

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
November 11, 2020

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

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

EX OFFICIO: David Everitt, Deputy City Manager, Hannah Tyler, Planner; Rebecca Ward, Planner; Liz Jackson, Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney

The Planning Commission meeting was conducted virtually via Zoom.

The public was able to submit eComments during the meeting.

NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC MEETING & HOW TO COMMENT VIRTUALLY:

Chair Phillips read the Public Notice for Electronic Meetings and Exhibit A: Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk.

This meeting will be an electronic meeting without an anchor location as permitted by Utah Code Open and Public Meetings Act section 52-4-207(4) as amended June 18, 2020, and Park City Resolution 18-2020, adopted March 19, 2020. The written determination of a substantial health and safety risk, required by Utah Code section 52-4-207(4), is attached as Exhibit A. Planning Commission members will connect electronically. Public comments will be accepted virtually as described below.

To comment virtually, use eComment or raise your hand on Zoom. eComments submitted before the meeting date will be attached to the packet as appendices. eComments submitted on Commission meeting days will be read aloud. For more information on participating virtually and to listen live, please go to www.parkcity.org.

Exhibit A: Determination of Substantial Health and Safety Risk

On October 23, 2020 the Commission Chairperson determined that conducting a meeting with an anchor location presents a substantial risk to the health and safety of those who may be present at the anchor location. Utah Code section 52-4-207(4) requires this determination and the facts upon which it is based, which include:

- Summit County has extended its Emergency Declaration and Public Health Emergency Declaration through January 8, 2021.
- Statewide COVID cases and hospitalizations are

increasing. This determination is valid for 30 days and is set to expire on November 23, 2020.

Dated October 23, 2020.

ROLL CALL

Chair Phillips called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

October 28, 2020

Commissioner Thimm referred to page 13, first paragraph, fourth line from the bottom, and removed the word square from the sentence to correctly read, "Parking is within 1,000 feet of the development".

MOTION: Commissioner Hall moved to APPROVE the Minutes of October 28, 2020 as amended. Commissioner Suesser seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

David Everitt, Deputy City Manager, stated that he would be sitting in for Planning Director Bruce Erickson in his absence.

Mr. Everitt reported on a new process for the Planning Commission to take public comment from constituents in order to be consistent with how it is done with the City Council. The process will include public comments in real time, as well as how public comments are archived in the record moving forward. Mr. Everitt stated that they would use the current method for this meeting and the special meeting regarding PCMR base on November 18th because both have been noticed accordingly. The new process will be implemented beginning with the November 9th meeting.

Mr. Everitt remarked that under the new process, if people wish to make comments during the meeting they will need to do so live as opposed to having the Staff read

comments into the record during the meeting. The intent is to be consistent with how public hearings are conducted in all City Council and Board and Commission meetings.

Commissioner Suesser stated that she has heard complaints from the public about the meetings. She asked if the public would also be able to see who the participants and panelists are at the meeting. Apparently, the meetings have not utilized all the Zoom options and she heard from a frustrated participant who was not able to tell who the panelists were, who was speaking, or who from the public was in attendance.

Mr. Everitt was unsure whether they would be able to show who from the public was attending. He was not too familiar with Zoom, but he thought there might be a setting to allow people to at least see a list of attendees. Chair Phillips explained his own frustrations when he virtually attended the Hideout meetings and was not able to see the attendees. He agreed that it is helpful to know which citizens are there. If possible, he encouraged finding a way to give the citizens the ability to see who is in attendance without further communication. Mr. Everitt understood their concern and offered to look into it further. He noted that the City is constantly trying to navigate Zoom plus Granicus. Chair Phillips believed the way they were trying to revise the public comment portion of the Zoom meetings was more in line with what they would experience if the meetings were held in person.

Mr. Everitt introduced Brendan Conboy, the new Senior Planner who started yesterday. The Commissioners welcomed Mr. Conboy.

Jessica Nelson stated that trying to show all the attendees for the general public on Zoom might be possible, but they also stream the meetings through Granicus and there is no way to record or capture members of the public who tune in through Granicus off the listen live page. She wanted the Commissioners to understand that there is no way to capture a complete picture of everyone from the public who tune into these meetings.

Commissioner Kenworthy commented on the Transportation Committee that he and Commissioner Suesser sit on. The committee has not had a meeting in over a year, and he asked if Mr. Everitt could provide an update. He asked whether they would be gathering with the regional team to catch up, recognizing that Covid had changed things for everyone. Mr. Everitt asked if Commissioner Kenworthy was referring to the committee that was put together for the Park City Forward Master Planning process. Mr. Kenworthy answered yes. Mr. Everitt stated that the City Council recently gave direction to get back on board with making that happen. However, they are currently down to one transportation planner. With Alexis leaving, Julia Collins is the only staff member. They have hired one staff and they are trying to fill a vacancy for a third staff

member. Mr. Everitt remarked that Julia Collins has it on her priority list, but it might be the first of the year before they full reengage on the Park City Forward Plan process.

Chair Phillips asked if Mr. Everitt had a timeline to replace Mark Sletten who recently resigned from the Planning Commission. Mr. Everitt thought the vacancies would be advertised in the next couple of weeks to expedite the necessary replacements.

CONTINUATIONS – (Public Hearing and Continue to Date Specified.)

- 5A. Olive Branch Condominiums - 472A Deer Valley Loop- Appeal of a Planning Director Determination – The Planning Commission will Review the Appeal of the Planning Director's Determination to Require a Plat Amendment to Expand Private Area into Platted Common Area of a Two-Unit Condominium Located at 472 A Deer Valley Loop.

City Attorney Harrington stated that the Planning Commission did not need a motion to continue. The LMC provides that Staff can grant the continuance if the request is five days prior to the hearing, which it was in this case. The Staff has approved it and it was stipulated by both sides of the Appeal. Mr. Harrington clarified that because this item was noticed, it was posted on the Agenda only as notification to the Planning Commission and the public. No action was required.

WORK SESSION

- 6A. Off-Street Parking Standards and Maximum Building Height for Master Planned Affordable Housing Developments.

