PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
SEPTEMBER 25, 2024

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

EX OFFICIO: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner I; Lillian Zollinger, Planner III; Elissa Martin, Assistant Planning Director; Alec Barton, Senior Planner

---

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Sarah Hall called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. She noted that all Commissioners were present, with the exception of Commissioner Rick Shand, who arrived at 5:34 p.m.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from August 28, 2024.

Commissioner Johnson referenced the first sentence on Page 45 of the Meeting Minutes from August 28, 2024. He asked that the word "restriction" be changed to "restricting" instead. Ahead of the vote on the Meeting Minutes, it was noted that Commissioner Shand arrived.

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from the August 28, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting, as amended. Commissioner Sigg seconded the motion.

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

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, shared a reminder for those interested in providing public comment during the Planning Commission Meeting. There are two items scheduled for Work Session discussion, neither of which has a public hearing. However, input can be submitted to planning@parkcity.org. Both of the applications will come before the Planning Commission in the future as public hearing items. For public comments made, she asked those present to state their name for the record, limit input to three minutes, and address items under Commission review.

Director Ward reported that the update to the General Plan is underway. There was a community open house last week and there is a project website: www.engageparkcity.org/generalplan. There is an application process that is open for residents interested in serving on a Neighborhood Advisory Committee as part of that work. Committee Members will represent the 10 different neighborhoods within Park City. Those applications are open through October 25, 2024. Application information is available on the website for those interested in participating.

Chair Hall shared a disclosure and explained that she retains both HLH and Snell & Wilmer. However, that will not impact her ability to serve or contribute to the Commission discussions.

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

5. WORK SESSION

A. 1555 Lower Iron Horse Loop – Affordable Master Planned Development and Conditional Use Permit – The Planning Commission Will Conduct a Work Session for the Proposed Deer Valley Ski Rail Multi-Unit Affordable Development. PL-23-05824 AMPD, PL-23-05825 CUP.

Planner I, Jacob Klopfenstein, and Planner III, Lillian Zollinger, presented the Staff Report and explained that the first Work Session item relates to 1555 Lower Iron Horse Loop. There are several members of the Deer Valley team present at the Planning Commission Meeting. The Commission will discuss the proposed Deer Valley Ski Rail Multi-Unit Affordable Development. Planner Klopfenstein reminded Commissioners that the property is located at 1555 Lower Iron Horse Loop, which is a 1.47-acre lot in the Light Industrial ("LI") Zoning District. The applicant is proposing an employee housing development to satisfy a portion of the affordable housing obligations required for the Snow Park Master Planned Development ("MPD"). The current uses on the site include laundry services, offices, a gas station, and a parking lot, all used by Deer Valley.

The proposal for the employee housing development includes some dormitory or single-room occupancy-style living units. The applicant is proposing either a three or four-story option. Planner Klopfenstein shared a chart to highlight the different setback requirements for an Affordable Master Planned Development ("AMPD") and MPD. The setbacks would be the same 30 feet in the front with 10-foot setbacks for the rear and side. However, the open space requirements differ slightly between the AMPD and MPD, with a 20% requirement for the AMPD process, which would be 12,806 square feet for this particular site. For the MPD process, 30% open space is the requirement, which would be 19,210 square feet. The Commission has the discretion to reduce the open space requirements through the AMPD or the MPD code for affordable developments.

Planner Zollinger shared information about parking requirements. The proposal must meet the requirements of the Land Management Code ("LMC") for either the AMPD process or the MPD process. The applicant may request a reduction. There are limits to the AMPD process as far as what the Planning Commission can grant. With an MPD process, there are no limits on the reduction. As for the current proposal before the Commission, if there are three stories, there will be a required 215 parking spaces, and for four stories, there will be a required 288 parking spaces.

Planner Zollinger reviewed the AMPD Parking Reduction chart. She explained that it outlines the minimum number of parking spaces the Planning Commission may grant for affordable units. The absolute minimum number of parking spaces that are required for the proposal is 29. For the three-story option, which is a reduction of 86.5%, and for the four-story option, a reduction of

89.9%. The applicant is currently proposing 34 parking spaces, which is five more than the minimum required. That would be an 84.2% reduction for the three-story and 88.2% reduction for the four-story. As noted in the Staff Report, 34 proposed parking spaces is not compliant with the LMC.

As for the building height, this is where the difference between the AMPD and MPD is apparent. Planner Zollinger explained that for an AMPD, the regulating height is that of the LI Zoning District, which is 30 feet. There can be up to 45 feet as long as the height beyond 30 feet is stepped back at 10 feet on all sides of the building. For an MPD, the applicant must meet the 30-foot requirement, but it is possible to apply for a height exception if the criteria outlined in the Staff Report are met. Several questions were posed to the Planning Commission for consideration:

- Is the Planning Commission open to considering reduced open space requirements through an AMPD for this site due to its proximity to the Rail Trail?
- Does the Planning Commission find the MPD or AMPD review process regarding open space is best for this site?
- Does the Planning Commission have preliminary feedback regarding which AMPD or MPD tools are more appropriate to balance the goals of affordable unit production with neighborhood compatibility and LMC and General Plan guidance for the area?
- What additional information or analysis would the Planning Commission like to see regarding parking and parking requirements?
- Is this a site the Planning Commission feels may be appropriate for a four-story building with no stepback?
- Does the Planning Commission have preliminary feedback on the desired path for height: wherein they will review an MPD if there is no stepback and they will review an AMPD if there is a stepback. Which is more consistent with the LMC and General Plan criteria?

The applicant, Hannah Tyler, introduced herself as Vice President of Resort Planning for Deer Valley. She thanked the Commission for taking time to discuss the workforce housing project, known as Ski Rail, which is intended to provide Deer Valley staff will housing. She introduced some team members to the Commission, including Willa Williford, who is the Vice President of Workforce Housing. SAR Group is the new architectural partner and Dan Craig is present.

Ms. Tyler shared an update on the progress that has been made on the project so far. Over the last few months, the project has been reassessed to examine the massing, programming, and neighborhood impacts. The original design that was submitted did not meet the Deer Valley goals. It was determined that the building mass was too large for the neighborhood and did not meet the sustainability targets. As a result, the General Plan was considered as was the Bonanza Park Neighborhood Plan. Deer Valley was inspired to evolve the plans to meet the needs of the community as well as further consider the desires of staff. A significantly improved project has been developed, which features less visual impact, more open space, and better programming. Additionally, she believes that the sustainability values of the project have been enhanced.

Ms. Tyler noted that there is an opportunity to create a housing project that provides significantly more housing than the prior development plan. She feels this plan aligns with the community's goals and meets critical housing needs. Deer Valley has submitted this under the AMPD, which allows a maximum building height of 45 feet. There will be full compliance with 45 feet, as the proposed project will not be above that height. The intention is to discuss the 10-foot stepback. She pointed out that the AMPD does not give the Planning Commission discretion to have that discussion, so there is a desire to potentially consider a shift to the MPD instead. There are many elements of the AMPD that there is compliance with. Ms. Tyler asked that the current conversation focus on height. She is aware that this will be the first of many future discussions. It was noted that traffic and parking are determined by unit count, which is triggered by height. As such, the plan is not currently at the stage where it would be appropriate to submit a Traffic Study.

Something the Staff Report mentioned was that there was a lack of approval from the State for the setback from the seasonal stream. Ms. Tyler reported that this has since been received and that will be submitted. She asked Ms. Williford and Mr. Craig to share additional information.

Ms. Williford stated that she is excited about the Ski Rail site and how it can contribute to growing the workforce housing portfolio for Deer Valley because there is a commitment to growing that portfolio. It is believed Ski Rail is the ideal site as the first step in many investments in workforce housing over the next five years. With Ski Rail, there is an opportunity to take an underutilized site and align it with the vision of the Bonanza Park Neighborhood Plan. In terms of the amenities, she explained that this neighborhood already has a lot of what is needed, including medical services, groceries, education, transit, and so on. Employees are encouraged not to bring vehicles to work and this site is particularly well positioned for that. The site can be parked lightly to accomplish the goals for the site. She asked Mr. Craig to share additional details.

