

**PARK CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION NOTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
FEBRUARY 8, 2007**

Present: Mayor Dana Williams (excused for a portion of work session); Council members, Marianne Cone; Candace Erickson; Roger Harlan; Jim Hier; and Joe Kernan

Historic Preservation Board members: Gary Kimball, Todd Ford, Ken Martz, Nancie Putnam, and David White; **Planning Commission members:** Jack Thomas, Evan Russack, and Mark Sletten

Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Patrick Putt, Planning Director; Ron Ivie, Chief Building Official; and Stacey Noonan, Ice Arena Manager

Dina Blasé, consultant

1. Historic District discussion with Planning Commission and Historic Preservation Board. Patrick Putt acknowledged the number of board members and public in attendance and distributed a letter from HPB member Puggy Holmgren who could not be in attendance. He referred to his staff report and stated that the Historic District is an important resource to a variety of stakeholders. The City Council recently discussed the Historic District at its Visioning Workshop held in January and associated issues and alternatives are included in the staff report. Additionally, potential effects are outlined for each option, including associated costs and resources. Recommendations range from changing a process, providing additional training/education, and/or proposing a budget option for a more substantial project like updating our Historic District Guidelines. He suggested moving ahead with program changes that may involve amendments to existing policies, guidelines and the Land Management Code. It is beneficial to clarify this information for neighborhoods, property owners, designers, and staff, specifically as it relates to the Main Street Historic District. Mr. Putt noted that the inventory has been completed and updating the Historic District Guidelines is the next logical step. Mr. Putt strongly recommended a concerted historic preservation program, including education and training, not only for staff, but the Council, HPB and Planning Commission. He urged Council to consider directing staff to begin the process to formally adopt the Historic District Inventory by notifying all affected property owners of scheduled public hearings. The inventory is contemplated to become the official list of the significant properties in Park City.

Mr. Putt addressed the first issue, the Historic District designations. Staff recommends strengthening the Historic District's preservation policies and programs by reinforcing Main Street District programs and policies by adopting the Secretary of Interior's standards for rehabilitation. These standards are applied to evaluate restoration projects or new construction in the Main Street District. It would involve updating the

Historic District Guidelines and using the Grant Program as a financial incentive to encourage compliance with national standards. This could include requiring the removal of modifications to historic structures made over the years. Staff encourages the use of grant monies toward rehabilitation of threatened buildings in the Main Street core. Updating and clarifying the Historic District Guidelines for the residential area, or Thematic District, defining the meaning of *integrity* and illustrating design objectives are contemplated. In developing a new strategy for the guidelines, he recommended a collaborative approach including stakeholders and available local resources. There needs to be involvement and buy-in with regulators, designers, and builders and the changes should be quantifiable and factual, not based on feelings or emotions. Mr. Putt pointed out that there are 25 properties in the Thematic District eligible for listing on the National Register and holding public workshops for property owners is another possibility.

Joe Kernan believes the level of mandatory requirements is important to establish. Gary Kimball, HPB, stated that the preservation of the entire Historic District is important. Todd Ford, HPB, expressed his support of applying higher standards on Main Street than in the residential section and feels updating the Guidelines is also a good step. HPB Chair David White encouraged that the Main Street area become a top priority. The Design Guidelines were crafted in 1983 and need to be updated. Ken Martz, HPB and long-time resident of the Historic District, pointed out that the thinking has gone full circle. The growth and increasing valuations in the Historic District create unique challenges and these recommendations are a step in the right direction. Training is very important. Planning Commissioner Evan Russack and Nancy Putnam, HPB, agreed with the comments made. Mark Sletten felt it would be helpful to get direction from Council first. Roger Harlan stated that an investment in education and training is money well-spent. Jim Hier indicated that he is not in favor of a "stick" approach. There are a number of modified structures in the Historic District that are no longer compliant and the difficulty in economically justifying bringing the building back to an acceptable condition. In an effort to move on, he suggested supporting staff recommendations. Candace Erickson relayed that she prefers the stick approach, acknowledging that there also needs to be an accompanying incentive program. The 25 property owners in the Thematic District should be advised of potential benefits, if applicable. She pointed out that the current grant program is subsidized with RDA funding and a long-term funding source will need to be identified. Marianne Cone agreed with staff's recommendations. Planning Commissioner Jack Thomas believed that other communities are far ahead of Park City with regard to historic preservation and it is time to take a more professional approach. Joe Kernan encouraged finding a compromise or middle-ground with regard to regulations. Mayor Pro Tem Cone invited public comment.