Planner Hannah Tyler noted that in their report, Cascadia Partners stressed that it was crucial for Park City to reduce the off-street parking; however, they also put emphasis on the need to provide height increases for affordable housing. Cascadia believes that both changes together would enhance the financial feasibility, which is what the City asked them to identify. Planner Tyler stated that Cascadia recommended four Code updates to address the increase in building height. The Staff was requesting direction on the four Code amendments. However, when they come back with the density bonus discussion, it is important to revisit the height to make sure the Staff and the Planning Commission understand how large a building would be using the density bonus. Planner Tyler wanted to make sure they do that exercise so everyone is educated on what the density bonus will give if it is implemented as Code.

Planner Tyler showed the current maximum building height standards for all of the zones that was included in the Staff report. She noted that generally the residential zones hover

around 27' to 28'. Most zones have a height exception for a roof pitch. In that case a taller building can be achieved with the appropriate roof pitch, which in most cases is greater than 4/12. Commercial and resort zones typically have a taller maximum building height than residential zones, which can be anywhere from 35' to 45'.

Planner Tyler reported that the first Code amendment recommended by Cascadia is allowing affordable housing MPDs to build up to four stories in order to achieve a density bonus. The existing zoning districts with a maximum building height of 45' typically already results in four-story developments. If the Planning Commission is interested in allowing four-story developments in zoning districts where the maximum height is less than 45', the Staff would recommend allowing the building height up to 45', based on their knowledge of previous developments in Park City. She intended to show examples of buildings that have achieved four stories in a 45' setting.

Planner Tyler remarked that it is feasible to squeeze five stories into 45', however, the Planning Commission could recommend a maximum number of stories in addition to building height. One reason for doing that is because once it goes above four stories it shifts into a different building code and the structure becomes much more expensive. Planner Tyler stated that a bigger issue is that Park City's utility infrastructure has been developed based on known development standards and future projections for development. Therefore, capacity has been determined by the building heights and densities in the zones. In some instances, the water department would not be able to service a structure greater than four stories due to issues with water pressure and capacity. Planner Tyler noted that the water system could be upgraded, but it would be very expensive. She assumed most of the developments would stay around 4-stories.

Planner Tyler believed that allowing developments to increase building height to 45' to achieve the four-stories poses concerns regarding compatibility with existing neighborhood developments. However, the issue could be addressed by supplemental LMC amendments that address the bulk, massing, and scale.

Planner Tyler walked through building height in a zone by zone setting. She noted that the Staff report includes the high level and initial thoughts based on the different zoning district typologies. The Staff was requesting direction from the Planning Commission on whether to allow the one-story height bonus going from three-stories to allow four-stories, and basically look at a 45' maximum height. Planner Tyler pointed out that the Staff was not in favor of this occurring in the historic districts. The existing height in the historic districts is 27'. In the commercial districts there is already code that allows buildings to achieve 45', and it has a massing code that is specific for the historic districts. She emphasized that the Staff was not supportive of any additional height exceptions for that zone, primarily because they worked so hard to build the design guidelines and the existing LMC to address compatibility. The Staff was concerned that

adding anything else at this point would compromise the success of that program.

Planner Tyler stated that the next typology were the residential zones, which is the RD zone, the Estate zone, and the Single-Family zones. The existing maximum building height is 28'. Planner Tyler noted that the Staff has concerns with increasing building height in the existing neighborhoods because they are predominantly residential, and not located within the resort-oriented areas. The existing maximum building height in these zones have resulted in mostly one, two, and some three-story buildings. Allowing a development with a fourth story could seem out of context. Planner Tyler stated that with appropriate with supplemental codes to address mass and bulk, it could maybe be appropriate with the right architecture. The Staff was concerned that because the maximum height has resulted in a maximum of 3-stories, that four-stories would be out of context.

Planner Tyler stated that the next zoning typology was a more mixed residential and resort-oriented zone. These are all zones on Deer Valley Drive heading up to the Resort. The existing maximum building height is 28'. These are generally a mix of residential and more resort-oriented developments, and they are located within the resort area. Planner Tyler stated that due to the existing topography in that canyon, there are some areas where structures still complied with the Code, but they were able to achieve four-stories because of how the slope worked. The Staff could see no issues with considering a four-story allowance because it would not be out of context with the neighboring development. She presented a slide showing an affordable housing development that achieved four-stories. Planner Tyler noted that the Staff was recommending codes to address the massing and the bulk and believed this would be a good place to consider a height increase.

Planner Tyler stated that the next zoning typology was the resort-oriented and commercial zoning districts. These are mostly in the commercial areas of town that one would think of as commercial; as well as at the PCMR base. Planner Tyler pointed out that the existing heights are either 30' or 35' with exceptions for a pitch to achieve a taller building. Planner Tyler stated that many developments within these areas have been granted a height exception through the MPD process, and some buildings are well over four-stories. The Staff believes this is an area where there should be no issue with adding a fourth story. It would not be out of context and they could apply the additional mitigation strategies to look at the mass and bulk. Planner Tyler anticipated redevelopment in some of these areas because the highest and best use might not be what exists now. This could be a great opportunity to incentivize additional affordable housing through a height increase to four stories.

Planner Tyler stated that the next typology was the entry corridor off of Highway 40, which is the CT zone. It is a unique zone that allows for a wide variety of uses ranging from residential in Park City Heights to Intermountain Healthcare and USSA Center of Excellence. Planner Tyler remarked that the development pattern is very complex, and it is difficult to assign a typology to this zoning district. However, this zone is intended to act as a transition to development within the City, and it encourages low-density development that is visually compatible with the natural landscape and provide open space opportunities. The Staff would definitely want to look at additional mitigation strategies to make sure they were still complying with the intent of that zone. Planner Tyler noted that there are already developments in the CT zone that have achieved four-stories. She commented on the concern with adding additional residential in some of these area in the event there is not enough transit to serve it. She believed they could get through that with development as long as there are mitigation strategies on the overall mass and bulk.

Chair Phillips understood that Park City Heights was not included. Planner Tyler replied that Park City Heights is technically within the CT zone, but at this point the Staff could see no reason to add additional height in Park City Heights unless the Planning Commission gives direction to do so.

Planner Tyler stated that the next typology was the open space zoning districts. These zones have a maximum building height; however, development is typically open space-oriented development such as the ice rink and trailhead management items. The Staff did not support adding height in the open space zoning districts. Aside from the fact that residential uses in open space would not comply with the zone, there would not be enough services to warrant additional development.

