PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
FEBRUARY 26, 2020

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair John Phillips, John Kenworthy, Laura Suesser, Doug Thimm, Christin Van Dine

EX OFFICIO: Planning Director Bruce Erickson; Hannah Tyler, Planner; Caitlyn Barhorst, Planner; Rebecca Ward, Planner; Alexandra Ananth; Planner; Elizabeth Jackson, Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

===

ROLL CALL

Chair Phillips called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present except for Commissioners Hall and Sletten, who were excused.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February 12, 2020

MOTION: Commissioner Thimm moved to APPROVE the Minutes of February 12, 2020 as written. Commissioner Suesser seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Carol Sletta, a resident at 135 Sampson Avenue, commented on the Alice Claim CUP scheduled on the March agenda. Ms. Sletta stated that she has followed this project for more than ten years. She has attended meetings and provided input on why the project was not good for this Old Town neighborhood. She noted that the project was finally approved, and while disappointed, she moved on and accepted that the City was in charge of watching over this project. Ms. Sletta stated that when Advanced Shoring constructed a wall on the west side of the entry to the project this Fall, she thought the wall appeared too high. She assumed the location was based on the stamped approved plans that the City provided to the developer. Ms. Sletta remarked that the wall was actually placed where the developer wanted it and not according to the approved plans. The developer was now asking the City for forgiveness and for a CUP to leave the wall where it was built. Ms. Sletta questioned how this could happen and whether the property was not properly surveyed. She also wanted to know what plans Advanced Shoring used when they constructed the wall.

Ms. Sletta noted that Alliance Engineering had provided a letter to the City indicating that the location of the wall is better than the location shown on the approved plans. Ms. Sletta thought the message is that the developer can dictate what is best for the City and feel empowered to override approved plans. Ms. Sletta stated that one of the items in the letter from Alliance Engineering mentioned widening the intersection, which is what the developer wanted to do from the beginning. She pointed out that wider is not better in historic Old town. They want to keep the character of this neighborhood and asked that the City to keep the street and the intersection as it exists. Wider encourages faster driving. Ms. Sletta remarked that the Alliance Engineering letter argues that a wider street would be helpful for larger vehicles. She agrees that big fire trucks need to navigate Old Town neighborhoods, and they been able to do that since the roads were built.

Ms. Sletta remarked that the City must not be too concerned about the safety of the intersection, because the stop sign disappeared at the corner where the wall was built and it has not been replaced. She stated that when the developer was working on another project at the end of Sampson Avenue, the stop sign at the corner of Sampson and Upper Norfolk was also removed and that sign has never been replaced.

Ms. Sletta requested that the City leave the Old Town streets the way they were constructed and keep the character of Old Town as much as possible. Ms. Sletta noted that this was just the beginning of this project. The developer has already requested an extension for recording the lots, and now the CUP for the misplaced wall. She was concerned for what would come next. Ms. Sletta stated that she was depending on the City to oversee this project to ensure it is built according to the approved plans. It took many years to approve this project and it must be built as approved.

STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Erickson reported that the Planning Department would be providing Staff communication to the City Council on the ideas that come out of this meeting and the meeting on March 25th. Michelle Downard will provide an update on the Task Force at the same time.

WORK SESSION

<u>Staff will present a working list of pending and future Land Management Code amendments to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission will discuss and provide staff with recommendations. Staff will return on March 25, 2020 for a follow-up work session to discuss Land Management Code amendments in terms of future prioritization, phasing, and a work plan</u>.

Director Erickson reported on concerns regarding the relationship of the LMC work to the General Plan. The Staff will listen to the comments this evening and come back with a prioritization schedule. If the Planning Commission would like to readjust the schedule in the Staff report, they should make that change this evening.

Director Erickson noted that the Senior Planners were present this evening. Planner Jackson would be taking notes to reflect the Commissioner's comments. The Staff will use those notes to compile the information and come back on March 25th with a prioritized list for moving forward.