Tom Peek, developer, asked for clarification on the scope of revisions. Pat Putt explained that this discussion was prompted by the risk of Park City losing its historic designation. The Main Street District and the Thematic District are our two technical areas of discussion. If there is potential for delisting an area, it would probably be Main Street although the City has not been threatened by the state or any other agency. Since the inventory was completed, a focus on taking appropriate corrective actions to bolster the District is emerging. He added that we can learn from the mistakes made in the past. The residential area is known as the Thematic District which is quite different than the Main Street District, a contiguous historic property group. The Thematic District is a collection of individually listed historic buildings and buildings that could be eligible for the National Register. There is a perception that an historic home surrounded by new or incompatible buildings should be exempted from the list which is not the case. This discussion is geared toward preserving our Main Street designation and taking appropriate steps to preserve historic homes in the residential areas. The goal is to provide livable houses, including practical elements like garages and getting cars off the street for snow removal and emergency access, recognizing that a garage may affect the historic character of the structure.

Jim Hier asked if the Thematic District can be defined by a geographical boundary. Consultant Dina Blasé clarified that the Main Street Historic District contains contiguous properties from the top of Main Street to Heber Avenue, and including some buildings on Heber Avenue. This designation is consistent with the National Park Service Program. The Thematic District includes non-contiguous properties within Park City that meet the National Park Service guidelines for eligibility on the National Register for Historic Places. She acknowledged confusion prompted with the City's duplicate assignment of the word, "District" for its zoning designations. Ms. Blasé added that a period of significance must be identified for a Thematic District, and qualification in Park City is limited to four architectural types from the mining boom era in Park City. Even if a building was built during this period, it must be one of the housing types. The City Manager encouraged direction on developing mandatory approaches or focusing on preservation incentives.

Don Bloxom, designer, emphasized that providing latitude to design professionals may result in better projects in the Thematic District. He pointed out the current challenges in bringing the dwellings in compliance with modern codes. He felt that these only have historic significance as a grouping. He is very concerned about piece-meal changes to the LMC which is a lousy document and should be rewritten. The stick approach could cost property owners millions of dollars and he felt that the money would be better allocated to pedestrianization or parking. There should be an appropriate cost to benefit ratio.

Dina Blasé added that the criteria established for eligibility for the National Register is different than provisions in the LMC. It is important to understand that there are buildings in the inventory listed as *historically significant* which are not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places which creates some confusion for people. She stated that the stock in the Thematic District includes mining boom era residences, some of which are historically significant and some that are not. If they are not, it means that they do not comply with the standard outlined in the LMC. There is no additional level of regulation for the eligible but unlisted 25 properties in the Thematic District. She explained opportunities to receive federal rehabilitation tax credits and the recognition of being on the National Register of Historic Places. Ms. Blasé reiterated the importance of the properties meeting criteria established in the LMC which guides owners on what is allowed.

Craig Elliott, architect, referred to Mr. Bloxom's comments and felt that there should be some latitude relating to restoration projects. However with regard to the complexities of the LMC document, Mr. Elliott pointed out that it has been generated over time. He felt it is a good document in need of a *tune-up* and the suggestion of forming a task force with professionals and staff is a good solution, which he supports.

