supply. They would not build their way out of the affordable housing crisis with taxpayer funds or public/private partnerships, nor would they Band-Aid a lack of childcare with a \$2 million investment, nor would they support a declining middle class with subsidies.

Speaker Moschetta posited that everyone was into Band-Aid solutions through which the very people and industries driving Park City’s problems get to offer false, tax-deductible solutions while their lifestyles and values keep perpetuating the problems to their own benefit. She suggested that the solution was a big, bold policy change. They should not allow a property owner to combine two lots, demolish a house and only replace it with one. Lot Combinations were antithetical to the community values; they need to upzone and promote density by way of Accessory Dwelling Units (“ADUs”), multi-family, and Lot Subdivisions. They need to use existing housing stock and residential Lots to shift the balance between supply and demand. If they could dramatically increase supply by reducing the likelihood of parasitic real estate practices, then they could change the economics of Old Town in a few years. Prices would not decline, but they would stabilize, and it would bolster a relative middle class.

She added that stricter licensing requirements for Nightly Rentals would organically return some properties to the year-round rental market, and then they could focus the affordable housing on the 84060 working class. Where Staff proposed that the “Pending Ordinance establishes a baseline for the Planning Commission discussions,” Speaker Moschetta opined that the baseline was not even drawn in the ballpark. She urged those on the Commission and on Staff who truly care about Park City as a complete community to do better and stop propping up decades-old planning concepts that eroded this town and stop recycling policy that does not work. She asked the Commission and Staff to use their vision and position to introduce bold policy change that might make a long-term difference, not merely address a singular need inside a vacuum.

Speaker Moschetta also requested the Commission demand a moratorium on all development in Park City. The Planning Commission remains overwhelmed, and the Planning Department was without a Director. Taxpayers were owed the most efficient service of the Code consultant hired by the City, and they must push pause on new applications.

Ed Parigian was unable to connect. Chair Suesser stated they would take his comments at the next public hearing on Lot Combinations.

There was no further public comment. Chair Suesser closed the public hearing for this meeting with the understanding that it would be continued to July 12, 2023.

Commissioner Sigg asked how the zones were established for this review, and noted that he could think of an instance that was not in any of these zones where someone was trying to go the opposite direction. He mentions the Recreation Commercial (“RC”) zone that has very

similar characteristics, but they happen to be in a different zone. He noted that many of these properties were smaller and would not lend themselves to a multi-family situation. He asked if this should be expanded into other zones where they have similar characteristics of housing, and he expressed concern that they were leaving out some areas.

Commissioner Hall liked the idea of the affordable ADU and would support a further discussion on creative options as to how they could make that work. She would also request no Nightly Rental use of the primary dwelling. With regard to existing unusual lot configurations, Commissioner Hall stated that she was concerned with placing a maximum and suggested having an exception for not creating remnant parcels. She noted they have had a number of unusual Lots come before the Commission.

Commissioner Frontero struggled with the wording “encouraging Lot Combinations.” When they look at Plat Amendments, Staff invariably inserts that wording as part of good cause, and he believed that wording was an error and should be immediately removed. He noted there was no other language in the LMC that encouraged Lot Combinations. The Historic District Design Review (“HDDR”) does not encourage Lot Combinations, and in fact, it states the opposite when it states to keep the scale and mass of Old Town. He expressed that Goal 15 of the General Plan, as pointed out by Speaker Moschetta, was the opposite of encouraging Lot Combinations; rather, it encouraged single 25’ x 75’ lots.

Chair Suesser agreed with Commissioner Frontero’s comments and suggestion, and requested Staff to address the language in LMC Section 15-2.2-1(D), which includes “encourages Single-Family development on combinations of 25’ x 75’ Historic Lots.” She stated the Commission had struggled with that language multiple times and requested suggestions on either removing it or clarifying it so that it would be consistent with the Design Guidelines in Section 15-13-8. She felt that it was clear that Section 15-13-8 and the General Plan were what was intended with respect to Historic Lot Combinations. Chair Suesser did not agree that the current Code encouraged Historic Lot Combinations.

Chair Suesser felt it was important that they maintain flexibility with regard to Lot Line adjustments that had not been platted, or where homes were built over Lot lines. She was not opposed to combining two Historic Lots and felt that was part of the pattern and grid of Old Town at this point; however, beyond two Lot Combinations, they get out of the scale and character of the Historic District. She disagreed that they should consider allowing Lot Combinations so that a Single-Family home could be built over three Historic Lots as long as it included an ADU.

Commissioner Kenworthy agreed and felt the question was one of scale within the Historic District. He expressed that this area of Park City is the City’s economic driver, and makes the City different from everyone else. He felt there was no way that a scale of over 50’ worked for him. He noted the Report that stated the Code encouraged Lot Combinations to reduce overall density, and he did not agree. He noted on his street there were 10,000 square foot houses on three Lots. They were not taking away landowner’s rights; rather they would be maintaining the history of Park City that is so valuable.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated that everywhere else in town they could build on big lots, so why throw the scale of Old Town off. He wanted to do everything they could do to protect the scale of Old Town and did not believe the goal was to reduce overall density. He referenced Speaker Moschetta’s suggestion of a moratorium and recalled a year ago they unanimously felt

the City should have taken a six-month break. He would seriously consider that especially given what they were seeing with their Code and the precedents they were set with these new projects.

Commissioner Johnson agreed with many of the comments. He asked that when this item comes back that they also address the Steep Slope and Excavation because he felt the site disturbance on Historic Lots related to Lot Combinations might be relevant to take into account. He asked if they could move LMC Amendments to the front of the agenda. Assistant Director Ward explained that the consensus among the Commission last fall was to put the LMC Amendments at the end of the agendas. If the Commission would like that changed moving forward, they could evaluate that.

Chair Suesser noted that tonight's Agenda went much longer than anticipated.

Assistant Director Ward summarized that there appeared to be consensus for a two-Lot maximum Lot Combination with exceptions for the outlier properties. There was also an interest in exploring the RC Zone for Single-Family Dwellings on the perimeter of the Historic Residential Zones. As there was a split on potential incentives for ADUs that would be deed-restricted and affordable, Assistant Director Ward stated they could provide more information at the July 12th discussion.

Staff would also clarify and update the Purpose sections of the Code. She noted that in some communities, Minimum Lot Sizes were required for development on Steep Slopes, and she suggested there could possibly be an exception for properties on Steep Slopes. They could look at the overlap between Lot Combinations and Steep Slopes criteria.

Commissioner Johnson noted there was still shoring being done on non-Steep Slopes in Historic Residential-1. He would like to address site disturbance in general, whether or not it involved a Steep Slope.

Chair Suesser agreed given that Steep Slopes have to have a 50' horizontal impact. Assistant Director Ward stated they could have those clarifications with regard to the Sensitive Land Overlay and Steep Slope regulations, as well as the Historic Residential Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit criteria.

Commissioner Hall stated she would support the Planning Commission having the final say on Plat Amendments or Boundary Adjustments, or have them moved to Administrative review. If they were going to limit what an applicant could do, she would be in favor of having the Commission be the final decision-maker or having it be Administrative.

Commissioner Hall noted they were significantly decreasing the allowable Maximum Lot size. City Attorney Harrington observed that some Commissioners had a very clear policy goal with regard to the one sentence, and Staff could provide further history. He did not believe that sentence was a mistake and they could provide examples of the reasoning behind the language. Staff's intent was to provide the history; they were not advocating retaining that language.

City Attorney Harrington noted this was a small step towards increased density, which is why it would not present a takings challenge. Staff needs to understand what the Commission wants to encourage, they need to spend some time collectively on what problem they would solve with

these amendments. If it was consistent with the streetscape, that would be very different than what was being advocated in terms of out-of-the-box solutions for affordable housing and increased density.

Chair Suesser advocated for better streetscapes. City Attorney Harrington stated they did not want any unintended consequences, and he mentioned subdivisions in Old Town that were not 25' x 75' Lots and would not comport with these new maximums. The Commission would have to be very deliberate as to whether it wants to open the door for these owners to re-subdivide within the new Subdivision Standards.

City Attorney Harrington stated that conversely if the Commission stated that they did not care about the historic build-out pattern and looked at it as an affordable housing policy, Staff must know that because it would present a different exercise. If the Commission wanted Staff to come back with options to add density to Old Town, that would be a different exercise. He stressed that they needed to be clear on what they want Staff to do, and stated that Staff would be happy to provide the requested information.

Chair Suesser agreed that given the value of the Lots in Old Town, as much as she liked the idea of trying to provide more density and more affordability, she felt it would be cost-prohibitive.

City Attorney Harrington stated it was not fair for Staff to be criticized when the Commission directed them one way, and the public expected something different.

Commissioner Sigg offered that the concept of less density conflicted with the historic nature and tried to keep the preservation of Old Town. He felt it was a philosophical question of whether they wanted fewer people or smaller houses that might have more people. The Commission should get its arms around that before anything else because they were conflicting ideas.

Commissioner Hall stated the streetscape was important for her, and having a more densely populated Old Town with more consistent streets was desirable. She also liked the affordable housing component because even if they go to 25' x 75' she did not think that someone would build an affordable Single-Family Dwelling or Duplex on any new Lot. If they were to encourage affordable housing, Lot Combinations would be a way to introduce them to Old Town. Chair Suesser asked if Commissioner Hall would be concerned about the streetscape, and Commissioner Hall responded that would be the topic of discussion as part of the application.

Commissioner Hall proposed that the strict parameters be made conditional and for things such as unusual Lot sizes or affordable housing, they could have a real discussion.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked the Commission if they were concerned with the streetscape and scale, and there was consensus. He was open to hearing about new tools, and he agreed that they did not want less density by combining 10 Lots. In order to protect the magic of Old Town, he felt it all started with the streetscape and not having 10,000 square-foot homes.

Commissioner Sigg stated that reducing scale potentially mitigates the State's indication that every house on the street could be a Timeshare. This was part of Chair Suesser's concern with what someone could do with more than two Lots.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated they do not want these fractional homes taking over; rather, they want to protect the streetscapes.

Commissioner Frontero asked about the moratorium. Assistant Director Ward stated that was not part of the discussion on Lot Combinations.

MOTION: Commissioner Hall moved to CONTINUE Land Management Code Amendments – Lot Combinations – to July 12, 2023. Commissioner Frontero seconded the motion.

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

7. WORK SESSION

- A. Land Management Code Amendments – Steep Slope and Excavation Standards – The Planning Commission will Review Steep Slope and Excavation Standards for the Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit, Sensitive Land Overlay, and Master Planned Development Reviews. PL-23-05657.**

This item was continued to a date uncertain.

8. ADJOURN

MOTION: Commissioner Kenworthy moved to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 10:17 p.m.