Director Erickson stated that most of what is ongoing now has been vetted through the General Plan. The next step is for the Planning Commission to triangulate a coherent policy for the future based on the results of the City Council's Vision 2020, changes in the General Plan, and the LMC.

Director Erickson reported that there have been requests for General Plan information and updates, and the Planning Staff was currently working on it. He thought the Planning Staff was obligated to bring forward the direct relationship between the General Plan and all the Land Management Code Amendments. Planner Rebecca Ward had included the information in the Staff report that brings the current situation forward.

Director Erickson stated that he had a large packet of previous requests for Code amendments that he had not brought to this meeting. The packet included five pages of information from former Planning Commissioner Steve Joyce; as well input from the current Planning Commissioners over time. Director Erickson remarked that Planner Ward went through and organized all the comments. There were open dates on the calendar, and as they move forward between this meeting and March 25th, the Planning Commission can fill in those dates and determine what direction to take.

Planner Hannah Tyler presented a slide showing the current applications the Staff was working on. She noted that the Planning Team was split up based on their skill sets to take on some of these LMC amendments. However, it is a team approach and they were moving these forward as the Planning Department. Planner Tyler stated that if the Planning Commission wants to prioritize some of the items discussed this evening, or reorganize the list presented, the Staff was willing to do that. She pointed out that April 8th, March 25th and March 11th were set because of noticing requirements. However, anything after those dates could be moved around on the schedule.

Chair Phillips asked if the Commissioners who were absent this evening would have the opportunity to provide input on the comments and discussion from this meeting.

Director Erickson answered yes. He noted that the Staff report contained the LMC Amendments being proposed and the General Plan framework. Prioritization is the most important issue in order to clean up anything they might have missed in the main Code before the March 25th meeting. Once that is done, they can talk about future things moving forward.

Chair Phillips asked for the anticipated timeline for rewriting the General Plan. Director Erickson replied that it depends on the outcome of Vision 2020. Some data sets are inadequate, and they were bringing forward software that will allow them to do a better job of City Planning and more accurate counts. Director Erickson stated that the Staff was trying to move the Code sections forward so they can begin to work on Vision 2020. He expects the General Plan to take at least a year and anticipates moving the General Plan Amendment forward sometime in the third quarter.

Director Erickson stated that because the City has 22 zones that are nuances, and there is a lot of local information. If they use an outside General Plan consultant or a zoning consultant to rewrite the General Plan, the local nuances will not come through. He believed they would spend more time fighting with the nuance than they would with the work from the consultants. Director Erickson credited Planner Ward with saying that they need to fix the local wording before hiring someone from the outside. He noted that the Planning Staff was having an internal conversation about whether or not to have the Code completely re-edited by an outside company so the Code is rational, orderly, the graphics are correct, and it is easy to understand. Director Erickson remarked that it falls within the General Plan triangularization in terms of how to do these things. He agreed that Planner Ward was correct and they would try to clean up the local issues first.

Director Erickson noted that Planner Kuhrmeyer has worked through and completed 130 pages of Code changes in order to make all the H Districts line up and all the issues move forward. Those were scheduled to come before the Planning Commission on June 24th.

Chair Phillips commented on the 2020 Visioning and all the work that goes into it. He came on the Planning Commission at the end of the 2014 General Plan re-write and he understands that it is a long process. He was just curious about a timeline and how long before it starts. Director Erickson stated that it depends on Vision 2020, how they handle the Arts and Culture District, and whether they see redevelopment of one or more shopping centers. He noted that Arts and Culture is also a team effort in the Planning Department and those responsibilities have been divided among the Staff. Director Erickson stated that Planner Ward expanded the planning boundaries of Arts and Culture to make sure walkability, sustainability, and transit were incorporated into the plan.

Planner Tyler explained the process. The Staff would not be giving a presentation this evening. The intent is to listen to the Planning Commission, make notes of their comments throughout the meeting, and review those comments at the end to make sure there is consensus.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked how many times TDRs have been used in the last ten years. Director Erickson replied that no TDRs have been done. Commissioner Kenworthy thought TDRs should be addressed if it is a tool in the toolbox. Director Erickson stated that TDRs are on the list of items for consideration and whether or not they are effective. He noted that TDRs are done inside of Master Planned Developments. Density is stripped off of undevelopable lands and placed into development pods, which is also a TDR action and similar to what is being done with the Huntsman project. Chair Phillips agreed that the TDR program is dysfunctional.