Ron Whaley, property owner and realtor, stated that in an effort to better understand this dialog, asked what is *broken*. Pat Putt explained that this public forum is intended to hear comments or concerns about losing important elements of the Historic District, acknowledging that this objective is very broad and invites many different points of view. There are also complaints that recent projects constructed in Old Town are too big or architecturally inappropriate. He discussed the term "*transparency*" or "*predictability*"; implementing goals with easy to understand rules and guidelines so applicants know what to expect in the process. He senses support from the Council, Commission and Board to begin to update the guidelines. Funding this project will be considered during the budget process. There also seems to be support for a stakeholders' group and implementing education and training, which could occur immediately. Jim Hier interjected that the LMC will never be fixed and stable; it is a living working document,

Patrick Putt asked for feed-back on demolition and disassembly of buildings. There are a number of historically significant buildings in different conditions. The Building and Planning Departments require preservation plans to determine if the project is feasible. Disassembly is used as a last resort to preserve historic elements which has raised criticism. Staff is recommending that the Chief Building Official continue to work with architects on disassembly on a case-by-case basis. Staff recommends continuing to allow this as an option because it may contribute to the long-term preservation of the building. Keeping buildings in-tact does not always result in saving them in the future. Staff recommends continuing to use this approach and with the input of the stakeholders' group, will provide upfront clarity on features of a preservation plan.

David White stated that he has experience with both approaches; some buildings can withstand being raised or craned to pour a foundation under the structure. Other dwellings are so fragile, that trying to move them in tact is a big mistake and in that situation he recommended taking the building apart. With the latter, the architect should provide for an additional phase to clearly define what elements are being reused and those that are not. Todd Ford expressed concerns with "*panelization*" of structures. He relayed that is not so much the materials, but the preservation of original form and streetscape. This relates to updating the Design Guidelines and construction needs to be closely monitored and regulated. Gary Kimball felt that buildings should be examined individually but pointed out increases in density with platting parcels. Ken Martz liked the idea of a preservation plan which needs to be reviewed on the onset by the HPB and the plan should be inspected and monitored.

Evan Russack believes that staff should have *as many arrows as necessary* until we get a firm policy in place. Marianne Cone also supported requiring preservation plans. Candace Erickson referred to previous discussions on the inventory regarding the number of elevated historic buildings with new foundations. Although garages help mitigate on-street parking problems, the dwellings are likely to lose their historic significance designation. Also, historic structures with huge additions are no longer eligible for inclusion in the Thematic District and there should be some balance. Roger Harlan pointed out the successful restorations of historic homes on upper Main Street and expressed that the untrained public isn't likely to be aware of replication.

Kevin King, designer, stated that he agreed with David White's position. Documentation is the key as is measuring and duplicating details like the eaves or soffits. It shouldn't matter whether the project is panelized. The UBC provides that anytime the loads are modified greater than 5%, the structure has to be brought up to current code standards. The proposal will require compliance with a preservation plan in addition to shear and seismic regulations. He asked what is preservation; the siding or materials or is it the form. He didn't feel the City should be able to determine if the building should be disassembled or moved. Many larger buildings have been built onto several times. These buildings can not be raised and he suggested replacing historic elements with new pieces milled to the original specifications. There needs to be less emotion and better documentation of the buildings.

Chief Building Official Ron Ivie felt that one of the problems with this discussion is that it is too detailed at this point. These discussions should be held in a technical forum to determine the appropriate approach. He suggested that the word "*integrity*" be defined and that Main Street be viewed differently than the residential district. Define *integrity* and what you expect to have and then focus on writing clear concise standards. He strongly supported a preservation plan, recognizing that each building will be ranked

individually on its importance and technical requirements. He reiterated the need for a systematic approach and discouraged education and training until goals are defined. He felt the new inventory is flawed like the others because it doesn't address integrity. There is a list of properties, *but what do we do with them?* After that target is determined, the technical standards can then be applied. He questioned how productive it is to debate panelization or replication at this point because there needs to be some direction on process. Again, a meaningful technical document needs to be written to update current code provisions. Mr. Ivie pointed out that many of these buildings were not built to last.