Mr. Craig presented a map of the area and pointed out the location of the site. The numbers shown indicate where it might be appropriate to consider three stories and four stories. He explained that four stories might make sense with some flexibility in the stepback where it is further away from Bonanza and closer to some of the adjacent condominiums. The condominiums are four stories and exceed some of that height with the roof forms. Given the surrounding context, it is believed that what is proposed will work well in the area. Commissioner Laura Suesser believed it is suggested that under an MPD application, there would be a three-story building close to Bonanza and a four-story building closer to the condominiums. Mr. Craig clarified that it is one building and the request is that part of it be four stories. With an MPD, the request would be for additional height to accommodate that, but in an AMPD, it would be compliant with the 45-foot height limit. The request to exceed the stepback will be further discussed later in the presentation.

Commissioner Suesser noted that under an AMPD, the Planning Commission does not have the discretion to reduce or eliminate the stepback for the fourth story. She believed that is what is driving this discussion. This was confirmed. Commissioner Suesser understood the challenges.

Commissioner Henry Sigg asked if the stepback is on all sides. Planner Zollinger confirmed this. Under the AMPD proposal, if the zoning height is exceeded, there needs to be a 10-foot stepback on all sides of the building. Additional discussions were had about AMPD requirements and how those compare to the MPD requirements. Mr. Craig shared an illustration of a compliant three and four-story building in the AMPD. There is a desire to seek guidance on an alternative. He explained that building within the stepback would make it possible to achieve some of the density and program goals that Deer Valley wants to be able to provide to the employees.

Mr. Craig reported that the intention is to design and build something contextual in the neighborhood. The four-story section does have some context on the east side closest to the four-story condominiums. Commissioner Suesser noted that this is the LI Zoning District, where there is a building height of 30 feet, despite the other residential units in this district that are three or four stories. Mr. Craig clarified that under the AMPD it is possible to build to 45 feet. Commissioner Suesser pointed out that the district has a height limit of 30 feet, so what is being discussed would be an exception under an MPD. Commissioners were reminded that the AMPD allows up to 45 feet without the discretion of the Planning Commission, assuming there was compliance with the stepback. What is proposed would comply with the 30 feet adjacent to Bonanza. Commissioner Suesser further discussed the difference between the AMPD and MPD.

Mr. Craig pointed out the area where some guidance and flexibility are requested. It is around the perimeter of the partial fourth floor. The red highlights where that flexibility is desired and the yellow reflects what the zoning code would require the applicant to do otherwise. Mr. Craig shared information about another workforce housing project that opened in the past year at Winter Park. That project was successful in part because it utilized modular construction and systems. That could be used in this case as well. That system requires that walls stack up due to the structural components and the way those are fabricated. He noted that the modules can be shipped to the site and stacked. That is the reason for the requested fourth-story section.

Commissioner Bill Johnson asked if the modular design is inhibiting the stepback on all sides. This was confirmed. Mr. Craig explained that modular construction requires the ability to stack. It is important to reflect on the density and efficiency of the floorplan. Even if the modular construction is removed, the units reflected in the drawings are efficient and create appropriate residences. Mr. Craig reported that 60 feet is the maximum length of a module that can be trucked. Commissioner Shand wondered whether it would be possible to have a module that is 40 feet wide on the fourth floor to achieve the 10-foot stepback on both sides. It was confirmed that this could be done. However, many of the walls that would support the fourth floor above would either require structural beams, which would reduce ceiling heights or increase the height of the building, or the walls would need to be pulled back. There are many different considerations.

Mr. Craig shared an additional drawing to illustrate what work has been done with Deer Valley. He explained that the drawing shows the three and four-story building as it relates to the nearby streets, the Rail Trail, and the transit orientation. The idea is to create a building that is responsive to the site, creek, and transit. There is a desire to create a building that makes sense in the area.

Ms. Williford explained that when revisiting the plan, there were conversations with neighbors and employees in order to obtain feedback. A lot of questions were asked about the site. There were some common responses related to amenities, the connection to the Rail Trail, and gathering areas. This affirmed the sense of community, connection, and livability which are the guiding principles. Ms. Williford asked that the Planning Commission discuss the following Staff questions:

- Is this a site the Planning Commission feels may be appropriate for a four-story building with no stepback?

The answer to that question will drive what traffic study will be modeled and what further data will be collected. It will then be possible to come back to the Commission with traffic and parking details at a future meeting. Chair Hall asked that the Staff questions be shared for reference.

Commissioner Johnson asked what would happen if the AMPD was pursued. He wanted to understand how many units and tenants would be reduced. Mr. Craig reported that a three-story building would provide 211 beds for residents. With the partial fourth floor, which would increase to 243 beds. Ms. Tyler stated that Deer Valley has a need for housing overall. Right now, the housing is open to all staff members and is organized by department. There will be new staff at Deer Valley that will come with Snow Park, but this project could fill a demand that is greater than the Snow Park employee generation. Ms. Williford explained that overall, the workforce housing need exceeds the strict calculation of the need generated by Snow Park Village. Ski Rail is seen as block one and then there will likely be a need to focus outside of the Park City limits since there are employee housing needs on the east side as well.

Commissioner Sigg asked about the plan to move employees to the mountain. Ms. Tyler reported that a lot of the staff that lives in the housing do not drive to work. If there is not public transit provided, Deer Valley provides a shuttle. If there is transit, then employees take the transit. There is collaboration with the transit agencies to ensure there are buses early enough and late enough.

Commissioner Johnson mentioned the State approval for the buffer from the stream. Ms. Tyler reported that there is agreement that the edge of the building and zoning setbacks are a comfortable distance from the edge of the property line. That approval will be included in the next Meeting Materials Packet. Commissioner Johnson asked if there would be grading or filling close to the stream. This was denied. Ms. Tyler explained that there are regulations in place. In addition, the property does not go to the stream. All of the grading will be within their property line. There is a voluntary clean-up plan, but that is a separate process from this. Commissioner Johnson suggested that some of that information be included in a narrative for the next meeting. It was also recommended that a Federal Emergency Management Agency ("FEMA") map be shared.

Chair Hall suggested that the Planning Commission discuss the fifth question posed by Staff. She reminded those present that the question relates to the height. Ms. Tyler explained that what is proposed is a three-story building close to Bonanza with a fourth-story section that is closer to the condominiums. It is proposed under the MPD and no portion would be over 45 feet.

Commissioner Sigg asked for clarification on the stepback differential between an AMPD and MPD. Planner Zollinger clarified that the proposal is a three-story or four-story option. However, the maximum height is what is being discussed currently. The maximum height, either in the AMPD or MPD is 30 feet. In an AMPD, the applicant can exceed that, up to 45 feet, which in this case, would allow for the fourth story. If the height exceeds 30 feet, there needs to be a step back of 10 feet. For an MPD, the limit is 30 feet, but the Planning Commission has the discretion to allow an applicant to exceed the height. The applicant is proposing to go up to 45 feet, with three stories on the front adjacent to Bonanza Drive and a fourth story on the back portion.

Commissioner Christin Van Dine noted that there is more flexibility to work on this proposal within the MPD. There is more discretion about what is acceptable both in terms of height and parking. As much as she likes to see AMPDs move forward, this particular project might fit better into the MPD box. Working within that setting, the fourth-story location is reasonable and can hopefully meet the criteria that exist for exceptions. Commissioner Johnson noted that this is affordable housing and is modular. He wants this process to be as smooth as possible and worries that there might be difficulties with the MPD process. He is leaning towards the AMPD route instead.

Commissioner Shand is leaning towards the AMPD route. He knows that the applicant has asked the Commission to consider height, but really, it is the setback that is being considered. If there is additional height, then there could be parking issues. There are complications on the site, which is the reason he would prefer the three-story version of the proposal. Commissioner Shand asked whether the Rail Trail will be incorporated as open space for the project. This was denied. Mr. Craig stated that based on the preliminary calculations for open space, it is exceeded by 30%. That does not include the Rail Trail and is based on the open space within the property line.

Commissioner Shand likes the location, due to the proximity to public transit. He also likes the energy that it will bring to the Bonanza Park area. That being said, he believes there needs to be more information provided before the four-story option is further considered by the Commission.

Commissioner John Frontero stated that he is leaning towards the partial four-story option with an MPD. He believes these beds are critical. Some flexibility with the stepback is a tradeoff that he has comfort with. Commissioner Frontero asked about the open space and noted that the MPD open space requirement is 30%. Mr. Craig reported that the preliminary calculations suggest that the development will meet or exceed the 30% requirement associated with an MPD. Commissioner Frontero pointed out that the open space requirement is less with an AMPD. Commissioner Johnson believes that an AMPD will make it possible to move this project forward faster than an MPD. Commissioner Frontero spoke about parking and explained that he is comfortable that Deer Valley will be able to address parking and mitigate any issues that arise.

Commissioner Shand noted that he has been past that site previously. It is on the south side of that road where the slope is between steep and very steep, as noted in the Staff Report. The retaining wall that would need to go in there would be exceedingly tall. He would not be in favor of granting an exception to put in parking on that side of the street. Chair Hall asked that the Commission focus on the fifth question posed by Staff before discussing some of the other questions.

Commissioner Suesser asked if the applicant had a preference for an AMPD or MPD. Ms. Tyler reported that the preference is an MPD with 45 feet and no stepback. There could then be discussions about elements of the AMPD there is compliance with that could be brought over to the MPD. There are elements of the AMPD that are advantageous and there are good pieces of it that can be brought forward through the MPD process. Ms. Tyler explained that the MPD process gives the Planning Commission discretion on some of those elements. Commissioner Suesser noted that she is leaning toward the AMPD process rather than the MPD process.

Commissioner Sigg favors the stepback from Bonanza Drive in exchange for the fourth floor. He believes the tradeoff is there. There is enough of a setback from Bonanza that it will create a meaningful difference. He has comfort with the four stories under the MPD. Chair Hall agrees with the Commissioners who are in support of the back building being four stories. She also wondered whether the Commission should reevaluate the AMPD code in the future.

It was suggested that the first question posed by Staff be considered next, which relates to reduced open space requirements due to the proximity to the Rail Trail. Mr. Craig stated that there is a desire to connect to the Rail Trail system so the residents have every opportunity to commute in various ways, whether it is by bus, bicycle, or something else. Commissioner Shand believes there is a connection to the Rail Trail at the end of the road. This was confirmed. Mr. Craig reported that the connection to the Rail Trail at grade would exist at the northwest corner of the property. In the Site Plan, the intention is to make a connection for the residents there.

Commissioner Suesser is not in favor of reducing open space given the proximity to the Rail Trail. This is a residential project and she believes the current open space requirements are appropriate. She feels this way whether it is an AMPD or MPD that is ultimately pursued. Other Commissioners agreed that the open space requirements should remain in place for this project.

Director Ward explained that the questions were framed in a way to assist the Commission with their discussion. The intention was to provide clarity about the difference between the AMPD and MPD. Now that input about the height has been provided by the Commission to the applicant, there is enough information for the applicant to regroup and prepare to come back for a future meeting. A question was asked about whether the road is public or private. Director Ward reported that the property is part of the Iron Horse Industrial Subdivision. This portion of Lower Iron Horse Loop Road is platted as a private road with a public access easement. Chair Hall thanked Staff and the applicant for the information provided during the Work Session discussion.

B. **1400 Sullivan Road** – Conditional Use Permit, Master Planned Development, and Plat Amendment – The Planning Commission Will Conduct a Work Session to Discuss the Proposed Park City Community Center at City Park. PL-24-06244 CUP, PL-24-06246 MPD, PL-24-06247 Plat.

Planner Klopfenstein presented the Staff Report and explained that the item relates to the Park City Community Center at City Park. The applicant team is present at the meeting to answer any questions. The purpose of the Work Session is to provide a brief overview of the proposal and allow Commissioners to provide some feedback and input. Planner Klopfenstein reported that this is a proposed 15,000-square-foot facility that is envisioned to include a playground, outdoor sports courts, and indoor community amenity spaces. The existing building on the site is 5,000 square feet, which means the proposal would be a substantial upgrade to the existing building.

A Site Plan was shared for the proposal. Planner Klopfenstein pointed out the location of the playground and sports courts, which would be at the back along the trail on the site. The building itself would be toward the front of the site. The floor plan for the indoor portion of the building was shared. He referenced the various community spaces for the interior of the building. An overlay illustrated the existing building, which was shown in yellow, and the existing sports courts, which were shown in blue. It was overlayed with the proposed building, which was shown in light gray.

The lot and site requirements for the Urban Park Zoning ("UPZ") District were reviewed. Planner Klopfenstein reported that the UPZ District requires a setback of 25 feet from the lot boundary. The proposal is a 30-foot setback on the west/east side and over 100 feet on the north/south lot lines. The maximum height allowed in the UPZ is 28 feet from the existing grade. The applicant is not proposing to exceed that 28-foot height maximum, but there will be an additional 5 feet of height allowance for rooftop mechanical equipment. He noted that this is allowed under the code.

The off-street parking requirements were reviewed. Planner Klopfenstein reported that public recreation facilities require five spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area. The site already has 47 existing spaces. The applicant proposes adding 28 new parking spaces for a total of 75 parking spaces, which fulfills the requirement of five parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area. The Parking Plan was shared. The new parking is highlighted in blue and the existing parking is highlighted in yellow. Proposed bicycle parking is also listed on the plan in green.

Planner Klopfenstein discussed the electric vehicle ("EV") and outdoor bicycle parking requirements. EV charging conduit is required for future EV charging station installations for 50% of the first 100 required off-street parking spaces. The applicant is proposing EV charging infrastructure for 14 of the 28 new parking spaces (50%) and two charging stations (5% of the new spaces). Outdoor bicycle parking is required for 10% of required off-street parking. The applicant is proposing nine bicycle racks for a total of 18 spots, exceeding the requirement.

Enclosed bicycle storage was discussed next. Planner Klopfenstein reported that the requirement is that there be enclosed bicycle storage for one bicycle per 10 employees generated for uses as outlined in the Affordable Housing Resolution. That being said, the applicant has indicated that there are no plans to hire additional employees when the Community Center opens.

The MPD review standards were shared. Planner Klopfenstein reported that for open space, a minimum of 60% is required. The applicant proposes maintaining 489,951 square feet of open space, which is approximately 79% of the lot. Regarding landscaping, the Forestry Board has approved the applicant's proposal to remove 48 trees and replace 44 trees. The Forestry Board required retaining flowering crab apple trees that are currently on the site. Planner Klopfenstein explained that the Commission can now ask for additional information or share comments.

Commissioner Suesser asked where the new playground will be located. Planner Klopfenstein reported that it will be in the northeast corner of the site. In terms of square footage, it will be comparable to what is currently in place. Shifting the playground to that location will provide better access and visibility. It will be safer for the children than the current location against the road.

Commissioner Shand asked how many current employees are in the 5,000-square-foot facility. It was clarified that the building is only used seasonally on a full-time basis. The day camp is run out of there in the summer and there are 100 children. For that, there are approximately 10 staff members per day. During the rest of the year, that building is used sporadically, but a lot of the time, it sits empty. It is also leased by Sundance, which accounts for a portion of the winter use.

Commissioner Shand wondered how it is possible additional employees will not be needed if the building will triple in size. It was stated that this would ensure everyone would be located in one facility versus having staff in two different places. Commissioner Shand believed additional bicycle parking should be considered. Commissioner Van Dine also thought there should be more bicycle parking and also felt there should be some covered bicycle parking that is shaded or will offer protection from snow. That will also ease the need for indoor bicycle storage. She appreciates the addition of new parking, as that will be helpful for the area, especially as it relates to the courts.

Discussions were had about food service. It was stated that the food service in the building is a catering kitchen that would be in the community room. There is also a location for food truck parking where a food truck could pull in with close access to that community room. It would meet the LMC requirements for a food truck, where it would be out of the right-of-way and have its own location. Commissioner Sigg asked about the restrooms available. It was stated that there are indoor restrooms associated with the day camp and community event space. There is also a replacement for the outdoor restrooms as well. The requirements are exceeded for the building and the requirements are met for the existing restrooms provided for the park area.

Commissioner Frontero asked how the 100 children arrive at the area currently for the day camp. For instance, if those children are dropped off or ride their bicycles. It was reported that there is a mixture. Some parents drive their children there, but it is not a drop-off scenario. The parents need to come in and sign their children into the camp. When those children are picked up, the parents need to come back into the building. The drop-off times are spread out. Commissioner

Van Dine mentioned the turnaround that comes between the two parking lots in front of the building. She foresees that as a safer loading spot when there are field trips.

Discussions were had about the parking spaces. It was noted that the parking spaces have never been assigned for specific uses. However, there is a three-hour time limit in City Park currently. Commissioner Suesser asked about the dimensions of the sidewalks on the perimeter and through the site. It was reported that there is a main entry plaza that starts at approximately 20 feet and narrows to approximately 12 feet. The main sidewalks running in the front of the building are approximately 7.6 feet and the smaller perimeter sidewalks are 6 feet. The trail is 10 feet. Commissioner Suesser asked if there has been thought given to making the Community Center available to the senior citizens. Some history was shared and in 2017 there was a proposal to make this a joint-use facility between the Senior Center and Community Center. In the end, the seniors did not want to be part of that project and wanted their own facility instead. The design has changed since those discussions took place. It is comparable in size and the idea is to move several programs to this facility in order to alleviate some pressures elsewhere. It is envisioned that this building will be operational seven days a week throughout the year.

Commissioner Johnson believes that bicycle storage should be increased and should be covered in certain areas. It sounds like the Community Center will be accessible to everyone in the community, so the seniors will still have the ability to use the building. He asked about the roof design. It was stated that the flat roofing at the MARC has been less problematic than the pitched roof. Flat roofing tends to perform well in these kinds of environments. Depending on the decisions that take place in the future, the bulk of the roof may actually have solar panels on it.

Commissioner Johnson asked about the mechanical equipment on the roof. He would like to look at a Condition of Approval that requires it to be stepped back from the parapet walls by at least a 1:1 ratio or whatever the Planning Director recommends, as that is a good planning practice. Commissioner Suesser asked if there would be access to restrooms from the exterior of the building. This was confirmed. The restrooms will still be accessible even after the building is closed.

Chair Hall is excited about the upgrades that are proposed. She likes that the park is fenced and there is a lot of shade. She asked that shade be considered over and around the play structure moving forward, as some shade will likely be lost with the relocation of the structure. It was clarified that shade sails will be included in the design as well as a covered seating area. The item is tentatively scheduled to come back in December 2024 for consideration and approval. The hope is that the construction work will start when the students are back to school in August.

The Commission took a five-minute break before discussing the Regular Agenda items.

6. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Parcel SS-104-B – Robbins Addition Annexation Petition – The Applicant Proposes Annexing a 0.94-Acre Summit County Parcel within the Thaynes Canyon Neighborhood to Create One Lot for One Single-Family Dwelling and to Zone the Property Single Family. PL-23-05882.

Assistant Planning Director, Elissa Martin, presented the Staff Report and explained that the item is an Annexation Petition. The petition is to annex a 0.94-acre parcel within the Thaynes Canyon neighborhood from unincorporated Summit County into Park City to develop one single-family dwelling and affordable accessory apartment within the Single-Family Zoning District and Sensitive Land Overlay ("SLO"). The surrounding acreage was annexed between 1983 and 1993. The annexation petition was submitted by Ivory Development, LLC, and Boyer Robbins JV, LC.

The petition to annex requires that the applicant state the requested zoning. Currently, the property is zoned Rural Residential in Summit County, which allows one dwelling unit per acre with the potential for a nightly rental, a building height of 32 feet, and limited commercial uses. The applicant is requesting Single-Family Zoning in Park City, which allows three units per acre, no nightly rentals, and a building height of 28 feet. Since the annexation petition was initiated by the property owner and includes property intended for future development, a Preliminary Subdivision Plat is required. The applicant submitted a Preliminary Plat that combines unincorporated Parcel SS-104-B and adjacent Parcels IC-MISC and PCA-105, already within City limits. The intention is to increase the developable acreage from 0.94 acres to 1.73 acres. Initially, the applicant's proposal included the creation of three lots for the development of three single-family dwellings, but the applicant recently amended their application to propose the creation of one lot to develop a single-family dwelling and potentially an affordable accessory apartment.

The unincorporated Summit County parcel is the result of three annexations into Park City from 1983 through 1993, which included acreage surrounding the property. The 56-acre Iron Canyon property was annexed in 1983, the 238-acre Smith Ranch property was annexed in 1988, and the 0.92-acre Ross annexation occurred in 1993. In the same year that the Iron Canyon property was annexed, the Iron Canyon Subdivision was approved, which created a remnant parcel located between Iron Canyon Drive and the Summit County parcel. Originally, the County labeled that parcel IC-CA (Iron Canyon Common Area) but later changed the label to MISC for miscellaneous. According to tax records and the Title Report submitted by the applicant, IC-MISC has remained in private ownership of The Boyer Company, LC, and in December of 2022, the parcel was conveyed to the Boyer Robbins JV, LC. It is not the role of the Planning Staff or the Planning Commission to weigh in on the dispute over who has the authority to shape how the property is developed. Assistant Director Martin provided the background of the annexation process to date.

After the applicant filed the petition to annex the parcel, the City Council held a public hearing and voted to accept the petition for further processing. That took place at the March 7, 2024, City Council Meeting. During the meeting, the City Council advised Staff and the applicant that only one lot for one single-family dwelling would be considered. The next step in the process is the evaluation of the petition by the Staff Review Team, which includes the Planning Director, City Engineer, Public Works Department, Fire Marshal, Police Chief, utility providers, and the Park City School District. The Staff Review Team phase has ended and it is time for the Planning Commission review. Assistant Planner Martin explained that at the next public hearing, the Planning Commission can provide a recommendation to the City Council for final action.

The LMC requirements for annexing were reviewed. Assistant Planner Martin discussed LMC 15-8-1 and noted that it outlines the purpose for annexing. The language was as follows:

- Protecting the general interests and character of the community;
- Assuring orderly growth and development;
- Preserving open space;

- Enhancing parks and trails;
- Ensuring environmental quality;
- Protecting entry corridors, view sheds, and environmentally sensitive lands;
- Preserving historic and cultural resources;
- Creating buffer areas;
- Protecting public health, safety, and welfare;
- Compliance with the General Plan.

In the General Plan Goal #1 it states: "...discourage sprawl and direct growth inward to strengthen existing neighborhoods." The annex parcel and larger residential lots adjacent and to the south provide a transitional buffer between higher-density areas and open space and agricultural lands to the east. This location is appropriate for infill development and would not contribute to sprawl.

To evaluate the proposed development in relation to the character of the community and pattern of growth, Staff looked at the surrounding neighborhood and analyzed three main aspects: land uses (existing and allowed), the density of the lots, and the scale of the structures. The annexation parcel is surrounded by three subdivisions: Iron Canyon, Aspen Springs, and Thaynes Creek Ranch Estates. Within these subdivisions, the uses are predominantly single-family residential and open space. On the outskirts, there is some agricultural use. In terms of density and scale, annexation agreements for all three developed areas included limitations on density and the size of dwellings, which established the community character and pattern of development.

While at the time and at present, the allowed density in the Single-Family Zoning District was three dwelling units per acre, the lots within the developed area vary greatly in size due to limitations put in place to restrict lot size. The end result is a net density much lower than what the zoning would permit at one dwelling unit per 1.24 acres. Additionally, lots directly adjacent to the subject property vary in size from 0.4-acres to 4.5-acres. The average lot size for the adjacent lots is 1.33 acres. When the net density of the surrounding subdivisions and the average density of the adjacent homes is considered, the proposed one-lot subdivision for the development of one single-family dwelling on a 1.73-acre parcel is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

For compatibility with community character and to ensure orderly growth, Staff recommends a Condition of Approval and a Plat Note to restrict the density of the subdivision to one single-family dwelling on one lot and to prohibit future subdivision of the single-family lot. In addition, since the General Plan states that the Thaynes neighborhood primarily includes full-time residents and "should remain a quiet residential neighborhood dominated by single-family homes," there could also be a Condition of Approval to prohibit nightly rentals. To further ensure compatible residential infill, the existing residential structures in the neighborhood are considered in terms of scale. The Single-Family Zoning District does not restrict house size on a lot, but the adjacent subdivisions are subject to Plat Notes that restrict building footprints, gross residential floor area, and limits of disturbance. Assistant Planner Martin shared an image of the subject area for additional clarity.

The adjacent Aspen Springs Subdivision Phase I requires a maximum floor area of 5,500 square feet for smaller lots ranging in size between 0.37 acres and 0.55 acres. In Phase II, floor area is restricted to between 6,000 and 8,250 square feet for homes on lots 1 acre to 1.9 acre. The adjacent Thaynes Creek Ranch Estates Subdivision is subject to Plat Note restrictions on the building footprint and gross residential floor area. It limits the 1.3-acre lots in Phase I to a building footprint of 4,150 square feet and a maximum gross residential floor area of 6,640 square feet. Building footprints of homes on adjacent lots are approximately 4,000 square feet on average.

With regard to the compatibility of scale, Staff recommends a Condition of Approval that requires future development on the proposed annexed property to be limited to a maximum building footprint of 4,000 square feet and a maximum gross residential floor area of 6,500 square feet, including an above grade garage, to be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood character.

Annexation requirements include the protection of view sheds, entry corridors, and sensitive lands. The location of the annexation property is near the base of Iron Mountain with proximity to McPolin Farm and the northern entry corridor. While the subject property does not have steep slopes, it does slope gently upwards from Highway 224 and is visible from designated vantage points along the highway. It is also surrounded by lands that are within the SLO. In land use regulation, there are some tools that can be used to mitigate the impacts of proposed development on view sheds, entry corridors, and sensitive lands. One of those tools is to establish a maximum building height. In Summit County, the Rural Residential Zoning has a maximum building height a structure of 32 feet. In Park City, with the Single-Family Zoning District, the maximum building height is 28 feet. Assistant Director Martin noted that some lots within the Aspen Springs Subdivision are restricted to a building height of 25 feet by way of a Plat Note.

Another tool that Park City uses is the SLO. If the 0.94-acre parcel is annexed into the SLO, a comprehensive analysis would be required at the time of Final Plat to evaluate the impact of development on sensitive environmental and aesthetic areas, such as slopes, ridgeline areas, crest of hills, wetlands, stream corridors, wildland interface, and wildlife habitat areas. The SLO analysis would also inform appropriate limits of disturbance that would minimize the visual impact within the entry corridor. Limits of disturbance can also include a provision for the driveway location. Assistant Director Martin noted that the adjacent Aspen Springs and Thaynes Creek Ranch Estates Subdivision Plats impose a maximum limit of disturbance requirement as well.

The General Plan recommends that "shared view corridors should be maintained…barns and secondary structures should maintain view corridors and be located near the primary building on a lot." As a result, Staff recommends the Planning Commission consider a Condition of Approval to limit building height as well as a Condition of Approval to annex the parcel into the SLO and require limits of disturbance at the time of the Final Plat. As far as affordable housing, Resolution 05-2021 requires contributions to the City's affordable housing for annexations. The annexation would require an affordable housing unit with a minimum of 585 square feet of net livable space. She explained that net livable space is calculated by measuring the interior living area dimensions and does not include items like garages, patios, decks, and porches. The LMC provides several options for developers to satisfy the affordable housing requirement, but Staff recommends the construction of an on-site accessory apartment, which can either be attached or detached. This would not count towards the maximum building footprint or floor area. The Staff Report outlines additional Conditions of Approval that are related to affordable housing requirements.

Assistant Director Martin reported that the annexation will resolve an existing island of unincorporated County property. However, the Staff Review Team flagged some issues with service capacity for future development of one single-family dwelling and accessory apartment. Assistant Director Martin reviewed some of the next steps. She explained that the Annexation Agreement is a significant component of this process. The Conditions of Approval will be incorporated into the Draft Annexation Agreement and brought to the Planning Commission for review at the next public hearing. Upon consideration of the Annexation Agreement, the Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council, who will then take final action. Once the annexation is complete, the applicant could then submit an application for the Final Plat.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review the annexation petition, conduct a public hearing, provide feedback on the recommended Conditions of Approval, request any additional materials that might be needed for review, and then continue the item to October 23, 2024.

Chris Gamvroulas from Ivory Development noted that the Staff Report was comprehensive. He pointed out that Richard Moffatt is also present at the meeting. The Boyer Company was the original developer back in 1983. There was a request that Ivory Development come in and build a home on the property. The annexation makes sense in order to address the island issue. The application was revised from three lots to one lot based on feedback received from the City Council. He noted that there are some concerns about the recommendations included in the Staff Report as it relates to the maximum floor area. The feedback from interested individuals indicates there is a desire to build a larger home. Creating a larger floor area on the main level would allow for a larger home without making it too vertical. He understands the height limits and will work within the guidelines, but the market is asking for a larger footprint. He asked that this be considered. As far as an accessory dwelling unit ("ADU") there is support to pursue that.

Commissioner Frontero noted that the applicant stated there is a desire to have a larger footprint than the Staff Report has suggested. He asked for a ballpark number. Mr. Gamvroulas clarified that the desire is to see 6,500 on the floor area. That would allow for a larger home without going vertical. There is precedent in the lot size based on some of the surrounding development. Commissioner Frontero believed the request is for a 6,500 square foot footprint and 8,200 square foot gross residential floor area. Mr. Gamvroulas stated that this is what would be preferred. Commissioner Sigg asked if 6,500 square feet would include the garage, which was confirmed.

Commissioner Johnson believed the Staff Report proposes a maximum building footprint of 4,000 square feet and 6,500 square feet for the gross floor area. That is consistent with the adjacent Thaynes Creek Ranch Estates Subdivision. Assistant Director Martin explained that there are two examples of larger lots adjacent to the applicant property that have a maximum floor area of approximately 6,000 square feet, but in general, the Staff recommendation is compatible. Commissioner Johnson expressed support for what has been proposed in the Staff Report.

Chair Hall opened the public hearing.

Henry Fulton stated that he is a resident of Iron Canyon and is on the Architectural Control Committee, which is a small group that ensures everyone adheres to the protective covenants that date back to 1983. The intention is to make sure the neighborhood stays the way it is. Mr. Fulton thanked the Planning Department for addressing many of the initial concerns related to the application. He commented on safety on that road, as there can be issues there due to the elevation. The hope is that work can be done with the Planning Department, applicant, and City Engineer to make sure it is a safe environment for all. Mr. Fulton asked the Commission to consider what to do with the other remnant properties, as it would be nice to have some certainty.

Jim Helfand lives in Aspen Springs with his wife. Their home overlooks Iron Canyon Drive, which is the S-curve mentioned previously. In the 30 years, he has lived in the area, there has not been a year where there has not been at least one slide-off. The City Engineer has a letter from the Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") and UDOT reported that there have not been any accidents on that road. However, that is untrue. Normally, a tow truck comes to handle the issue. Mr. Helfand explained that it is a dangerous road and it is narrow with blind corners. He encouraged the Planning Commission to drive that road to better understand the conditions.

David Avrid stated that he is a 22-year resident of Aspen Springs. He believes the grade easily exceeds 10% in the curve. The road has a lot of pedestrian traffic, even during the winter months. The subject property might have a gentle slope, but the adjacent road does not have a gentle slope. He asked that the Planning Commission take that into consideration moving forward.

Steve Boyd has lived in Iron Canyon for 16 years and is a retired Fire Captain with Park City Fire. He has lived in Park City for 34 years. Mr. Boyd asked to speak about the safety of the road. What is unique about Iron Canyon is that the road is not wide enough to legally stripe and there are no sidewalks. Pedestrians walk up and down the road regularly. Mr. Boyd noted that he has personally responded to vehicles off the road, since 99% of the time that the cars slide off the road, there are no injuries. Approximately 10 years ago, Iron Canyon was so concerned about that section that the speed limit was reduced from 25 miles per hour to 15 miles per hour. Consideration of driveway location will be key for the application before the Commission. It might also be worthwhile to consider encouraging sidewalks in order to protect the property.

Ellen Hotung has lived in the neighborhood for 21 years and has been a resident of Park City for 29 years. She has gone off the road and ended up in the ditch before. When that happened, she did not call the Police Department or Fire Department but was towed by a friend. Ms. Hotung noted that she submitted a written letter to the City that mentioned the wildlife in the neighborhood. She reiterated the importance of addressing the driveway location and a potential sidewalk.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was continued to October 23, 2034.

The Commission discussed the Staff Report and praised the work and effort that was put into the document. It was thorough and well done. When it comes to square footage, the applicant is suggesting that the lot could handle larger square footage than what has been proposed. However, the Staff Report indicates that the adjacent neighborhoods support a 4,000-square-foot footprint. There were questions about potential flexibility. Assistant Director Martin explained that this is not her decision to make, but the Staff Report lays out the data and provides an analysis for the Planning Commission to consider. Ultimately, the Planning Commission can discuss what has been provided. The approximate building footprint for all of the properties surrounding the parcel was measured. The largest one is 5,899 square feet and the smallest single-family home has a building footprint of 2,248 square feet. The average is 4,000 square feet. The recommendation was based on the averages of the surrounding properties to the site.

Commissioner Johnson agrees that this is an excellent Staff Report and noted that there is a lot of data and documentation. He is supportive of the proposed Conditions of Approval in the Staff Report. Commissioner Van Dine mentioned the different lot sizes for the adjacent properties. She wondered whether it might be reasonable to have a little bit more square footage on this lot.

Commissioner Shand agrees with the comments made by the other Commissioners. When the applicant comes back, he would like to see the driveway proposal. He is not sure where the best location would be for the driveway, but given some of the concerns expressed during the public hearing, it makes sense that there be a gradual entrance into the driveway. He pointed out that the drivability of the road in question might be a City matter rather than an applicant's responsibility. Commissioner Suesser believes the City should consider a sidewalk along the road.

Commissioner Sigg agrees that the safety of the roadway should be taken into consideration as well as driveway placement as this becomes a platted lot in the City. As for the footprint size, he can understand why the applicant would seek a larger building footprint. Commissioner Sigg asked if there had been a wildlife study conducted. Commissioner Frontero believes it is possible to find flexibility given the fact that the lot size is significantly larger than some other nearby lots. It could potentially handle a bit more square footage, so he is open to considering other numbers.

Chair Hall sympathizes with the public comments that were shared. She has been a regular user of that road and will not drive there in the snow because of the conditions. There is potentially something that can be done with the driveway placement as the discussions move ahead. Assistant Director Martin explained that the driveway location is important. It has been discussed with the City Engineer already. The location will come down to standards that the City Engineer will apply to the site for safety. That would be decided on through the platted limits of disturbance and would be included in that boundary and designated on the plat in the future.

MOTION: Commissioner Van Dine moved to CONTINUE the Robbins Annexation Petition – Parcel SS-104-B and the Public Hearing to the Planning Commission Meeting scheduled for October 23, 2024. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion.

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

B. 1800 Park Avenue – Park and Kearns Master Planned Development – The Applicant Proposes Redevelopment of the Site with 171 Hotel/Condo Units, 60 Affordable Units, 7,303 Square Feet of Restaurant/Bar Uses, 4,679 Square Feet of Retail, 6,469 Square Feet of Office Space, a 306-Square-Foot Coffee Shop, and at least 67,711 Square Feet of Accessory Use Exceptions in the General Commercial Zoning District and Frontage Protection Overlay Zone. PL-22-05476.

Senior Planner, Alec Barton, presented the Staff Report and explained that the item relates to the Park and Kearns MPD. Over the last few months, the Planning Commission has considered the project in the context of criteria for building height exceptions, as found in LMC 15-6-5(F)(1-6):

- The increase in building height does not result in increased square footage or building volume over what would be allowed under the zone required building height and density, including requirements for facade variation and design, but rather provides desired architectural variation, unless the increased square footage or building volume is from the transfer of development credits;
- Buildings have been positioned to minimize visual impacts on adjacent structures. Potential problems on neighboring properties caused by shadows, loss of solar access, and loss of air circulation have been mitigated as determined by the site-specific analysis;
- There is adequate landscaping and buffering from adjacent properties and uses;
- Increased setbacks and separations from adjacent projects are proposed;
- The additional building height results in more than the minimum open space required and results in open space that is publicly accessible;
- The additional building height is designed in a manner that provides a transition in roof elements in compliance with Chapter 15-5, Architectural Review.

Since the project involves a request for increased building height, the applicant must demonstrate that the criteria are met. Senior Planner Barton explained that the Planning Commission may grant additional building height if it meets the six findings, but is not required to do so. As the project has evolved, the Commission has consistently stated that most of the required criteria have not been met. The applicant has returned several times with revised plans. For example, at the last Planning Commission Meeting, the applicant presented plans that moved the increased building height entirely out of the Frontage Protection Zone ("FPZ") and reduced the overall area of the building within the FPZ. For purposes of comparison, these changes are included in graphic form within the Staff Report. Senior Planner Barton stated that at the current meeting, the focus will be on the revisions made to the plans since the meeting held on September 11, 2024.

The six criteria can be grouped into three categories. The first category includes Criteria #2 on the list. Senior Planner Barton noted that this is the sole criteria the Commission did not express concerns about at the previous meeting. The second category includes Criteria #1, Criteria #4, and Criteria #6. Those items focus on the form of the building, architectural variation, increased setbacks and separation from adjacent projects, and transitions in roof elements. The building footprint, form, and façade have been mostly unchanged in this application since the last meeting. However, the Roof Over Topography Plan shows additional screening around elevator penthouses and mechanical equipment. The applicant has also added space for a coffee shop or similar use on the Kearns Boulevard frontage. The final category includes Criteria #3 and Criteria #5, which focus on landscaping, buffering, and open space. These are the areas where the applicant has made the most significant changes since the last Planning Commission Meeting.

The item was noticed for a public hearing and possible action or continuation to the October 23, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting. Staff is not asking the Commission to take action to approve the project, as additional analysis of the project is required, which includes the following:

- Traffic impacts;
- Updated Parking Management Plan;
- Building mass, bulk, and orientation;
- Criteria for building height exceptions;
- Programming of open space;
- Historic feature (bell);
- Soils ordinance;
- Affordable housing;
- MPD, CUP, and Subdivision criteria.

If action is taken at the current meeting, it should be to deny the project because the Planning Commission determined the required findings for building height were not made. If the Planning Commission feels the revised plans meet the criteria for building height, the project should be continued to October 23, 2024, for additional in-depth analysis of the items previously listed.

Senior Planner Barton discussed the open space and parking analysis in the context of the building height criteria. He shared a sketch provided by the applicant to show the proposed changes to the configuration of the open space. The signature trail extends along the northeast and west perimeters of the project site and the applicant has updated the trail configuration along the north perimeter to provide more direct access to the site. Although it is not proposed as part of this project, the applicant has identified an area on the site plan where a ramp could connect with the proposed tunnel under Kearns Boulevard. Additional features in the redesign include a plaza with benches at the northwest corner of the project site, a space for a coffee shop or similar use between Building B and Building C, a reimagined art plaza between Building C and Building D, and space for a food truck or similar use to activate the signature trail along the north perimeter.

Senior Planner Barton noted that the amenity terrace south of Building A is intended for customers of the retail space in that building. The Open Space Plan in the Staff Report included this area in the open space calculations shown. He believes the applicant has prepared an updated Open Space Plan that corrects these calculations. The revised project results in a modest increase in open space over the previous iteration of the plans that were seen by the Planning Commission.

As for parking, as a multi-family nightly rental project with specific commercial and non-residential uses, the project requires 374 parking spaces. The applicant proposes 288 parking spaces, including 263 spaces in an underground garage and 25 surface parking spaces within setbacks. Senior Planner Barton shared a diagram with the reconfigured surface parking, which is highlighted in yellow. The parking remains within setbacks and is not compliant with the LMC. To access the parking, a driver would need to enter the site from a neighboring property.

The applicant has proposed a 23% reduction in required parking. Accessory uses, such as meeting spaces and lobbies are not included in the parking calculations. The Planning Commission may decrease the amount of required parking for the site if the Commission determines that the applicant's parking analysis supports that reduction in parking. Elements of the parking analysis include a parking management system. Senior Planner Barton reported that the applicant is proposing to manage the use of parking spaces on the site. They have indicated that they would provide an optional valet service for guests. Additionally, they have indicated that they will encourage employees and guests to utilize existing amenities, including transit service and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. Staff recommends that the proposal be updated to reflect additional information about how the optional valet service will function and how it will impact full-time tenants who park at the site. The proposal should also be updated with details about how employees will be encouraged to take alternative modes of transportation to and from the site.

Some of the other parking requirements include outdoor bicycle parking. This proposal complies with that requirement. The applicant is also proposing a 900-square-foot area for enclosed bicycle storage. Staff recommends that additional information be provided to demonstrate whether that is adequate. The application also complies with minimum requirements for electrical vehicle charging stations and conduit. Staff's conclusion is that the Parking Analysis is incomplete. It is recommended that the applicant provide additional information to support a parking reduction.

The applicant representatives, Carla Lehigh and Craig Elliott were present to share information with the Commission. Ms. Lehigh pointed out the southeast corner of the property and explained that the parking would be rotated. It was perpendicular to the building and is proposed to be relocated so there is parallel parking. That will provide additional space for buffering. The signature trail will be 12 feet and is included on the east, north, and west sides. She referenced some of the gathering areas, such as the one between C and D. Many of the proposed changes reflect an increase in open space. Two weeks ago, there was approximately 40% of open space and now there is 41.4% proposed. This is slightly different than what is in the Meeting Materials Packet because the outdoor terrace for the amenity space in the hotel has been removed.

Mr. Elliott shared the Connectivity Vision for Bonanza Park map. He discussed the intention to break up the super block that is between Park Avenue, Homestake Road, and Kearns Boulevard. The connectivity vision map shows the signature trail in red and potential sidewalk trails in yellow. There were some questions previously about connectivity on the site, so he has created a diagram of all of the pedestrian and bicycle pathways that come to the site. All items that come to a star on the diagram are the locations that meet at the site. The purple arrows represent the City plans for the tunnel and the ramp. The designs have considered what is contemplated in the area. The retail has been contemplated along the east and south sides. The blue line shown on the south side is envisioned in the Small Area Plan as being an enhanced walkway and pedestrian path. Mr. Elliott pointed out the parallel parking, signature trail, sidewalk, and amenity space.

Discussions were had about the south side of the project. Mr. Elliott explained that the signature trail is not envisioned there, but an enhanced pedestrian walkway is envisioned in that area. To the northeast corner is the ramp that they were given to work with from the Engineering Department. It is envisioned that the signature trail will be able to work through that space. As for the art plaza, there have been discussions with different artists. There is an opportunity to create a gathering space there. Additionally, a food truck location could enhance the use of the signature trail. Mr. Elliott shared some renderings with the Commission for additional context.

At the corner, the trail comes to a gathering space. It has been identified and separated from a different small plaza area. This allows users of the trail to stop and pause or even wait for others. Coming down to the south, another space works off of the drop-off area. That area can be programmed for different uses over time. The map of the area was further reviewed. On the southwest corner, there will be the bicycle share location. There have been discussions about an amenity terrace. At the last Planning Commission Meeting about the project, there was a request for an overlay of the images previously presented. Three specific images from the last presentation were selected to show how the building starts to fill in over the top of that space. Mr. Elliott reviewed those images with the Commission so there was clarity about what is envisioned.

Additional work was done on the Roof Over Topography Plan. Mr. Elliott explained that they have been using the 8-foot height exception for the elevators in all of their plans. There has been work done with the elevator manufacturers and he is confident that those can be brought down to the same height as the mechanical screening. Each one of those could be dropped down 3 feet. He has marked down the sections where the elevator is located and indicated the dimensions that will be in the next submittal to the Planning Commission. As for the parking information, there is one discrepancy between the Staff Report information and their calculations. There is agreement that the hotel calculations were smaller, but they are not as small as what is shown in the Meeting Materials Packet. For the multi-family calculation, the number they reached was 358.34 spaces. The difference is in the retail and multi-tenant. The Staff Report shows it as 5,000 square feet, but the support commercial space that services the lobby is not counted in the parking requirements, as it is a service for the hotel use. The calculation is then slightly less than shown. The hope is to work with Staff and finalize the numbers before the next meeting occurs.

For the parking calculations, the weekday time of day and weekend time of day were both considered. Mr. Elliott shared a chart to illustrate the data. 9:00 p.m. is the time when the greatest demand on parking exists and it is 292 parking spaces on a weekday at that time. This is driven by the hotel and residential use. For weekend time of day, there is not a lot of differentiation between the uses and the number is also 292 parking spaces. The monthly occupancy was considered as well. He noted that the hotel occupancy has driven most of this. The red on the top of the chart represents the high season and the peach color represents the low season. The yellow color represents the shoulder season. January had the highest demand for parking, which was 286 parking spaces. There are also modal adjustments to take into consideration. For instance, whether the parking will be reduced due to the public transit, access to trails, and so on. Based on discussions with traffic engineers and others, there is a 5% reduction overall for that.

Mr. Elliott reported that 288 parking spaces have been provided between the parking structure and the surface parking. Additionally, a Parking Management Plan has been put together that describes the use, knowing that the hotel will be operating a valet service. If there is maximum demand, there is a requirement in the LMC that the plan show the overflow condition. The overflow is to shift to full valet. 61 self-parking spaces will never be part of the valet. That area is dedicated to staff and affordable housing. The maximum parking reaches 355, which is almost identical to the parking demand. With a hotel, there is clarity about the occupancy levels and demands. The valet use can be increased and modified as needed.

Mr. Elliott believed that with additional work with Staff, any issues can be addressed and resolved. He asked for Commissioner input about what had been proposed. The Planning Commission took a brief break before resuming the discussions about the 1800 Park Avenue application.

Chair Hall opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was continued to October 23, 2024.

Chair Hall believes it would be worthwhile to focus on reaching a consensus on height. The six criteria were further reviewed. Commissioner Frontero noted that during the presentation made by Senior Planner Barton, it was stated that the applicant had made some adjustments since the September 11, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting. He asked for those changes to be further highlighted so that information can be applied to the six criteria listed. He wants to focus on the changes from the last meeting to the current meeting. Senior Planner Barton reported that the primary changes are to open space and parking. The open space changes include a modest increase in the total amount of open space and a significant reconfiguration of that space. The trail was reconfigured and some of the plaza spaces were reconfigured and reimagined. There is space for a coffee shop and a food truck in this proposal. The other significant change is to the parking. Previously, the applicant was proposing surface parking that would've required the operator of a vehicle to back into or out of a space. Those spaces are now parallel instead. This has increased the amount of landscaping and buffering on the south and east perimeters.

Commissioner Frontero asked if the parallel parking is compliant. This was denied. Senior Planner Barton explained that the LMC does not allow surface parking in the site setbacks in this zone. Staff has recommended that surface parking not be included in the application given its proximity to adjoining properties. Commissioner Frontero wanted to know where the additional surface parking will be located. Senior Planner Barton stated that this is the only surface parking being suggested. The parking analysis suggests the space in the drop-off area could be considered to accommodate short-term parking. Neither the applicant nor Staff has included that in the parking calculations. Additional discussions were had about parking on the site.

Mr. Elliott stated that the parking lots that surround the property are three separate properties. Property lines go in the middle of the parking lots. There is a shared parking agreement between the three. This property has had an as-of-right use over the years because there have been access points. The property owner of this site has met with the surrounding property owners. There is a willingness to have a Condition of Approval related to the finalized parking agreement. The neighboring properties are actually supportive of the parking in the proposed locations. It would be the same kind of agreement that currently exists, but the agreement would be expanded. Mr. Elliott explained that the agreement is needed in order to make the proposal compliant.

Justin Keys represents the applicant and shared additional comments about the parking. He reported that vehicles are not permitted to back onto sidewalks, parking strips, or roadways. There is nothing in the code that says it is not possible to back out onto an adjoining property. The neighboring property owners are willing to provide written easements for access through the existing drive aisles to the parking locations. It is beneficial to have some surface parking available. He offered to sit down with Staff and review the code language further if that is necessary. He believes that based on the language that the proposed parking is in compliance.

Commissioner Frontero noted that there is a deficit in parking. He is struggling with the mitigation that has been presented, which is the valet service. He has not seen that it will necessarily mitigate the issues. Commissioner Frontero would like to see mitigation that reduces vehicle traffic, but a valet service does not reduce vehicle traffic. The mitigation needs to have a stronger element that incentivizes visitors, especially hotel guests, not to bring their personal vehicles. For example, providing shuttles to visitors. He wants to see an element that reduces the need for personal vehicles and asked for proposals that focus on that in the future. Mr. Elliott offered to share information about the historical use and some other potential options. Commissioner Frontero pointed out that a condo hotel has different traffic patterns than a standard hotel.

Commissioner Frontero appreciates the effort that has been made with the open space, but he is struggling to move forward with the height exception. Chair Hall reiterated a desire to reach a consensus on the building height. Commissioner Sigg pointed out that building height and parking are connected. He agrees with Commissioner Frontero that the historic profile of the property versus the contemplated profile of this property could be very different. Commissioner Sigg asked for information about the certification of the parking analysis. He wanted to know where the data came from. As for the shared parking rights with the neighbors, he wanted to know if there is any kind of platting that outlines a right-of-way where if it were compliant, the parallel parking or diagonal parking would go into a right-of-way that is fixed and is there in perpetuity. That way, when a neighbor develops their property, nothing is conflicting. He also expressed concerns about the surface spaces and the interconnection between the neighboring properties. To him, the height is not an independent decision with this application and other criteria must be a factor.

Chair Hall acknowledged that the MPD is looking at all of the criteria, but she reiterated there is a desire to reach a consensus on the issue of height. There are certain elements of the application that she likes, such as the perimeter sidewalk and removing the height from the FPZ. She is supportive of a parking reduction, especially with a shuttle system, and knowing that the bus stop is there. The reduction of the mechanical and elevator space is also appreciated. However, she does not find that the six criteria listed have been met for the height in excess of 35 feet.

Commissioner Johnson asked what amenity space within the building the affordable housing units can use. Mr. Elliott explained that each floor has a large gathering area. There is also an outdoor terrace between Blocks E and D. In addition, there is access to the rest of the site. Commissioner Johnson noted that Staff has requested additional information and he supports that request, as it is needed, especially when it comes to the valet option. Senior Planner Barton noted that internal bicycle storage information has also been requested. The applicant has indicated they will be able to provide that, but it was not ready in time for the current meeting. Commissioner Johnson wants to put a limitation on how the mechanical equipment will be configured. There is a desire to be flexible, but also to have a limitation that will provide some sort of setback. He added that he supports the new configuration of the trails that will run along the border of the property.

Commissioner Van Dine wondered whether the parking requirements change if a use is designated office rather than retail. Mr. Elliott clarified that it is not significantly different. Commissioner Van Dine does not find that the full requirements for the 45-foot height exception have been met. She is still not in support of the height exception based on what has been shared. It might make sense for Building E, but it does not seem to be appropriate for the other buildings.

Commissioner Shand likes the project and believes improvements have continued to be made. He looks forward to reviewing data from other similar projects. Some condo hotels have solved their parking issues where owners of the residences, who typically only use them for a short time, cannot leave a vehicle there. Whatever the applicant comes back with to illustrate how parking spots are used at similar properties would be beneficial. He likes the wider sidewalks and a lot of what has been proposed for the site. He reiterated that he is looking forward to more data.

Commissioner Suesser appreciates the realignment of the trail and feels that is a notable improvement. As for the south portion of the buildings, there is no bicycle path there and that is still being worked on. She would like to see an additional buffer there, including a path that connects. Commissioner Suesser does not think the driveway area near the front door of the property should be included as open space, as it is a driveway area as opposed to a plaza area. She asked Staff to verify the open space calculations ahead of the next discussion on the item. Commissioner Suesser pointed out that the parking is not currently compliant. One way to make it compliant is to either reduce the building size or reduce the plaza sizes to provide more room on the east and south sides. It is also possible to reduce the internal courtyard size. Those changes would provide a better buffer, particularly around the east and south sides of the project.

Commissioner Suesser is not currently supportive of the height exception based on the reasons that were stated during the last Planning Commission discussion about the application. She feels the office space users should have designated parking in the parking garage, but she does not see any allocation for that. She was surprised to see staff parking in the applicant presentation because there is no number listed for the employees in the materials from the applicant. Commissioner Suesser stated that an evaluation from the applicant is needed to address potential adverse impacts on the surrounding neighborhood from the proposed reduction in parking. She would also like to see details related to alternative modes of transportation, such as a shuttle.

Commissioner Suesser agrees with Staff that the current Parking Management Plan does not provide enough details to evaluate the shared parking and whether there is compliance. In addition, she feels the applicant needs to provide additional information to demonstrate compliance for bicycle storage. She would also like to see an analysis and breakdown of the accessory space. It was noted that the applicant will come back at a future meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Van Dine moved to CONTINUE the 1800 Park Avenue – Park and Kearns Master Planned Development and the Public Hearing to the Planning Commission Meeting scheduled for October 23, 2024. Commissioner Johnson seconded the motion.

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

7. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Commissioner Van Dine moved to ADJOURN.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:25 p.m.