Commissioner Kenworthy clarified that there was zero activity on public/private partnerships in terms of building affordable units, and zero activity on TDRs. His intent was trying to see where they are currently in 2020 versus where they predicted they would be at this point in 2014.

Commissioner Kenworthy thought nightly rentals was an important number to understand whether it was a desperate issue to address. He recognized that a few years ago nightly rental was a greater item than it is today.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked if the City had a current percentage of second homeowners. Director Erickson answered yes, assuming that it was being reported correctly. Commissioner Kenworthy requested to see the actual number of nightly rentals and second homeowners so they have good information when they start this process. It is important to know what happened over the years and how the City got to where it is today so they know the calculus going forward.

Commissioner Kenworthy clarified that he was trying to find out where they stood with some of the items that were predicted in the General Plan so they can prioritize the list. They need to determine which issues are the most important to address and which ones can be addressed that will provide the solutions they have been missing.

Commissioner Thimm noted that there have been conversations regarding affordable housing and some talk about Code amendments. However, if they want to look at the traffic and parking issues for downtown and resort related, they need to take a hard look at what it takes to get affordable housing in a sustainable, walkable location. Commissioner Thimm thought the City needed to look at ways to encourage development that is sustainable for property owners and developers that would allow that to occur. He suggested looking at some of the zones in terms of building heights and setbacks requirement, as well as other incentives. Commissioner Thimm stated that if they do not start looking at what has happened from the standpoint of gentrification and second homes, they could end up with a City that is broken. He thought this was a good opportunity to address those issues.

Commissioner Kenworthy also thought it would be important to know the average age in the community.

Commissioner Thimm referred to previous discussions regarding a commitment to sustainability. The Staff report talks about considering LEED Certification or equal for municipal buildings. Commissioner Thimm encouraged looking at net zero, at LBC buildings as a standard, and at regenerative buildings, which produce more energy than they use. Commissioner Thimm stated that LEED was a great awareness tool, but they need to step beyond the LEED capability. He asked if something could be written into the Zoning Code that would actually encourage the type of development that would be good for the planet. If they intend to look at certain sustainability standards, he recommended going beyond LEED.

Commissioner Thimm stated that there are issues with transportation and they were trying to figure out the best way to encourage people to take the bus or ride, their bike, or walk where they need to go. He believed those were solutions, but the issue is how to make it work. He asked if there were tools within the zoning ordinance that could help. Commissioner Thimm commented on the trail connections and asked if there were areas in the City that should be looked at for upgraded to make the City more walkable. Commissioner Thimm believed there was enough pedestrian traffic to justify sidewalks for a safe path. He pointed out that pathways are not only a single-track path up in the mountains. Urban pathways are part of great streets and he believed there were areas in Park City where they could look at having sidewalks.

Commissioner Thimm commented on parking in relation to the Arts and Culture District. He asked if there are strategic locations where land could be available, either walkable or with public transportation, where parking could be added to reduce the number of cars coming into the City.

Commissioner Thimm wanted the Planning Staff to know how much he and the other Commissioners appreciate their hard work and the great job they do. He thanked all of them. Chair Phillips concurred. They have an incredible Staff and it was nice to see everything mapped out for a path forward.

Chair Phillips agreed with the comments from Commissioner Kenworthy and Commissioner Thimm. He believed a priority that ties into the gentrification and affordable housing would be to look at the Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) as soon as possible. He thought it was important to get through that discussion and to do whatever is necessary to encourage affordable housing and reduce nightly rentals. Chair Phillips also agreed with the comments regarding sustainable practices.

Commissioner Suesser stated that connectivity in the community was one of her interests and she would like it to be a top priority. Commissioner Suesser suggested looking at past walkability studies to see what was implemented, how far it got, and whether they should refocus those studies or implement new strategies towards walkability.