Patrick Putt explained that the mass and scale of buildings in the Historic District can be addressed by updating the guidelines and providing training and education. It is contemplated that the stakeholders group will address these important issues by analyzing the number of remaining vacant in-fill lots, the number of steep slope conditions, and other factual information. Marianne Cone acknowledged the flurry of opinions in the community on the state of the Historic District. Jack Thomas emphasized that the American Institute of Architects and the Utah State Code both recognize the five phases of construction, which include schematic design, design development, construction documents, construction administration, and bidding/negotiation. In terms of evaluating mass and scale, the board needs to see a complete set of schematics, not sketches, or models in an early stage to better understand the massing before the architectural drawings are rendered. At the schematic stage of an application, there should be complete plans, sections, elevations, and a massing model provided so an early evaluation can be made. Marianne Cone noted that she hears many complaints on the size of additions onto historic structures. Evan Russack pointed out that mass should be considered in the context of the streetscape or surrounding buildings.

Jim Totoro described the difficulty in designing a plan to be compatible with adjacent properties when there is the possibility that they will be modified at some point in the future. He doesn't believe there is a problem in Old Town and is happy with the look of Woodside Avenue. People's investments should not be encumbered and there should be an opportunity for discussions before a decision is made.

Susan Gilson, Woodside Avenue resident, commented on eight new condominiums and a duplex constructed near their historic home. These units average about 4,000 square feet and she doesn't feel this size is appropriate.

Roger Durst, architect and former HPB member, commented that addressing just massing and scale is not enough. The visual elements and contextual qualities are also important to consider.

Missy O'Neal, Woodside Avenue resident, relayed that some visitors are not aware of where the Historic District is located because she feels its historic character has been compromised.

Pat Putt stated that there is no simple solution and establishing some complicated formula to reduce size is probably not the answer. The greatest chance of solving this is a holistic approach, and the sizes of buildings are being driven by the LMC. There are situations where a small historic house sits on a large lot and applicants feel compelled to pursue the maximum building footprint. He suggested separating the buildings rather than constructing an addition. Currently, the Code does not allow this approach. Solutions like this should be considered and the stakeholders group may be helpful in identifying other ideas.

The next issue involves the plat amendment process and the density in Old Town. Concerns expressed are that the plat amendment process is a mechanism to increase density. Staff believes that the density in Old Town is established by the Park City Survey and the Snyders Addition, as well as the underlying zoning. He is not recommending changing the underlying density in Old Town, but rather maintaining the existing density entitlements as established by the plat and zoning. However, there could be criteria in the Subdivision Ordinance regarding the existing context of the neighborhood. Standards to evaluate base density for large unplatted lots, unplatted properties, or lots that may not have street access could be formulated. Many vacant lots have no street access or utilities and it may be wise to explore our standards for improving streets in platted but unbuilt rights-of-ways.

Jim Hier stated that he has a hard time visualizing a small house with a new structure on the same lot and maintaining the same density. He supports not increasing density over what platted lots would allow under the LMC. A square footage calculation designed so that the total building square footage is not increased but allowing for more than one structure depending on size may be desired. Todd Ford asked if this initiative would prohibit the subdivision of a 50 foot wide lot into two legal 25 foot wide lots. He added that 25 foot wide lots in Old Town are historically consistent and he would rather have two small homes than one large home in the neighborhood. He likes density in Old Town. Jim Hier clarified that developing 25 foot wide platted lots is different than platting a metes and bounds property into 25 foot wide lots and that is what he believes needs to be examined. Don Bloxom suggested looking at definitions and uses in the LMC.

Marianne Cone discussed the process for plat amendments where the end product and result is unknown at the time of action. Evan Russack stated that he also struggles with this as a Planning Commissioner and felt that additional criteria for review of plats would be helpful. Compatibility criteria would be beneficial in considering applications. Ken

Martz spoke about property owners maximizing their building footprints to the extent that there isn't room for landscaping. This results in boring cookie-cutter designs and unappealing living areas. There may be opportunities to create green spaces in the platting process.