Planner Tyler asked if the Planning Commission wanted to add the one-story height bonus to allow four stories, and whether they would want to codify the maximum building height and the number of stories to four stories in the event that someone could achieve five stories, which would create an infrastructure issue. The Staff recommended doing both and requested that the Planning Commission have that discussion at the end of her presentation.

Planner Tyler reported that the next recommendation is to require height step downs adjacent to lower intensity zones. She noted that the concept behind a height step down is to limit the drastic change between a lower maximum building height and a taller development. Planner Tyler explained that the Staff did not want to only require this next to lower intensity zones. They would want to apply it to any site that is seeking a height increase. The Staff believes there is a greater impact on the entire zone and not just the adjacent zone. They would push for it along the edges of a development

and not just when adjacent to another zoning district. Planner Tyler stated that it could be applied as a specific setback for the fourth story from either the edge of the building or from the property line. A similar tactic is used in the historic districts for all front facades on Main Street and in the residential zones. She thought the Main Street model was more applicable because that zone limits the front facade to 30' at the front.

It must then step back before going to the zone height of 45'. Planner Tyler presented a slide of the Susan Schwartz Studio on Main Street, noting that behind the facade was a third story that the studio was able to achieve. She noted that the perceived height of the building is a two-story brick building, but they were able to achieve a larger development by reducing the bulk and the mass. The Staff believes a step down will help with any concerns someone would have on the bulk, massing and scale, and could allow for the maximum building height increase in zones that are predominantly residential or in other zoning districts where the maximum building height is 28'. Planner Tyler recommended requiring the step down everywhere.

Planner Tyler asked for direction on whether the Planning Commission wanted to consider a step down, and if so, do the Commissioners want to require measuring the step down from the edge of the building or from the edge of the property line. The Staff recommended measuring from the edge of the property line. Codes throughout the Country do it either way; however, the Staff believes that going from the edge of the building would reduce the bulk of the overall building.

Planner Tyler stated that facade articulation and length were the next two recommendations by Cascadia. She noted that the City already regulates those type of things in the design guidelines and on a city-wide scale through Land Management Code. Planner Tyler remarked that it is basically intended to encourage new development in the historic districts when it is compatible with historic structures. In the broader LMC, it is intended to regulate large buildings to reduce the bulk.

Planner Tyler remarked that Cascadia proposed two different recommendations; however, the City already does both of them. The first is to require a breakup in the facade when the facade is greater than a certain length. The second would be to require some level of articulation. Rather than a single break, require articulation either at certain points or a percentage of a facade. Planner Tyler noted that the existing Code has regulations for buildings that measure more than 60 feet but less than 120 feet. The Code also has regulations for any buildings over 120 feet. It requires a shift in the facade to create the articulation and to better break up the overall length. Planner Tyler thought Park City was doing a hybrid between the two recommendations.

Planner Tyler asked if the Planning Commission thought the City should change it or if they believe the existing Code that they have applied on other buildings is sufficient. It has been successful, and they know it works. The Staff was prepared to continue to apply this to large developments regardless of whether or not they are affordable housing. She asked if the Commissioners wanted to look at other shifts in the Code or just use the existing requirements.

Commissioner Suesser understood that people have floated the idea of potentially putting affordable housing on top of the Dan's shopping center. She asked Planner Tyler to walk through what the maximum height would look like if affordable housing were to be put on top of that strip mall. Planner Tyler could not recall the exact zoning and used the GC zone as an example. If someone wanted to flatten the entire development and seek this new affordable housing MPD, the City would like to be able to say if they do x-amount of affordable housing, the maximum height could be x. If a developer scraped Dan's and came to the Planning Department with an appropriate affordable housing project, they could build four stories. She believed that Dan's is three stories. The proposal would also need to comply with the new parking regulations. It would be more dense than what would typically be seen because they would be seeking a density bonus. She explained that the only way to get the density bonus is through a height exception. In response to Commissioner Suesser's question, Planner Tyler believed they could see four stories.

Chair Phillips asked if allowing additional height beyond what exists now would impact the fire department having access and the proper equipment to handle a fire in a larger building. Planner Tyler offered to meet with the Fire Marshal, who is currently the Chief Building Official, to ask that question. She noted that the issue did not come up in any of the discussions about adding four stories because the distance to the hydrant does not change. She will make sure it does not trigger the need for a different ladder truck or other issues. Planner Tyler noted that the City already has four-story buildings, and she did not anticipate that it would be an issue.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked if the Staff was recommending measuring to the property line or the edge of the building. She replied that the Staff would recommend the edge of the building. Commissioner Kenworthy asked her to repeat her explanation. Planner Tyler stated that the Staff recommended edge of the building because it is predictable and easy to apply. Measuring from the property line, if the building shifts at all the distance will start to shrink. The Staff wanted to make sure that every building within a development has a reduction in the massing. Requiring it at the edge of the wall would require every building in the development to have reduced bulk and mass.

Chair Phillips supported edge of building because if parking is put in front of the building, there may not be a step back in the facade. It would be better captured at the face of the building.

Planner Tyler asked if the Planning Commission wanted to regulate the number of stories in addition to regulating height, no matter which zone they end up doing this in. Chair Phillips questioned why they would not allow a fifth story if the height did not change. If someone could find a cost-effective way to add another floor and stay within the height limit, he thought it would be a good opportunity to create affordable units. Chair Phillips personally thought height was more of an issue than the number of stories.

Planner Tyler stated that any development that comes before the Planning Commission will have gone through a development review. The water department would review the plans and they would know whether or not it could be serviced before it comes to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Thimm did not believe the Planning Commission needed to get involved in the regulation of number of stories versus building code. He stated that it goes from a Type 5A building to a Type 3A building, and there is a little bit of a premium. With regard to water pressure, he knows an architect who designed many buildings with booster pumps, and it has not been a problem. Commissioner Thimm did not think those issues should be the deciding factor in any decisions they make.

Commissioner Thimm stated that measured height has more of an impact on the community and not necessarily the number of stories. He preferred to deal with the 45' measured height rather than number of stories, especially if it provides more affordable housing where it is needed. It helps create a walkable and multi-generational community and it creates a sense of neighborhood.