Commissioner Suesser named other big picture items, such as affordable housing contributions to all construction and not just MPDs. She thought they needed to take a hard look at parking requirements and possibly require minimums. They should analyze the current requirements to see how they reflect the focus on transit and alternative transportation options. Commissioner Suesser thought they needed to find a way to introduce more affordable housing into the neighborhoods.

Commissioner Suesser thought the General Plan for the Bonanza Park Section was blank at this point and she suggested focusing their energies on developing that area. She also wanted to look at possibly limiting nightly rentals. Commissioner Suesser requested feedback on the nightly rentals that were approved in recent years and whether there have been incidents or problems.

Director Erickson replied that there were no problems with the nightly rentals that have been approved. The problems arise with the casual rentals under Airbnb and VRBO. He noted that over 60 companies rent nationally and conglomerate nightly rentals. The primary ones are VRBO and Airbnb. Director Erickson stated that the current Code prohibits commercial use of nightly rentals. They are unable to count each one and the City has had issues this year. Director Erickson noted that a discussion regarding nightly rentals on the west side of the hill above King Road was scheduled for the March 11th meeting. Currently, nightly rentals are prohibited on the east side of the hill in the HRL zone. Director Erickson reported that people in Prospector were also providing feedback on nightly rentals that were beginning to cause problems.

Chair Phillips concurred with revisiting Bonanza Park again because in the past the Planning Commission had a completely different idea on what would occur in that area. Director agreed and noted that the plan went nowhere when the ideas got bigger than the budget. He stated that the Arts and Culture District is on a specific piece of City property. The Planning Staff stretched the planning boundary out to all of Homestake Avenue to the Homestake Affordable Housing property. They also stretched it through the pedestrian village at Prospector; and at a minimum, to Cook Drive and Aspen Villas. Director Erickson noted that the Staff grew the boundaries in a manageable way, as opposed to trying to redesign that entire section of town. It is a team approach and the Planning Commission will see what the team looks like when they move forward on Arts and Culture. Planner Tyler clarified that it was not on the list because it was not an LMC Amendment, but the Staff could add Bonanza Park General Plan to the list.

Commissioner Suesser suggested eliminating all resort support commercial in the Code. She would also like to consider removing any type of provision in the LMC regarding building private driveways in unplatted City streets. Director Erickson noted that the MPD discussion was scheduled for April 8th. He noted that the City Council took action on the platted unbuilt rights-of-way and repealed that section of the Code. Director Erickson pointed out that the City Council removed the raw section. However, the section where the paved street is not in the right-of-way is still in the Code, and they were still trying to figure out how to address that issue.

Commissioner Suesser referred to the schedule and noted that on April 22nd there would be a discussion on a new LMC section for private driveways within platted unbuilt City rights-of-ways. Planner Ward reported that a work session is scheduled with the City Council on March 26th and they will be talking about encroachments in general. She noted that when the Code was repealed, the City Council talked about a Code that might allow this to occur in a very rare circumstance, but in a way where there would be no conditional use allowed. It would be through an encroachment agreement only and it would go through a process with the City Engineer, the Planning Commission, and the City Council. Planner Ward stated that based on the recommendations following the work session, the Staff will come back to the Planning Commission with Code language for consideration. Director Erickson remarked that he had reviewed the Staff report for the City Council meeting and Planner Ward had incorporated all the Commissioner's comments about Planning Commission advisement with respect to encroachment agreements.

Commissioner Suesser believed they were still going in the direction of providing certain criteria of what the City would like to see when someone wants to encroach. She thought a better option would be to not even have that section or criteria in the Code. Commissioner Suesser clarified that the City could still address it if someone wanted to build a driveway in the right-of-way, but she was opposed to defining it in the Code or creating criteria for it.

Chair Phillips pointed out that some of these items are addressed at both the City Council and the Planning Commission. He asked the Staff to notify the Planning Commission when an item goes to the City Council and they think the Planning Commission might benefit from hearing their discussion. It would give individual Commissioners the opportunity to attend the meeting in person or listen in on the live discussion.