Pat Putt addressed the criticism that steep slope lots are too large, visible and disruptive to be compatible in the Historic District. Staff's recommendation is moving forward with the stakeholders' group to look at some of these issues including revisiting the maximum building height permitted through the CUP exception. Right now it is established at 40 feet and there may be a desire to rethink this and to look at criteria for height exceptions not exceeding some standard. He encouraged everyone to read the steep slope criteria in place and believed there are effective tools in this document. It allows the Planning Commission to recommend reduced square footage for projects. Mr. Putt felt that flexibility to arrive at good designs in the steep slope section of the Code should be maintained. Dana Williams pointed out the difficulty in measuring natural grade for steep slope lots and while the floor area ratio is small, the look of the massing of the building appears huge. Pat Putt described the method for measuring height from the highest point of the roof directly down to existing grade (prior to construction). Height exception requests exceeding 27 feet require approval by the Planning Commission, subject to specific criteria outlined in the LMC.

Jim Hier asked the status of applications submitted in the interim. Mr. Putt explained that it is staff's recommendation to move forward but to continue to apply the existing LMC and Historic District Guidelines. He is not recommending consideration of a temporary zoning ordinance. He felt there is clear direction to proceed with the initial phase consisting of noticing all affected property owners of public hearings on the Historic District Inventory document before the Planning Commission and City Council. A strategy for the rewrite of the Guidelines and for establishing the stakeholders group will be formulated. It is contemplated that the task force will be charged with reviewing the integrity issue, establishing criteria for base density for large parcels (mass and scale), access problems, steep slope criteria and processes. Time frames will be assigned for each element and a schedule will be available within three weeks. The training and education programs can be implemented immediately. Joe Kernan supported the concept of the stakeholders' group and hoped the historic character of Old Town can be better protected, specifically with regard to parking.

Marianne Cone asked the consultants for a recommendation on moving houses. Dina Blasé responded that they didn't make a recommendation on moving historic buildings. Ms. Cone believes this also relates to the integrity issue.

Cindy Matsumoto, property owner in the Historic District, stated that at some point she would like to improve her two properties to reap the economic rewards or the rewards of

living in a home. She felt that when Council disbanded the Historic District Commission in 2003, the Historic District began to fall apart. Citizens are upset because the public process has been eliminated and reinstating the public back into the process is important. She felt the *status quo* recommendation regarding process is not acceptable. The public feels left out.

Tom Fey, property owner, agreed with Ms. Matsumoto's comments and stated that Alternative 2 should be adopted under the Historic District Process section. Many people felt left out of the 2003 process. He felt the newly formed Historic Preservation Board should not have more review authority than staff. Cindy Matsumoto supported better educating staff and the design community, but other things need to be done.

Joe Tesch, attorney, expressed that individuals are concerned about how their properties will be affected with amending regulations in the Historic District. Jack Thomas encouraged that in an effort to analyze individual buildings that we don't lose sight of how the entire community feels. He suggested thinking in terms of streetscapes and neighborhoods.

Marianne Cone thanked everyone for attending and encouraged the audience to contact Council members with ideas and comments. Peter Barnes spoke about seeking out and utilizing available resource material on contextual planning.