Chair Phillip thought the Central Park Condo project on the Rail Trail in Prospector is a good example of what they were trying to accomplish. He noted that an exception in the Code allowed that project additional height at the discretion of the Planning Commission. Chair Phillips recalled that at the time the project needed a fourth story in order to pencil out what they were trying to achieve. He thought the Planning Commission had granted an additional 5 feet. Chair Phillips stated that this was another reason for not limiting stories because the additional story made the project work. He thought Central Park Condos was a good model on which to base some the decisions they were being asked to make now.

Commissioner Suesser asked if they talk about a maximum building height, whether that would be from existing grade. Planner Tyler replied that it would be determined zone by zone. Sometimes it is existing grade and sometimes it is final grade. She stated that they could add language in the affordable housing code stating that if a developer seeks a height increase it is measure from existing or final grade, whichever the Planning Commission decides on. Chair Phillips thought it would be good to know when they make the final decision what zones those are. For example, if someone wanted to dig down ten feet in Prospector to gain an additional level, he did not think that was suitable. He thought it was a good question. Planner Tyler stated that she would include that for the next meeting.

Planner Tyler asked if the Commissioners wanted to go through each zone and say yes or no on whether to add height.

Chair Phillips agreed with Planner Tyler's comments. Commissioner Suesser concurred. She had gone through her notes and she agreed with all of the Staff's recommendations. Commissioner Van Dine also agreed with the Staff recommendations. Commissioner Thimm echoed agreement. However, he thought they needed to start with baby steps. There may be other areas to look at later, but he did not believe now was the time to do it.

Commissioner Suesser stated that she agreed with the step down from the edge of the building. She also agreed with requiring the step down in all areas.

Commissioner Kenworthy wanted to be able to use the CT zone in the Highway 40 entry corridor. He agreed with his fellow Commissioners on the other zones, but he was concerned about limiting the Highway 40 entry corridor because they will be doing transportation somewhere along the SR248/Rail Trail/Highway 40. He believed it would be a big transportation center at some point in the future. Commissioner Kenworthy was concerned about limiting that for affordable housing and asked Planner Tyler to explain why the City's concern for that zone. Planner Tyler stated that the concern primarily stems from the intent and purpose of the zone as it is currently written. She thought they could caveat and say that with the property mitigation strategies, such as the step down and the facade articulation, there is an opportunity for success in a future housing development if the step down can be applied. Commissioner Kenworthy understood that this zone would be up for discussion in the future. Planner Tyler answered yes.

Planner Tyler asked if there was Planning Commission consensus for measuring from the edge of the Building. Commissioner Thimm was comfortable with it, but he was

concerned that it might have a tendency to cause buildings to increase their footprint, resulting in less open space. Commissioner Thimm agreed with the intent.

Commissioner Suesser asked Commissioner Thimm to explain what he meant about losing open space. Commissioner Thimm stated that he was talking about on site open space. If someone wants to take advantage of the additional height and they measure from the edge of the building, they may have a tendency to bring the edge of the building closer to the property line than they might otherwise. He thought it could be an unintended consequence.

Planner Tyler presented another example of building articulation. She noted that the Staff believes the Code already addresses it because any affordable housing MPD will still be subject to the chapter that addresses articulation. She asked if the Staff wanted to change it.

Chair Phillips could not see a need for anything additional if the Staff felt the current Code language was sufficient. Commissioner Suesser asked if Planner Tyler was referring to the provision in the Code that gives an exception for building height requirements for additional articulation. Planner Tyler believed they would pull the required articulation out of this and apply it to the Affordable Housing Code. She asked if the Commissioners liked the makeup of the recommendation that is requiring the articulation as currently written and apply it to the affordable housing projects. Commissioner Suesser asked if they were removing the provision that gives a building height exception for added articulation. Planner Tyler stated that the two were different. She understood that this one is applicable to any development. As part of the affordable housing MPD, they would create a section related to facade length and variation using the same or similar code, and make sure it is catered to the affordable housing projects.

Commissioner Thimm thought they should stay with the articulation as currently written and understood rather than introducing something new. Commissioner Suesser agreed.

Planner Tyler reported that the Staff will come back for a density bonus work session. They will also bring back their final thoughts on the height and rudimentary modeling to help everyone understand if they get height what they would achieve with the density bonus. Planner Tyler stated that the Staff was still monitoring the vehicle ownership responses. The due date was not yet complete, and she would continue to update the Planning Commission on how many people actually own cars. The Staff would be doing a thorough and robust outreach effort to the affected zoning districts, as well as the larger community.

Commissioner Suesser asked if they would have another thorough discussion on the parking requirements for affordable housing projects. Planner Tyler stated that for the next meeting they will focus that discussion on the density bonus and bring some modeling. She will also bring back some redlines based on the feedback at the last meeting. Planner Tyler stated that the Commissioners will have an opportunity to discuss the redlines for parking specifically. At this point, they were still trying to collect all the feedback so they could bring back code for the Planning Commission to review and discuss.

Chair Phillips asked if the Staff had an ending timeframe for completion. Planner Tyler stated that the Staff was working through timing on the density bonus discussion so they do not overburden the schedule. They will come back as soon as the Staff does it, and then turnaround the redline package as quickly as possible. Planner Tyler was hopeful that the Planning Commission could expect redlines sometime in the beginning of 2021. In the meantime, the Staff will work with the engagement team to think about how to engage the public during Covid.

REGULAR AGENDA - DISCUSSION/PUBLIC HEARINGS/ POSSIBLE ACTION

5.A. Land Management Code Amendment – The Planning Commission will Consider Updates to the City’s Outdoor Lighting Regulations, Land Management Code § 15-5-5(J), to Align with Summit County’s Recently-Adopted Code and the International Dark-Sky Association Standards to Set Maximum Lumens for Fixtures and Properties, to Prevent Harsh Lighting with a Maximum of 3,000 degrees Kelvin, and to Fully Shield Lighting.

Planner Rebecca Ward stated that the Planning Commission would be reviewing proposed redlines to update the outdoor lighting regulations. She noted that the updates to the Night Sky Ordinance was a recommendation from the General Plan. Planner Ward noted that mitigating the impacts of outdoor lighting was already a policy and purpose in the Land Management Code. However, because the Code has not been updated since 1998, the Staff was proposing these amendments. In February 2020 this was identified by the Planning Commission as a 2020 priority.

Planner Ward remarked that this was a follow-up on the September 9, 2020 work session. On October 4, 2020 the City initiated a dark sky survey and 306 community members provided input through the survey. They received over 50 emails and had a lot of phone calls and public input. Planner Ward stated that two virtual community discussions took place with representatives from the Utah Chapter of the IDA, as well as an additional virtual community discussion on November 5th. The Staff was pleased

with the public input received and they have done their best to incorporate what they could at this point.

Planner Ward stated that potentially the items discussed this evening could be viewed as Phase 1. If there are additional areas where the Planning Commission would like to see more regulations, the Staff would come back with additional phases. Planner Ward stated that recreation lighting was a major topic for public input. She noted that the Staff worked with the Recreation Department and looked into IDA regulations and what is in the existing code, and also the possibilities for mitigating some of these impacts. At this time the Staff was not proposing any changes to what is currently in the Code. The existing Code requires that lights be fully shielded, have fixtures with sharp cut-off capability to mitigate glare, and that the light be shut off by 11:00 p.m.

Planner Ward reported that there are some IDA criteria for community friendly outdoor sports lighting, which was developed in 2018. With this criteria IDA recognizes that it is difficult for existing structures to be brought into compliance. It is still new, and they are finding ways to ways to measure and certify these recreation lighting areas. Planner Ward stated that the current Code does require IES Class 3 and 4 compliance for these recreation facilities, and the Recreation Department is in the process of updating the lighting at the Quinn's Recreation Facility. They are aware of community concerns and are working to mitigate those impacts.

Planner Ward stated that streetlights are regulated through the Engineering Department because they are in the City rights-of-way. However, since 2015 the City has been in the process of updating the streetlights from high pressure sodium lights to LED lights that comply with what they were proposing for these updated amendments. Planner Ward noted that the new lighting fixtures being installed in several area throughout town comply with the fully shielded fixture.

Planner Ward reported on input from community members who voiced concerns about streetlights. She noted that there are shields the Engineering Department and Public Works can install to reduce the impact of lights in residential areas.

Planner Ward stated that public safety is another issue that was raised. The question is whether they would be creating a dangerous situation by implementing these Code amendments. Public input brought up the point that fully shielding lighting could potentially reduce the area being lit and might require additional lighting installations. Planner Ward noted that the City Engineering Department looked into this issue when they were fully shielding the streetlights. It does require more lights to be installed, but because the lights are fully shielded the impacts is lessened.

Planner Liz Jackson walked through some of the benefits of mitigating light pollution. She stated that a big idea is good neighbor lighting, which is not having a bulk of lighting on the property and not spilling over onto other properties or blinding the neighbors. Some of the concepts include light only what you need, use energy efficient bulbs and only as bright as you need. Keep lights down directed and shielded. Use timers. Choose warm light lightbulbs versus the bright blue or white lights. Planner Jackson stated that a lot of light can be an energy suck, and this is an opportunity to allow for the entire community to conserve more energy.

Planner Jackson referred to a document produced by Utah Work Force Services Housing and Community Development Office for rural planning regarding lighting. A major aspect is disruption of circadian rhythms of sleep in humans and community members, which can be connected to many physical disorders. Planner Jackson reported that circadian rhythm can be affected by blue rich light. That is another reason why going in the direction of warm light is a good move.

Planner Jackson stated that another aspect is lessening the eco-system impact. She noted that all animals are affected by the natural light cycle. They depend on it for reproduction, sustenance, sleep, migration, etc. This issue has been raised by the IDA, National Parks Service, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences and many other agencies. All have confirmed the negative effects of light pollution on not only humans but wildlife as well.

Planner Jackson presented an article that was published by the Salt Lake Tribune regarding a study showing that light pollution attracts deer to urban areas and cougars follow. It was a University of Michigan study that tracked deer herds and cougars in Utah, Arizona, Nevada, and California. The idea is that the deer are attracted to the light as it mimics their preferred grazing time, and the cougars tend to follow.

Planner Jackson reviewed the overall ideas of the Code amendments. She stated that the Staff was proposing to set a maximum lumen for fixtures and properties. Lumens are the output of the fixtures. Another aspect is to prevent harsh lighting with a maximum of 3,000 degrees Kelvin, which is the warmer side of the lights versus going higher, which is white and blue. Last is to fully shield the lighting and have it down directed.

Planner Ward stated that the Staff was also proposing a few additional changes to establish a light trespass standard and to reorganize the Code to consolidate lighting that is prohibited. Planner Ward stated that the Staff received considerable input regarding the lighting impacts on ridgeline and steep slopes. She reported that some

community members brought up the idea of requiring film or establishing a light setback for interior lights that can be viewed on ridgelines and steep slopes. Planner Ward remarked that the Staff looked into that issue and included it in the public survey. She noted that 40% of the community members were willing to add film to windows to mitigate the impact of interior lights. However, at this time the Staff was only recommending additional mitigations for outdoor lighting on ridgelines and steep slopes, and additional shielding to mitigate the impacts. Planner Ward stated that while interior lights on a ridgeline and on steep slopes are visible, it is not a glare. The Staff also recommended heightening the gas station canopy regulations, so those lights are flush with the canopy to mitigate those impacts. They were also prohibiting landscape lighting, such as lighting of trees and shrubs. Low lumen pathway lighting that is less than 300 lumens will be exempt. They were also proposing to exempt historic replica fixtures but to cap the lumens to 400.

Chair Phillips asked how the City could regulate the historic replica lighting after the fact if people change the bulbs. He knew of a few historic replica fixtures in the historic district that have very bright bulbs. He questioned whether requiring low lumens would be effective. Planner Ward stated that later in the presentation they would be talking about bringing lighting into compliance and making sure it remains in compliance with the updated Code.

Commissioner Suesser asked Planner Ward to talk more about the prohibition on landscape lighting. Planner Ward replied that under the current Code lighting is allowed to illuminate trees, moonlighting, etc. The Staff was proposing to prohibit landscape lighting with the exception of pathway lighting for walks and driveways. Commissioner Suesser asked about holiday lighting. Planner Ward stated that the Staff received a lot of public input on holiday lights. Some people love seasonal lighting and others requested putting mitigations in place. She stated that currently seasonal lighting is allowed under the Code from November 1st through April 15th. It is required to be turned off by midnight. The Staff did considerable research to try to find model codes on how to cap the lumens or establish a standard for seasonal lights. Planner Ward remarked that Moab caps their seasonal lights at 70 lumens. The Staff looked into what that would look like and how it could be regulated. Depending on the color of the lights used, the lumens output and the impacts are different. At this stage, the Staff was recommending that seasonal lighting in residential areas be turned off at 11:00 p.m. rather than midnight. They also recommending language that establishes a standard so seasonal lights do not cause light trespass or interfere with reasonable use and enjoyment of property. Planner Ward stated that the Staff also recommended exempting the string lights on Main Street, Swede Alley, and commercial uses in the General Commercial Zoning District from the November 1st to April 15th restrictions to reflect existing conditions, but to require that this lighting be turned off by midnight.

Planner Ward stated that there may be opportunities to go in through the Code, and if they can find a better way to set a standard that is easily regulated and understood by the public, they were open to looking into an amendment for a future phase.

Planner Ward stated that the big question with the outdoor lighting amendments is how they want them to apply. The Staff recommends putting them into place right now so all new construction going forward meets these heightened standards. Planner Ward noted that Summit County enacted their Code in March 2019 and gave the property owners through March 2024 to bring existing properties into compliance. She asked if the Planning Commission wanted to follow Summit County's procedure.

Planner Ward stated that the Staff was proposing that all new construction comply. As currently drafted, all properties, commercial and residential, would need to be brought into compliance by December 31, 2024. Outdoor lighting that is damaged or operative would be required to be come into compliance when it is replaced.

Planner Ward reported that 73.9% of the 306 respondents felt they would be able to bring their property into compliance by December 31, 2024. Based on research for single-family dwellings, the Staff found that the cost could be around \$500, and more for some properties, to update these outdoor lighting fixtures. Planner Ward remarked that some properties might require a significant investment and time in retrofitting the property. Planner Ward stated that the Staff had looked into establishing a grant program to help property owners who can demonstrate economic hardship. The grant program would offer support to help the owners bring their lighting into compliance. The Staff was recommending that all lighting be brought into compliance by the end of 2020, and that would include City property lighting.

Planner Ward outlined some things that could be helpful through this compliance timeline. IDA encourages public outreach, public education, and community events. She thought there may be an opportunity in the Spring of 2021 to collaborate with the University of Utah Dark Sky Consortium students. These students are minoring in dark skies and they focus on a community for their project. Planner Ward stated that if the Planning Commission was interested in the amendments being proposed this evening, the Staff could work with the students and evaluate City-owned property to get an idea of the required updates, and to come up with a plan for those updates through 2024. Planner Ward noted that the students also have drones and equipment to measure the light pollution that currently exists. At the end of 2024 they would have something to measure the changes against.

Planner Ward stated that in preparation for this Planning Commission meeting, the Planning Department sent over 8,000 public notices to the community members to let the property owners know that these Code changes were being proposed. If these amendments are enacted, the Planning Department would send out an additional mailer with information on how to comply and the resources to bring property into compliance. They would also update the website to outline information. In addition, the Planning Department would host several community events with the Utah IDA Chapter regarding the new standards.

Planner Jackson commented on the possibility of a dark sky community designation for Park City. The Staff presented the idea in the survey and 69.3% of the respondents would like to see Park City designated as a dark sky community. She noted that it is not short-term and not necessarily easy, but if the Planning Commission would like the Staff to pursue it, they were willing to look into it.

Planner Jackson read a summarized list in the IDA documentation. 1) A quality comprehensive lighting policy is required, i.e. these Code amendments. 2) Community commitment shown by City-owned lighting conforming to the lighting policy within five years, and Municipal supportive efforts via publications, fliers, funding of light upgrades, etc., which could be the grant program, outreach, and a timeline of compliance. 3) Broad support for dark skies from a wide range of community organizations, such as HOAs, Chamber of Commerce, lighting retailers, IDA Chapters, etc. 4) Community commitment to dark skies and education. 5) Success in light pollution control must be demonstrated. If they were to apply, they would need to show success stories. 6) A sky brightness measurement program needs to be established and maintained. Once it is established, the community must erect and maintain appropriate signage indicating the International Dark Sky community designation.

Planner Jackson stated that the application and nomination are both required. They need to apply, as well as have a nomination from an IDA representative or something similar, and the process could take one to three years. Planner Jackson mentioned some of the benefits. It would be recognition of community efforts to protect the night sky. It would be promoted throughout the City and visitors and community members could take pride in it. It would enhance community awareness of the dark sky efforts. It would include IDA promotion of community efforts on their website. If Park City does certain things IDA would talk about it. Planner Jackson stated that the designation would also attract visitors and economic benefits through tourism. It is an effort to make the night sky more visible.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission review the proposed Code amendments, conduct a public hearing, and consider forwarding a positive recommendation for City Council's consideration on December 10, 2020.

Commissioner Kenworthy noted that in reading the public input there was a woman who asked if they had reached out to law enforcement for their opinion. Planner Ward replied that the Staff had not reached out to law enforcement regarding public safety where the regulations are down shielded lighting and not necessarily less lighting. However, that was taken into consideration when the lighting was updated in the rights-of-way.

Commissioner Kenworthy asked if the Staff had reached out to the Historic Business Alliance on Main Street regarding the requirement to turn off the lights at midnight. Planner Ward stated that they did reach out to HPCA, and there was no response specific to the 12:00 p.m. shutoff time. Commissioner Kenworthy noted that most of the late night businesses close at 1:00 a.m. and he thought it would be strange to have the lights go off at 12:00.

Commissioner Suesser asked if Commissioner Kenworthy was talking about exterior commercial businesses on Main Street. Planner Ward clarified that it was for the buildings outlined in string lights on Main Street. Chair Phillips agreed with Commissioner Kenworthy. He was comfortable exempting Main Street because people enjoying Main Street will not be complaining about bright lights. Commissioner Kenworthy was concerned that it would signal to the guests and clients that the business is closing. Planner Ward noted that Helper put into their Code is a requirement to turn off the lights 30 minutes after closing. Specific to string lights, she asked if the Planning Commission thought that would work for the Main Street area. Commissioner Kenworthy suggested discussing it further with HPCA to see how the businesses that stay open until 1:00 a.m. feel about it.

Commissioner Thimm asked if Commissioner Kenworthy had any thoughts as to when the lights should be shut off. Commissioner Kenworthy thought it should be 1:00 a.m. for the string lights. He was in favor of the dark sky, but he also wanted to be sensitive to his neighbors on Main Street. Commissioner Kenworthy thought the main lighting should be left on later for the security of people leaving the venues. He suggested leaving on some of the lights until 2:00 a.m., especially on weekends.

Commissioner Suesser asked if there are motion detector lights along public walkways in town. She particularly mentioned along Poison Creek past City Park. Planner Ward was unsure and offered to look into it. She has noticed motion detector lights in various

sections, and she was hoping to get an understanding of where it exists throughout town.

Commissioner Suesser stated that she lives in Old Town and she sees a lot of deck lighting and some people string lights around their decks. She wanted to know if that would be prohibited with the proposed amendments. Planner Ward stated that the string lights would be covered under seasonal lights from November 1 through April 15. However, low lumen stream lights would be exempt from the Code. She pointed out that stream lights in outdoor dining areas that are low lumen would be exempt from the fully shielded requirement.

Chair Phillips recalled from a previous meeting discussing holiday lights that are up all year long. He asked if they were proposing to regulate what months people are allowed to utilize holiday lights. Planner Ward stated that seasonal lights are allowed November 1st through April 15th, exempting the lights that outline the buildings on Main Street, Swede Alley, and the GC zone from that timeline. Residential seasonal lighting would be the November to April timeline.

Chair Phillips opened the public hearing.

Ed Parigian raised his hand on Zoom and was unmuted to speak.

Ed Parigian, an Old Town resident, understood that the deadline of 12/31/24 is one year longer than the County deadline. He wanted to know why the City was delaying the deadline. He thought Municipal properties should do it soon to set a standard. Mr. Parigian stated that he has been pushing dark sky in every project that he comes up against. He thought four years was too long. Mr. Parigian commented on a good neighbor policy of not regulating indoor lighting. However, in high density areas like Old Town, indoor lighting is effectively outdoor lighting. Considering the big new houses that are being built with floor to ceiling windows, he believed that created as much light pollution as anything else. Mr. Parigian referred to the IDA certification, and noted that Park City is attracting more tourists. He commented on the lights on Main Street and the issue of midnight versus 1:00 a.m. He pointed out that a lot of businesses have string lights around them and those lights are on when the businesses are closed. He suggested a time deadline for turning off the lights after the business closes. Mr. Parigian favored the proposed LMC amendments and he thought they should consider taking it a step further than what Summit County was proposing.

Planner Jackson read an eComment from Sherrie Harding that was received today.

Sherrie Harding wrote that cobra head streetlights exist on the power poles on Daly Avenue. There are extremely bright. According to the staff report we'll have to wait up to five years for these lights to be replaced and to be in compliance with dark sky. Please help to encourage Rocky Mountain Power and the Park City Engineering Office to change these power pole lights much sooner. This year.

Mari Mennel-Bell raised her hand on Zoom and was unmuted to speak.

Mari Mennel-Bell thanked the Planning Commission for taking up this topic, and for all the work that Rebecca and Liz have done. She supported Mr. Parigian in hoping that Park City would embrace the dark sky regulations even more stringently than Summit County. She was in favor of looking at lighting on ridgelines, particularly, and making sure there are not a lot of beacons up there. She had hoped they would consider if not regulating, at least advising that people control their indoor lighting. She thought it would be wonderful to send something out with tax statements or in another way to advise people to think about these issues. She personally started thinking about it differently in her own home once the City started having this conversation. Ms. Mennel-Bell thought they should do their best to encourage people to think that way.

Chair Phillips reminded Mr. Parigian and Ms. Mennel-Bell that this would be in front of the City Council on December 10th if they wanted to provide input to the Council.

Commissioner Suesser followed up on Ms. Mennel-Bell's comment. She understood that Planner Ward had said the Staff was not recommending film on windows to shield interior lighting in homes on ridgelines. Commissioner Suesser could think of one example that was very intrusive to the neighbors and she would support film on windows for homes on ridgelines.

Planner Ward clarified that the Staff recommendation at this time is that the amendment be applied to outdoor lighting; however, they were open to additional phases in the future. Film on windows could be considered in a future phase if there was Planning Commission consensus.

Chair Phillips closed the public hearing.

Planner Ward asked if the Planning Commission was interested in having the Staff come back at a later date with additional ridgeline regulations. Commissioner Thimm stated that he would be in favor.

Commissioner Hall stated that for the next meeting she would like to hear a safety evaluation for all of Main Street and for commercial to ensure they are not jeopardizing the safety of the residents and visitors.

Commissioner Suesser stated that this was her reason for asking about motion detectors. She was pretty sure there are motion detectors on the lights along Poison Creek trail leaving Main Street going towards City Park. A lot of people use those after hours leaving Main Street and throughout Old Town. Commissioner Suesser believed the 11th Street stairs has motion detectors on those lights. She asked Planner Ward to confirm whether those lights are on all night or if they go off at a certain time.

Commissioner Hall commented on pathway lighting. They want to encourage people to walk and bike around town even in the evening, and that is difficult and unsafe if they do not allow lighting. Commissioner Hall thought they should encourage lit pathways. Planner Ward stated that for public trails in the Public Trails Masterplan, the lighting standards are in place. She clarified that while there is a cap on lumens, the Code amendments still allow lighting. The difference is that the lighting needs to be shielded and warmer bulbs used. Lighting on public trails will be required to be fully shielded. Planner Ward offered to ask law enforcement for their opinion and to confirm that the lighting is sufficient for safety.

Commissioner Hall referred to the lumens section of the draft ordinance, the difference between single-family versus duplex versus multi-units versus non-residential uses, and asked Planner Ward to explain why they were distinguishing between uses.

Planner Ward explained that they looked through several codes and reached out to Summit County. She noted that these lumens are more restrictive than Summit County and align with Moab. Regarding the lumen cap, in order to ensure that entryways, driveways, and pathways have sufficient light, those lights would be exempt from the lumen cap. Planner Ward stated that this would be a way to establish a measurement to ensure that there is not excessive outdoor lighting, and to ensure that properties with large acreage have sufficient lighting. Smaller properties will have a cap on the lumens.

Commissioner Hall stated that if they were requiring the lights to be fully shielded and a darker hue, and less lumens, she asked if they needed to take the extra step in limiting the total lumens for a multi-unit dwelling. Commissioner Hall thought it seemed too restrictive and her concern was safety. Planner Ward explained that this provides a way to establish a standard that the Staff can use to measure against in approving lighting plans at the building permit phase. Commissioner Hall felt that having so many layers made the ordinance complicated. In terms of a residential compliance, a few people in Old Town shine lights all night and that is disruptive. She was not opposed to

protective measures in Old Town. However, in other areas where houses have outdoor lighting, it would be expensive and time consuming for people to retrofit their light fixtures, and the discarded lights would end up in the landfill. She thought overall compliance was a separate issue from safety and lumens.

Commissioner Suesser questioned whether the change was that drastic. She thought lights were always required to shine downward. Planner Ward stated that under the current Code light fixtures were approved in the past that would not comply with what was being proposed in the amendments. The Staff could see value in putting this Code into effect for new properties moving forward. The question is whether the Planning Commission wanted the amendments to retroactively apply to existing properties that have lighting that was compliant at the time it was approved.

Commissioner Hall recognized that there might be specific instances where they would like to retroactively apply it, but she was not in favor of forcing every home in Park City to retroactively change all their light fixtures when they were in compliance at the time they were approved.

Commissioner Thimm understood that retroactively did not mean instant. The draft ordinance allows a four-year timespan. He noted that most light fixtures have a limited lifespan, and not all light fixtures need to be torn down. Some can be modified to a higher Kelvin light source and still maintain the light fixtures. Commissioner Thimm supported the recommendations.

Chair Phillips stated that he also thought about the lifespan of a light fixture. He pointed out that even landscape lighting does not last forever. Chair Phillips suggested moving the date to target the same date as Summit County. At the same time, he thought Commissioner Hall made a good point about impacting the existing homes. Chair Phillips stated that he was trying to get an idea of the percentage of homes that would need to update their lighting.

Planner Ward stated that she has been walking around at night trying to get a feel for the impact this proposal would have on homeowners. One of the questions asked in the survey is whether property owners felt their existing lighting complied with what was being proposed. She noted that 60% of the respondents believed they were in compliance. Planner Ward agreed that retroactively updating these lights will require a lot of time and investment. The Staff believes these Code updates are needed because the Lighting Ordinance has not been updated for over 20 years. However, the Staff also recognizes that 2020 might be a difficult time to prioritize this retroactively to bring properties into compliance. Planner Ward clarified that Summit County was requiring all existing properties to come into compliance by March 2024. Park City

extend the date to December of 2024 to align with the County's timeline and to also give additional time for compliance.

Chair Phillips noted that many people do not pay attention and will not know the lighting code was updated or that it even exists. In terms of enforcement, he did not think it was fair to immediately penalize people once the deadline expires. He assumed the City would give those people leeway and some type of warning. He asked if people would be given a certain amount of time to come into compliance. He suggested allowing a year to come into compliance and if the lights have not been updated at that time, the fines begin.

Planner Ward remarked that public notice was sent to all property owners within Park City regarding these proposed changes. If these changes are enacted, the Planning Department would again send notice to all property owners and outline the timeline. They would also do a lot of community outreach in the four-year timeline. Planner Ward stated that one of the benefits of Dark Sky designation is that it brings community awareness to these priorities and the lighting ordinances. It is still possible without going back and requiring all properties to come into compliance retroactively, but it helps establish community awareness of these proposed ordinances.

Chair Phillips thought the amendments were good and he was ready to forward the proposed amendments to the City Council.

Commissioner Hall asked if the Commissioners wanted to forward a recommendation to the City Council before hearing from law enforcement on the safety aspect. Chair Phillips stated that it was noticed for action this evening and the Staff was recommending a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner Hall stated that she was not in favor of forwarding a recommendation without talking about amending the draft ordinance to include an exemption for Main Street and without addressing all the safety concerns mentioned this evening.

Commissioner Kenworthy concurred. He suggested that the Planning Commission continue this discussion and look into it further. He would make sure that Alison Kuhlowsky talks to the business owners on Main Street to get their thoughts, and relay that information to Planner Staff.

Planner Ward suggested a continuance to December 9th. Commissioner Suesser asked Planner Ward for the rate of response on the survey. Planner Ward stated that they received over 50 emails and seven phone calls. In addition, 306 community members completed the survey online. The majority of input was supportive of what

was being proposed. She noted that some community members would like to see more restrictions on ridgelines and steep slopes for interior lights. The Staff was open to bringing that forward in a later phase. The Staff had limited the amendments proposed this evening to outdoor lighting. Planner Ward stated that some community members wanted to see more restrictions on seasonal lights. The Staff tried to find a balance with a standard that could be established.

Commissioner Suesser asked if the survey was online on the City website. Planner Ward replied that they had set up an Engage Park City page and the survey was open until yesterday at 5:00 p.m.

Commissioner Hall requested an exemption for residential homes that are not impacting neighbors or the dark sky. She generally supported the concept of dark sky and recognized that a few can ruin it for everyone. However, she was concerned about unnecessarily creating significant waste, and she anticipated a lot of negative pushback from the community.

Chair Phillips noted that Park City is not the first to do this. There must be results from other cities and he was curious to know whether this type of ordinance has been a problem. He thought a difference might be the quantity of large properties in Park City versus other communities. Chair Phillips did not think the Staff was proposing anything radical or out of the norm of what has been occurring across the Country. Chair Phillips personally thought the amendments outlined in the Staff report were reasonable. In most cases, light fixtures will not need to be replaced and would only require an adjustment to bring the lighting into compliance. Chair Phillips agreed with some of the other concerns raised by Commissioner Hall.

Planner Jackson stated that in the three years she has been on Staff, even though the lighting code had some conflicting information and oddities from the past, the Staff has been encouraging people to install down directed and shielded lights. The proposed amendments add more specificity and encourages a good neighbor policy of not creeping onto other properties and into the sky. Even though this is what the Planning Department has been practicing for the past few years she still anticipated growing pains.

Commissioner Thimm thought the ordinance was well written. He also thought it was important to relook at the items that were suggested this evening. Commissioner Thimm had concerns with determining that one house does not have impact while another house might. It becomes subjective and he was unsure whether it could be fairly enforced. Chair Phillips agreed.

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to CONTINUE updates to the City's outdoor lighting regulations to December 9, 2020. Commissioner Thimm seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: _____

APPROVED 12.09.2020