Commissioner Van Dine believed life cycle housing was a high priority along with the affordable housing; especially since the Senior Center will probably be lost. Commissioner Van Dine stated that the senior population in town was feeling very displaced and that they were not being heard or appreciated. She thought it was important to find a way to bring the seniors back into the community and providing affordable housing that is not just for the working class. She encouraged having a discussion on making life cycle housing sustainable.

Commissioner Van Dine stated that parking improvements were another priority. They will eventually lose all the parking at PCMR to resort only parking. They will also be losing much of the parking to paid parking. A priority is to figure out where to put all the traffic and all the cars as more people keep coming to Park City.

Commissioner Van Dine liked that the dark sky initiative was on the schedule. She questioned whether it was too far back on the schedule, particularly given the number of MPDs that are coming. She used Woodward as an example of not thinking about light pollution before it is too late and everything is built. Commissioner Van Dine commented on the importance of having everything in place to prevent the same thing from occurring with the MPD going in at Park City Mountain Resort and the one at Deer Valley. It needs to be identified in the MPD and as criteria for the City. Commissioner Van Dine liked the schedule and she was pleased that the MPD discussion was coming up soon.

Commissioner Suesser asked how it would work if they were to remove resort support commercial now that PCMRs plans are already in place. Director Erickson explained that the developer of the base area, which is not Vail Resorts, had submitted drawings and information and Planner Ananth was reviewing it for completeness. Once that determination is made, it will vest to the Code that it must be reviewed under and will not be subject to new Code changes. However, the developer can volunteer to change something in exchange for an MPD consideration.

Director Erickson stated that there were no struggles with night sky at Empire. Empire is fairly well controlled because it is in the trees and not in a parking lot. He believed there were enough tools in the MPD to help the planning team correctly manage the situation. Director Erickson remarked that the Staff was working through big issues on the base area project. All the issues mentioned this evening need to be addressed in the review of that application under the terms of the MPD process.

Commissioner Kenworthy agreed with the comments on life cycle housing. He believed the City failed on all the objectives stated in the General Plan. Based on comments from the other Commissioners, Commissioner Kenworthy thought they should address the toolbox as one of the priorities.

In reading through the General Plan, Commissioner Kenworthy thought the City had done a great job on open space, and he believed the Historic Preservation goals have been met to a great degree. Commissioner Kenworthy emphasized that the Planning Commission was trying to create solutions and find agreement on where they fell short. He believed that Goal #7 on Life Cycle Housing should be addressed as a priority.

Commissioner Kenworthy noted that the General Plan predicted City build-out and he recalled that there was 10% or a minimal number left. He requested to see a current update. Commissioner Kenworthy thought the Planning Commission had the opportunity to look at the annexation pieces coming in to see if they can make suggestions to the City Council to help move the ones they fell short on.

Commissioner Kenworthy stated that he heard a lot about connectivity. He agreed that it was an issue addressed in the General Plan and he thought they had done a lot of positive things. However, no one had mentioned the gondola issue. Commissioner Kenworthy noted that the Planning Commission had reviewed a project recently and the applicant was not interested in putting in a gondola for various reasons. He had not thought about those issues until the applicant mentioned them. Commissioner Kenworthy noted that the connectivity of gondolas was addressed in the General Plan and he would like to see an update of that as well.

Commissioner Kenworthy concurred with Commissioner Suesser about maintaining the easements as much as possible because they do not know what the future holds or how they will eventually connect the regional transportation to the City transportation. Their job is to plan for growth and they need to consider the applications already coming as well as future applications. Commissioner Kenworthy believed they have the opportunity to work with the developers on these projects and go a long way with connectivity. He thought that should also be a priority. Transportation is part of connectivity and how that works is a priority for everyone in the community.

Director Erickson stated that he would like to prioritize the schedule through June this evening; and give the Staff the opportunity to organize their comments before the March 25th meeting. He believed there was consensus among the Commissioners on most of the items, and the Staff would use that consensus to build the priorities. Director Erickson thought that was a better approach than trying to get through several pages of their comments tonight.

Chair Phillips was unsure how much the schedule would actually change or how much needed to be reorganized. In listening to the comments, new ideas came out. As he looks through the schedule some of the items, such as nightly rentals, were issues that were raised during previous Planning Commission meetings. Chair Phillips wanted to discuss a way for the Planning Commission to create a time to have discussions on new ideas. He noted that often times an applicant raises an issue during the meeting that they might need to look at as a City, but the context of the meeting is not the right time and place to have that conversation. Chair Phillips stated that in discussions with his fellow Commissioners who have met with the Staff and City Council, he believes there is a desire as a body to create an opportunity to sit down and have those types of conversations with the Staff and then decide whether certain items need to be added to the schedule.

Chair Phillips noted that Commissioner Hall has been active in conversations with the Staff and Council Members. He spoke with Commissioner Hall earlier that day and she suggested creating a place on the agenda to have those types of discussions so it does take place in the middle of reviewing an application. Chair Phillips suggested adding a work session to the agenda for the first meeting of each month. The Commissioner can discuss which items they would like to address in a work session and provide the list to the Staff for scheduling on the agenda. Once the Planning Commission has a full discussion and the Staff provides input, the item could either be tabled or placed on the priority list. Chair Phillips thought it was important to carve out time to have those conversations.

Chair Phillips stated that he had other ideas that he thought the Planning Commission should discuss to stay ahead of the issues, but he did not want to present those ideas now because he did not want to distract from what they were already discussing. However, the question is when they should bring up other ideas. He asked if it was appropriate at the beginning of a meeting rather than as a work session item, or whether it was better to have that discussion later in the agenda. Chair Phillips remarked that because there is never time on an agenda or the Commissioners never find the right time and place to say certain things, it spills into the meeting at other times and can cause friction.

Director Erickson thought Chair Phillips made a good point. He would work on the best way to manage the agendas to try and schedule the time Chair Phillips was suggesting. Director Erickson pointed out that the Commissioners would need to provide a topic for each agenda so it could be noticed properly.

Chair Phillips recognized that the Staff already has a busy workload and he wanted to be sensitive to that as well. Commissioner Van Dine suggested allocating time at one meeting per quarter. Director Erickson stated that when the Staff organizes the table, they would check mark a few policy issues or ideas based on the Commissioner's comments.

Commissioner Kenworthy found the buildout he had on mentioned Pages 274 and 275 of the General Plan. He clarified that the comparison he requested was not the commercial aspects. He just wanted to know the buildout that was predicted versus the actual buildout numbers currently. He noted that the population was predicted to be 13,500 and asked for the actual population and whether it had reached 9,000. Director Erickson stated that the population was 7500+. He explained that the calculation was based on the remaining platted lot inventories, the Deer Valley density, and the PCMR density. Director Erickson stated that the challenger of those two numbers is that they cannot sort out the MPD density at PCMR and Deer Valley Resort from the detached residences and other housing projects. He offered to do what he could to get the information Commissioner Kenworthy was requesting. Director Erickson thought the numbers were skewed with the BoPa calculations.

Based on their comments, Director Erickson understood that the Planning Commission preferred to move various types of housing earlier in the schedule through August. He noted that nightly rental was already moved up; however, if the Commissioners wanted a meeting just for ADUs it should be included on the schedule. Director Erickson pointed out that no item was removed from the proposed schedule and the Staff would need to manage their workloads. He did not have an answer on inclusionary housing and age in place this evening.

Commissioner Suesser asked if they were looking at the whole calendar. Planner Tyler replied that it was a calendar of the revisions in progress and on the docket, but it could be shifted around. Commissioner Suesser understood that the LMC revisions would capture many things. She wanted to know where they would be discussing affordable housing. Planner Tyler replied that the Staff was trying to put together a timeline because they would like to do public outreach. In order to get a good outcome of the Code, they need a robust outreach on housing. Planner Tyler offered to come back to the next work session with a proposed timeline.

Chair Phillips asked about the special events work session on May 13th. Director Erickson stated that the intent is to deregulate tents out of the Land Management Code and instead let the Events Staff handle it. They have been working for two years with the Events Staff on how to get tents out of the Code. Commissioner Van Dine asked if it would include bounce houses. Director Erickson answered yes. Director Erickson stated that they were struggling in the Historic Residential District on whether or not to completely deregulate events in the historic districts. The Special Events team would like to do it; but the Planning Staff is not convinced that it is a good idea. However, if they have bike races through the District and it can be managed the way they handled Sundance this year, it could be a good idea. Director Erickson pointed out that those events are regulated under a special event permit and Jenny does a great job.

Chair Phillips asked if there was an issue with leaving tents in the Code. Director Erickson stated that it is difficult trying to manage it in the LMC. He noted that conditional use permits for all the tents in town vary on how many times each location can have a tent.

City Attorney Mark Harrington explained that there was a crossover between events and the people utilizing the tents to expand capacity year-round. An LMC provision was added to address that situation. Events were supposed to remain regulated by the Events Staff, but there has been increased confusion as to where that line begins and ends. Mr. Harrington remarked that the Events Staff would argue that this change was resetting the bar to where it was before. However, there have been increased discussions on whether that line should move within the Department. The details were still being worked out, but in terms of priority, the events are already scheduled for the calendar year. He suggested that if housing is a higher priority the Planning Commission could place housing ahead of the tent item.

Planner Ward stated that if the Planning Commission agreed with removing special events from the Code, a work session would not be required and the Staff could come back with the Code amendment. Director Erickson thought the Planning Commission needed time to discuss the issue. For example, if a tent can accommodate 100 people and the hotel is full, the question is where to park those cars if the 100 people are not staying at the hotel. The intent is to protect the Historic District. Director Erickson commented on tents that were regulated under a Special Event Permit in the Fresh Market parking lot and noted that those tents did not generate negative impacts.

Director Erickson preferred to move housing to a higher priority, and noted that connectivity should also be part of the housing discussion. The Commissioners concurred. Director Erickson stated that connectivity City-wide and in relation to

Transportation would take longer to coordinate for a discussion, but they could begin with planning for the Arts and Culture area. He pointed out problems in that area and how those might be resolved. Director Erickson stated that the Planning Department has promised Transportation that they will use every effort to use complete streets on Homestake Road to include bicycles, pedestrians, transit, vehicles, and parking. He noted that in the last discussion with the Transportation Department, Homestake Road was prioritized ahead of fixing Munchkin. It will go from Park Avenue to Kearns.

Planner Tyler thought they could bring the ADUs into the housing discussion. The Commissioners agreed. Chair Phillips asked about parking and whether it should be considered as part of the housing discussion. Director Erickson thought parking should be a separate discussion. However, parking would be part of the MPD discussion. In addition, parking with respect to certain housing types will also be part of that discussion. He noted that parking is a land use question and it changes according to the land use.

Commissioner Van Dine referred to the Affordable Housing Code Amendments and the Community Planning Strategies. She would like to see research looking at ADUs and other options in neighborhoods outside of Old Town, such as Park Meadows and Prospector. Commissioner Van Dine remarked that Park Meadows had very strict restrictions on accessory buildings. She wanted to know if there was a way to allow owners to have an accessory building if they agree to put it into life-cycle housing. Commissioner Van Dine thought it was important to generate those types of living areas on large lots that have the room and people want to do it.

Director Erickson reported that earlier this year the Planning Department approved an ADU on a lot at the corner of Lucky John and Holiday Ranch as a test case on how ADUs will work in those areas. He noted that accessory structures are not completely prohibited unless there is an HOA. Commissioner Van Dine understood the issues with HOAs and only asked that the Staff look at what options are available.

Commissioner Suesser asked what would fall under the MPD work session and whether that is where they would talk about Resort Support Commercial. She also commented on another issue that came up during the Treasure Hill excavation limits and asked if that was an MPD item or an LMC amendment. Director Erickson replied that it would be reviewed during an MPD. Those items are typically addressed in the CUP of the MPD sections. Director Erickson noted that the Staff went through Treasure Hill with the Planning Commission and know their thoughts. He remarked that underground parking and other projects coming forward will have the same issue. Director Erickson stated that other items coming forward on the MPD are nonsubstantive changes to the MPD and minor changes that could be handled administratively.

Planner Ward stated that sustainability was also coming forward. Walkability is part of sustainability and one of the criteria of the MPDs. The Staff was looking to propose standards or a plan that would show what the requirements would be to connect the community. That discussion was scheduled for April 8th.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked if they would also include discussions about employee housing it if were to be included in an MPD, or whether that discussion would be part of the housing discussion.

City Attorney Harrington stated that the City Council has requested that neither the Planning Commission nor the City Council begin that discussion until after public engagement occurs because some of the issues will be sensitive. Mr. Harrington remarked that scheduling would be dependent on public outreach occurring first. However, the City Council would like that to occur as soon as possible so the Planning Commission can have that discussion. He thought the projected May 13th date for the housing discussion was appropriate.

Commissioner Thimm recalled the advisory vote for the pre-annexation initiative and asked about the annexation. Director Erickson explained that the Planning Commission approved the annexation policy for Black Rock/Hideout, and Black Rock and Hideout approved an annexation policy that includes Black Rock. He asked if the Staff had seen anything in the Hideout where annexation was moving forward. Planner Ward was not aware of anything. At this point they were in the process of doing research for City-owned property.

Commissioner Thimm wanted to know how the zoning determination is made for newly annexed properties. City Attorney Harrington replied that the Planning Commission makes a recommendation to the City Council, the same as for any zoning action.

City Attorney Harrington offered advice to the Planning Commission as they move through this process based on his experience having gone through two General Plan rewrites and three LMC rewrites. There is a lot of similarity in terms of both criticism and optimism and he congratulated the Commissioners for doing both. Mr. Harrington remarked that the language is the same every time when the process starts, and he encouraged the Commissioners to prioritize the two to four items that are pragmatic and/or policy changes that are most important; and to keep them specific to outcomes where they really want to move the needle. He noted that the Planning Commission has already identified some of those items. Mr. Harrington stated that everyone wants connectivity, but the discussion is more difficult once they get into the specifics. Another issue is how the Staff and the development community will be expected to follow through on those specifics. Mr. Harrington encouraged the Commissioners to be conscious of that fact. As they move through the process, he recommended that they try to focus on the pragmatics for either high level policy items or the nuts and bolts of the Code. He suggested splitting the work sessions 50/50 on each of those. Mr. Harrington reminded the Planning Commission that these are living documents and they were looking to improve them on an ongoing basis. He remarked that it is easy to get lost in the totality. If they can focus on the critical items, they would be better served in terms of improving the applications and the policies moving forward. Mr. Harrington noted that the City Council focused on three critical priorities at first, but as they expanded to encompass two additional priorities, it had an immediate ramification on the focus of the Staff and the process. Prioritizing will be key in terms of which items they really want to move the needle.

City Attorney Harrington stated that he and some Staff members have a lot of knowledge on past processes in terms of what did not get re-prioritized and those that went through. He pointed out that the focus of each General Plan was super specific and had narrow goals from what the City Council wanted to adjust to as opposed to just checking the box on various elements that were part of a broader strategy. He thought it was important for the Planning Commission to understand those three strategies. He felt the same about annexations that could be considered planning failures but were something entirely different in terms of mitigating what was occurring in the County. Mr. Harrington thought the Staff could include that for context to help the Commissioners understand where they can best focus to prepare for future decisions. He believed Commissioner Hall was correct in pushing everyone to spend more time on the long-term planning questions. It takes time and focus and the Planning Commission should not hesitate to push the Staff on doing that.

Commissioner Kenworthy thanked the Staff on behalf of the Planning Commission for the effort they put in every day.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:07 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: ____