2. Strategic plan for ice arena. Stacey Noonan referred to her staff report and discussed the high demand for ice programs. Scheduled ice events this season include hockey tournaments, college hockey games, speed skating meets, curling open house, figure skating shows, and a sled hockey exhibition. There have been a small number of requests for off-ice events, which would require flooring and Ms. Noonan explained the restaurant tax grant funding approved for flooring. The guiding principals for ice arena usage include (1) being fiscally responsible; (2) developing programs; and (3) using the facility as an economic tool. The City's special warranty deed with Florence J. Gillmor allows for recreational and educational activities and with this in mind, the matrix illustrates current and potential uses and any impacts to programming, revenue generation, staffing, and capital needs. She explained features outlined in Level 1 – Ice Programs, Level 2 – Ice Programs and Ice Events; and Level 3 – Ice Programs and on and Off Ice Events. Ms. Noonan recommended that staff work to achieve Level 2: Ice Programs and Ice Events which incorporates off ice events in the off ice season. She also explained that moving to a year round ice schedule will require more full time staff but increased revenues are forecasted to cover expenses and bring the overall subsidy to \$150,000. The Snyderville Basin Recreation District Board has reviewed the plan and are comfortable with this direction.

Roger Harlan expressed his strong interest in encouraging better attendance at events, and suggested an enhanced marketing plan. Mayor Williams stated that the strategic plan is fantastic but expressed concerns regarding enrollment of children from families unable to cover costs and encouraged perhaps exploring free skate sessions. Tom Bakaly felt that Council could adopt the resolution as drafted while staff explores marketing plans and scholarship opportunities. Candace Erickson discussed a Recreation Advisory Board initiative in formulating an outreach program through the schools for Racquet Club programs which could easily be applied to the ice arena. The City Manager explained that \$10,000 is budgeted annually for this purpose and its availability could be better promoted. Mayor Williams expressed his confidence in Ms. Noonan's capabilities and the Council then convened in closed session. See regular meeting minutes.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
FEBRUARY 8, 2007**

I ROLL CALL

Mayor Dana Williams called the regular meeting of the City Council to order at approximately 6 p.m. at the Marsac Municipal Building on Thursday, February 8, 2007. Members in attendance were Dana Williams, Marianne Cone, Candace Erickson, Roger Harlan, Jim Hier, and Joe Kernan. Staff present was Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Gary Hill, Budget Manager; Seth Atkinson, Budget Analyst; and Kirsten Whetstone, Planner.

II COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

1. Council comments - Marianne Cone commented on the dog sled race event and enjoyed it at the alternate location on the Rail-Trail this year.

2. Legislative update – Gary Hill stated that in his six years of experience at the legislature, this is the least policy-centered session and unfortunately personal politics seems to be a trend this year. Seth Atkinson advised that the status of HB105, deputizing local police officers to perform federal immigration duties, is likely to die. Gary Hill addressed HB233, environmentally restricted zoning districts, which has the potential of compromising the City's sensitive lands ordinance. ULCT and home builders and realtors associations have expressed opposition to this legislation and there is a concerted effort on this bill. Mr. Atkinson explained that HB238 passed the House and proposed changing the municipal telecommunications tax from 4% to 3.5%; the fiscal impact to the City could be \$50,000 to \$100,000. HB282 has the potential of negatively affecting the City's resort cities sales tax revenues by \$500,000 and is another priority of staff and the ULCT. There was discussion about the form of county government bill and all Council members asked that the City formally oppose this legislation. Mr. Hill explained HB334, imminent domain, which relates to prohibiting condemnation of trails for emergency access or creating *linear parks*. There are proposed amendments to change the Utah Retirement System from a pension plan to a defined benefit plan and the City Manager is seated on this committee. Jim Hier asked staff to look into a school district bill for school regarding the requirement for partisan declarants for candidacy. Mr. Atkinson explained HB437 deals with proving legal residency before receiving any a local public benefits.

III PUBLIC INPUT (*any matter of City business not scheduled on agenda*)

None.

IV WORK SESSION NOTES AND MINUTES OF MEETING OF JANUARY 25, 2007

Candace Erickson disclosed that she will be abstaining as she was not in attendance. Joe Kernan, "I move we approve the work session notes and minutes of the meeting of January 25, 2007". Marianne Cone seconded. Motion carried.

Marianne Cone	Aye
Candace Erickson	Abstention
Roger Harlan	Aye
Jim Hier	Aye
Joe Kernan	Aye

V CONSENT AGENDA PUBLIC HEARINGS (*items listed will be open for public hearing prior to consideration for adoption or rejection; hearings may also be continued by vote of the Council*)

1. Consideration of an Ordinance amending the 1335 Lowell Avenue survey plat (motion to continue to February 15, 2007) – The Mayor requested a motion to continue. Roger Harlan, "I so move". Jim Hier seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

2. Consideration of an Ordinance amending the 654 Woodside Avenue plat (motion to continue to March 15, 2007) – Candace Erickson, "I so move". Marianne Cone seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

3. Consideration of an Ordinance approving the Elevator Subdivision, a replat of Lots 8, 9 and 10 and a portion of Lot 7, Block 58, of the Park City Survey, 430 Ontario Avenue 654 Woodside Avenue, Park City, Utah plat amendment – Kirsten Whetstone explained the request to reconfigure 3.5 lots in the HR-1 Zone and the allocation of the remnant parcel will be allocated to widen the other lots. There is no application for the design, but the topography indicates that it will require a steep slope review. Ms. Whetstone relayed that resident Ella Sorenson expressed concerns about the stability of Ontario especially with the use of construction equipment and vehicles on the road. Ms. Whetstone explained that a construction mitigation plan can be designed to meet her concerns. The Planning Commission forwards a positive recommendation; there was no public input rendered at its meeting on January 24, 2007 and staff also recommends approval.

There was discussion about appropriate wording on plats. She relayed that a construction mitigation plan will be formulated at the conditional use permit stage. Jim Hier suggested that the building size not increase and the remnant property be used for greater setbacks. Ms. Whetstone explained how the building footprint is determined in the Code and Mr. Hier asked that staff consider a revision to the LMC addressing lot combinations so that there is flexibility to require larger setbacks rather than

automatically increasing the house size. Mark Harrington explained that if there is consensus from Council, direction can be given to the planner to look at increased setbacks as a part of the steep slope CUP, and all Council members supported this approach for this application. There was discussion about demolishing the existing structure and the timing of building the three structures. In response to a question from the City Attorney, Ms. Whetstone emphasized that all encroachments on the property will be resolved. The Mayor opened the public hearing, and with no comments, closed the hearing.

VI CONSENT AGENDA (*items that have previously been discussed or are perceived as routine and may be approved by one motion. Listed items do not imply a predisposition for approval and may be removed by motion and discussed and acted upon under “Additional Discussion – Agenda Items”*)

Marianne Cone, “I move that we accept Consent Agenda Items 1 through 3”. Joe Kernan seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

1. Consideration of an Ordinance approving the Elevator Subdivision, a replat of Lots 8, 9 and 10 and a portion of Lot 7, Block 58, of the Park City Survey, 430 Ontario Avenue 654 Woodside Avenue, Park City, Utah plat amendment – See staff report and public hearing comments.

2. Resolution adopting strategic plan for Park City Municipal Corporation Ice Arena – See staff report and work session notes.

3. Acceptance of 2007 disclosure statements from the Mayor and City Council members – See staff report.

VII ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION – AGENDA ITEMS

None.

VIII ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the regular meeting of the City Council was adjourned.

MEMORANDUM OF CLOSED SESSION

The City Council met in closed session at approximately 4 p.m. Members in attendance were Mayor Dana Williams, Marianne Cone, Candace Erickson, Roger Harlan, Jim Hier, and Joe Kernan. Staff present was Tom Bakaly, City Manager and Mark Harrington, City Attorney. Jim Hier “I move to close the meeting to discuss property and litigation”.

Page 4
City Council Meeting
February 8, 2007

Marianne Cone seconded. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting opened at approximately 6 p.m. Marianne Cone, "I move to open the meeting". Roger Harlan seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

The meeting for which these minutes were prepared was noticed by posting at least 24 hours in advance and by delivery to the news media two days prior to the meeting.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott

