

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
NOVEMBER 9, 1995**

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of Park City, Utah will hold its regularly scheduled meeting at the Marsac Municipal Building, 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah for the purposes and at the times as described below on Thursday, November 9, 1995.

A G E N D A

Work Session

- 3:30 p.m. Council comments/questions
- 4:10 p.m. Public transportation services
- 4:55 p.m. Amendments to the Land Management Code regarding Historic Residential (HR-1) and Historic Residential-Low Density (HRL) Zones
- 5:40 p.m. Review of regular meeting
 - Plat amendments/vacation
 - School fields agreement
 - Canvass of General Election results
 - Meeting questions/comments

Regular Meeting

6:00 p.m.

I ROLL CALL

II PUBLIC INPUT

1. Business license amendment to allow ice cream trucks
2. Extended bus service in Thaynes Canyon

III MINUTES OF MEETING OF OCTOBER 26, 1995

IV PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Ordinance approving the vacation of right-of-way and dedication of a right-of-way plat for a portion of Deer Valley Drive East, Park City, Utah and authorization to the City Manager to execute the amended and restated encroachment permit for Deer Valley skier bridges and tunnels
2. Ordinance approving the amendment to the Park City Survey Lots 18 and 19 and 20, Block 32, located at 156 and 160 Norfolk Avenue, Park City, Utah

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
NOVEMBER 9, 1995**

I ROLL CALL

Mayor Brad Olch called the regular meeting of the City Council to order at approximately 6 p.m. at the Marsac Municipal Building on Thursday, November 9, 1995. Members in attendance were Brad Olch, Ruth Gezelius, Roger Harlan, Lou Hudson, Shauna Kerr, and Leslie Miller. Staff present were Toby Ross, City Manager; Rick Lewis, Community Development Director; Pat Putt, Planning Director; Bob Stephens, Administrative Department Director; and Jodi Hoffman, City Attorney.

II PUBLIC INPUT

The Mayor invited the public to comment on any matter of City business not scheduled on the agenda.

1. Ice Cream Truck - Tom Mohr discussed the provisions of the business license ordinance prohibiting ice cream trucks to operate in Park City, and urged Council to consider an amendment to the Code. The City Manager explained that it has been a conscious decision in the past of the Council not to allow these kinds of activities (operating out of unenclosed buildings); the Mayor suggested that in consideration of pending business that this be reviewed after the first of the year.

2. Extended bus service in Thaynes Canyon. Tim Lapage, resident of Thaynes Canyon, explained that he is speaking on behalf of 28 signatories of Thaynes Canyon and the Payday Drive area who request bus service. Although there was a letter to the editor in the Park Record criticizing the City for providing service, he stated that the Thaynes III Subdivision Association specifically asked for a bus service at a meeting held last year. He didn't feel there is a safety issue and contended that there will be a number of people who will use the service which will result in reducing traffic and parking at the ski area. The Mayor explained that the Transportation Director will schedule a meeting with the home owners associations in Thaynes Canyon and Aspen Springs to review transportation options. Mr. Lapage expressed his concern that service would not occur this year. The City Manager explained that extended service doesn't involve additional equipment or drivers so service could be implemented easily if that is the wish of the residents.

Rebecca Champion, Payday Drive resident, expressed that she has talked to about 20 people who are not supportive of bus service. She continued that bus service was discontinued in the late 1980s because of lack of ridership and running the buses, even on a limited basis like weekends, is a waste of money. She discussed the increased traffic on Payday Drive from Aspen Springs and the additional impacts of a bus service. Ms. Champion pointed out that there is a bus stop on Three Kings Drive a block away and criticized the City for not notifying the neighborhood

of this proposal. She discussed the difficulty of the design of the portico of the Radisson for loading passengers.

Carol Shackelford, resident of Thaynes Canyon, stated that when the buses were discontinued in the neighborhood, it was lack of ridership but the demographics have changed drastically over the past 10 years. She felt that the service would be used by the full-time residents and supported the service. She sympathized with the residents on Payday Drive and hoped that there could be better enforcement for speeding cars.

Ken Poulson, 60 Thaynes Canyon Drive, discussed the merits of public transportation, especially in a resort community, and felt that buses could make drivers slow down somewhat. He stated that the buses would be used by his household and urged Council to reestablish the service in Thaynes Canyon.

Bob Linton, 54 Thaynes Canyon Drive, discussed the home owners association meeting discussed by Mr. Lapage and bus service was overwhelmingly supported. He didn't feel there is a safety issue.

Christy Polson, 7 Payday Drive, stated her opposition to the service and her concerns with the amount of current speeding traffic on Payday Drive which is already noisy. She felt that the proposed bus stop, which is located about 25 feet from the intersection, is a very dangerous location.

With no further comments, the public input session was closed.

III MINUTES OF MEETING OF OCTOBER 26, 1995

Ruth Gezelius, "I move approval of the Minutes of the meeting of October 26, 1995, as presented". Leslie Miller seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

IV PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Ordinance approving the vacation of right-of-way and dedication of a right-of-way plat for a portion of Deer Valley Drive East, Park City, Utah and authorization to the City Manager to execute the amended and restated encroachment permit for Deer Valley skier bridges and tunnels - See attached staff report. Rick Lewis explained that a permit was issued in March for Deer Valley to expand the Snow Park Lodge which created a parking and drop-off area in a City street. Deer Valley has constructed a new street on its property; right-of-way for the new street will be dedicated to the City and staff is requesting that the old street be vacated. The other aspect of the ordinance addresses the ski bridges and tunnels; Deer Valley is responsible for maintenance. With no questions or comments from the public or the Council, the public hearing was closed.

2. Ordinance approving the amendment to the Park City Survey Lots 18 and 19 and 20, Block 32, located at 156 and 160 Norfolk Avenue, Park City, Utah - See attached staff report. Pat Putt explained that this is a request to replat three lots and that the owner has dedicated a ten foot easement across the north end of Lot 18. The owner has submitted plans to build two single family residences on the proposed combined lots. Leslie Miller pointed out that as the property exists, that three homes could not be constructed. Discussion ensued regarding larger homes and their contextual relationship with adjacent residences. Ruth Gezelius noted that plat amendments, reducing density, is the right direction for the City.

V CONSENT AGENDA

Ruth Gezelius, "I move to approve the consent agenda". Lou Hudson seconded. Roger Harlan asked if there was any problem with the contractor using City equipment, and the City Manager responded that the contract would cover the condition of equipment. Leslie Miller questioned if the amendment to the school fields agreement was really necessary. Bruce King, representing the Nature Preserve Steering Committee, explained that the committee desired to preserve the wetlands as an educational resource. As it is in the area leased by the City, it was felt that in order for the School District to pass a resolution taking this action, it should have full control of the area. Motion unanimously carried.

1. Ordinance approving the vacation of right-of-way and dedication of a right-of-way plat for a portion of Deer Valley Drive East, Park City, Utah and authorization to the City Manager to execute the amended and restated encroachment permit for Deer Valley skier bridges and tunnels - See public hearing and attached staff report.

2. Ordinance approving the amendment to the Park City Survey Lots 18 and 19 and 20, Block 32, located at 156 and 160 Norfolk Avenue, Park City, Utah - See public hearing and attached staff report.

3. Amendment to school fields agreement deleting the wetland area from designation as a lease area and deleting the eight foot pedestrian trail from the plan - See attached staff report.

4. Acceptance of canvass of General Election held on November 7, 1995 - See attached staff report.

5. Authorization to staff to enter into a cleaning service contract in an amount not to exceed \$34,000 for City buildings - See attached staff report.

VI NEW BUSINESS

Financing strategy of City purchase of Silver Meadows units - Bob Stephens, Administrative Services Director, explained that the City Council has already authorized the purchase of four units as a part of its employee housing program. The developer is eager to close on the first two City units this month; the other two units will be completed and ready to close in January. The City sent requests for proposals to 16 mortgage companies in mid-October with only First Security Bank and Zions Bank expressing interest in working with the City. There appears to be confusion surrounding what exactly can be worked out due to the City's municipal status and the banks are still researching whether PCMC can receive a commercial loan which will be considered tax-exempt. They are also researching the possibility and feasibility of a revenue bond. Mr. Stephens added that this is before Council so that the City can obtain these units while having a fall-back position. This is a request to explore short and long term strategies, including borrowing against City's funds. Ms. Gezelius requested that funding alternatives should be brought back to the City Council to evaluate.

Ruth Gezelius, "I move to accept staff's recommendation to enter into a short-term financial arrangement of one year with a lender as an interim strategy while staff analyzes long term options and to allow staff the flexibility of using City funds". Shauna Kerr seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

VII COMMUNICATIONS FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

None.

VIII ADJOURNMENT

Since there wasn't enough time in work session to discuss proposed amendments to the HR-1 and HRC Districts, discussion occurred at this point in the meeting. However, it is documented in the work session notes for ease of reference.

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

* * * * *

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



[Signature]
Janet M. Scott, Deputy City Recorder

**PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
NOVEMBER 9, 1995**

Present: Mayor Brad Olch, Councilmembers Ruth Gezelius, Roger Harlan, Lou Hudson, Shauna Kerr, and Leslie Miller

Rick Lewis, Community Development Director; Hope Bleecker, Transportation Director; Pat Putt, Planning Director

Hank Rothwell, United Park City Mines

Council comments/questions - It should be clarified for these notes that the Nory Winter survey deals with historic design guidelines and the Alan Roberts study relates to an Historic District inventory survey mistakenly referred to by Leslie Miller as the "Nory Winters study" during the work session. Leslie Miller asked the status of the inventory survey in the Historic District, which includes homes and vacant lots. Rick Lewis responded that it is in the process; staff is reviewing the draft which will be before the Historic District Commission shortly. Planner Janice Lew felt that this would be reviewed by the HDC by the end of the year. Leslie Miller felt that it is important to have this information for the General Plan and also the pending amendments to the Land Management Code, and not having a completion date on this contract is to our disadvantage. Ms. Miller stated that she would like to see the Sexually Oriented Business Ordinance revisions completed by January. The City Attorney reported that although it is Mark Harrington's project, the amendments probably involve minor revisions and there has been positive feedback from the meetings with the various interested parties. Ms. Miller also commented on the completion of the Park Avenue study as being important to the General Plan.

Lou Hudson reported that he has been receiving calls about the amendments to the LMC regarding the HR-1 and HRL Districts; most feel that determinations should be site specific.

Roger Harlan suggested that the Council consider an ex officio appointment to the ICTHOS Board at the retreat in January and reported on the Recycling Board. Brad Olch noted that curbside recycling was somewhat of a campaign issue and pointed out the success of the private business service. Ruth Gezelius pointed out that people are parking on the sidewalks of Deer Valley Drive and Park Avenue and the potential problems it may cause for snow removal..

Shauna Kerr suggested that the ordinance regarding amplified music in City Park be reviewed again by Council, as it was also a campaign issue. She discussed the editorial in the Park Record regarding Veterans Day and the war memorial plaque, which was in the old Memorial Building and is now displayed in the County Courthouse. There was discussion of moving it back to Park City and housing it in the Library and Education Center.

Public transportation services - Hope Bleecker discussed the proposed expanded bus route for Thaynes Canyon. She pointed out that this is controversial in the neighborhood, and

residents on Payday Drive have expressed concern. There will be a meeting with the homeowners associations in the area regarding this service. Ruth Gezelius felt that the Radisson Hotel, which has requested expanded service, should participate in improving the loading area. She also recommended that UDOT be contacted to calibrate the light at the intersection of SR224 and Holiday Ranch Road for the safety of pedestrians. Ms. Bleecker discussed the bus shelter at the Radisson; the City will participate in pouring the pad for the bus shelter in conjunction with the sidewalk that the Radisson is installing.

The neighborhood meeting was again discussed and Ms. Champion expressed concern that her area doesn't have an active home owners association. The City Council encouraged her to have a representative of the area at the meeting.

Ms. Bleecker discussed the Park Meadows area routing at 20 minute frequencies and the expanded service to American Saddler, Risner Ridge, and Fairway Village. She is currently recommending against this proposal because of its cost. The City doesn't have existing equipment for this type of service; ridership projections indicate that it is not cost effective for a large bus. Also the routing would require three drivers at a cost of \$60,000. There was discussion regarding the recruitment of drivers, and Ms. Bleecker indicated that the City is in a better position this year. Shauna Kerr discussed the School District's new busing policy and the considerable traffic generated by parents driving their children to school. Discussion ensued regarding the growing transportation needs of the residents and a strategy to accommodate school children not meeting the School District criteria for busing. The Mayor suggested that if buses were provided at certain hours to transport children to the schools that perhaps users could pay for the special service. Leslie Miller suggested that the Council reevaluate the way the transportation system is funded because of increasing residential needs compared to tourist demands. Shauna Kerr emphasized that the transportation system should meet the needs of the community. Ruth Gezelius felt that this type of supplemental service for school busing needs to be carefully evaluated before imposing. Jerry Gibbs explained that moving tourists and children change costs for a number of reasons and Ms. Bleecker added that the FTA has restrictions on such a service. It was felt that in order to accomplish this, there would have to be a regular route in Park Meadows.

Ms. Bleecker explained the requested extended service to the Silver Lake area, including a proposal for an additional route on SR224 South or the Mine Road, which the Silver Lake merchants support. She emphasized that there is no existing staff or equipment to safely travel on the grade, and no private carrier at this point. She stressed that there are safety issues to be considered and distributed a report detailing accident incidents. Ms. Bleecker explained, however, that with right equipment this service could be provided, but it should be thoroughly studied. She estimated a contracting service to cost approximately \$37 per hour. If services were looped in one route, a trip would take 45 minutes to accommodate Silver Lake and the Mine Museum. Leslie Miller felt that the Deer Valley merchants should fund the additional costs for the requested service.

Ruth Gezelius addressed the Mine Road being closed from time to time in the winter, which would cause confusion. However, she discussed the number of parked cars at the intersection of Marsac and the Mine Road from people car pooling to Deer Valley, and felt it important to move people; she supported both routes. Shauna Kerr expressed her concern that the Mine Road is not safe and is uncomfortable with the potential liability. Discussion ensued regarding information on grades and road improvements. Ms. Miller felt that improved road conditions would invite cars and that the City should address short-term needs and the goals of mass transportation. Shauna Kerr agreed but felt that the risk management aspect of running City buses on a steep grade should be heavily considered. Lou Hudson agreed with Ms. Kerr and commented that Council should take a realistic approach as he felt that the Mine Road was too dangerous. Toby Ross noted that the routing on the Mine Road could be provided in a safe manner with different equipment. Council member Kerr stated that she is not opposed to contracting the service, if the City is indemnified. The Mayor commented that the alternate Silver Lake Route is more cost effective and Ms. Kerr pointed out that there is better parking areas on this route. Roger Harlan felt that the safety issues on traveling on the Mine Road could be satisfied with proper equipment, but the concern for him is the cost of the right vehicle and associated insurance. Transportation Director Bleecker proposed that the alternate Silver Lake route be implemented on December 2 at 30 minute frequencies. She stated that staff will continue to evaluate options for the Mine Road. Ruth Gezelius suggested following up on better signage on Mine Road.

Hank Rothwell of United Park City Mines emphasized that it is unacceptable to close the road, as it is important to accommodate patrons of the Mine Museum; as a result, they have invested in snow removal equipment to ensure that the road is open from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m.

Amendments to the Land Management Code regarding Historic Residential (HR-1) and Historic Recreation Commercial (HRC) Zones - Pat Putt explained that this has been a difficult project for staff and the various boards involved. He emphasized that the tighter restrictions should not be perceived as "them versus us" as the result should enhance the viability of the Historic District which benefits all. He described the essence of the Historic District, including:

- Character-defining element which distinguishes us from other resorts.
- Reinforces our heritage.
- Provides housing for local residents.
- Is good business.
- Visitors come to Historic District because it is a real place.
- People invest in Historic District.

He felt it most important to guide building scale because it creates visual continuity and establishes the character of the Historic District. Mr. Putt noted that creating a pedestrian friendly scale is important and discussed concerns about losing scale and projects exceeding a practical capacity on the site. Symptoms of this situation include losing parking, the limited

separation of buildings, lack of yard areas, shadowed properties, and lack of privacy. Though illustration of slides, Mr. Putt showed examples of large projects and stressed that the purpose of the amendments is not trying to recreate miners' cottages but create better transition with contemporary housing. He added that this proposal is different than the strategy discussed in February.

Mr. Putt pointed out that the new amendment would reduce height in the HR-1 and HRL zones to a maximum of 27 feet measured from natural grade (currently 28 feet plus 5 additional feet for the roof) and discussed the method of measuring. Currently there is difficulty with determining natural grade and buildings result in much higher structures than appropriate. He commented on the new provision addressing the snow release issue, which must be approved to the satisfaction of the Building Official. There is a provision for revising setbacks in the HR-1 zone from 20 feet to 30 feet, and revising the setback requirements in the HRL zone to increase the minimum required rear setback from 10 feet to 15 feet. Finally, there is a provision for property posting and notification of immediately adjacent property owners when plans are submitted for residential construction and/or remodeling within the Historic District. Mr. Putt emphasized that the noticing would only be for adjacent neighbors and would not be as comprehensive as the 300 foot noticing. Neighbors would receive a copy of plans once in compliance with design standards, and appeals have to be based on substantive grounds. He reported that this proposal has been reviewed by HDC on October 16, after a public process, and the HDC has forwarded a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission reviewed this on October 25, 1995 and forwarded a positive recommendation to the Council with the following input that:

- one-story elements in the proposed additional 10 foot front/rear setback area on HR-1 lots not be permitted in order to provide more site area for parking, snow storage, yards and/or landscaping;
- parking requirements be added for lockout units in the HR-1 and zones a ratio of one space per unit;
- floor area ratios be eliminated on 24' x 75' lots; and
- a section be drafted in the ordinance that clarifies the effective date of the ordinance (City Council's adoption date) and specifies that only complete building permit applications received and determined to be complete by the Building Department prior to the effective date of the ordinance shall be processed under the prior standards.

Mr. Putt continued that in response to comments made at the October 25, 1995 Planning Commission meeting, staff has prepared an addendum to allow a greater flexibility on heights for one-story elements on steeply-sloping downhill lots and the minor increases in heights to allow for more desirable roof forms. The proposed ordinance addendums are as follows:

- In order to accommodate a one-story element and pitched roof running perpendicular to the street, a building height increase, not to exceed 15 feet to the ridge line when measured from the midpoint of the front/street side property line, may be permitted at the discretion of the

Community Development Director. The additional building height shall not be permitted for portions of the structure further back than 34 feet from the street front property line (allows for 10 ft. front setback and 24 foot deep building element). Prior to granting any additional building height, the Community Development Director shall find that the proposal complies with all requisite policies in the Historic District Design Standards and results in a better overall architectural design and neighborhood compatibility.

- In order to accommodate a pitched roof running perpendicular to the street, the Community Development Director may grant additional building height provided that no more than 20% of the ridge line exceeds the height requirements. Prior to granting any additional building height, the Community Development Director shall find that the proposal complies with all requisite policies in the Historic District Design Standards and results in a better overall architectural design and does not substantially interfere with sight lines of adjacent properties. (This is intended to promote more historic roof forms and prevent the proliferation of non-historic long sloping roof forms running parallel to the slope.)

Mr. Putt discussed the recommendations from the local architects who have been meeting over the past several months, who supported the above addendums as they address their concerns that a minimum of one-story elevation be accommodated on steeply-sloping downhill lots and provide greater flexibility for design. In addition, the architects requested that the following items be considered:

- the allowance for small projections (no more than 18") into required setback areas for elements such as bay windows, minor facade shifts, etc., provided such projections do not violate UBC requirements or increase snow release problems;
- the allowance for one-story elements within the proposed additional 10 foot front/rear setback areas in the HR-1 zone as proposed by the Historic District Commission;
- discourage development on single lots by increasing the floor area ratio for multiple parcels; and
- allow for small porch encroachments into required front yards to increase the pedestrian experience at the street.

Mr. Putt reviewed the benefits of the proposed amendments and the ordinance addendums by lowering the maximum building heights by six feet and precluding three story building masses under any roof plan. The amendments accommodate a minimum of one story elevation on steeply sloping downhill lots and provide greater flexibility for design by allowing for minor height increases, preventing the need for Board of Adjustment review. Adoption of the ordinance would also promote a more compatible residential scale in the Historic District and still

allow for the same amount of living space as currently allowed under the Land Management Code. The legislation reduces site coverage and provides additional area for parking, yards, building separation and snow storage. There will also be a greater degree of up-front design details and neighborhood contextual information and a process for notifying adjacent property owners.

With regard to "garage-scapes" in the Historic District, Mr. Putt noted that having studied this problem at considerable length and spoken to several designers, has concluded that on steeply-sloping downhill lots, garage doors will continue to be a feature on steep downhill lots due to platted 25 foot wide lots and the steep topographic realities. This situation has been the case for steep downhill lots in the past and will remain a design issue regardless of whether building heights are 33 or 27 feet.

The effective date of the ordinance was discussed with regard to vested applications and the features of a complete application. Staff indicated that seven applications will be affected by the proposed amendments. Mr. Putt indicated that staff needs direction on the setbacks, the elimination of the floor area ratios, "garage-scape" issue and the effective date.

* * * * *

This public input occurred after the adjournment of the regular City Council meeting, and appears here in the work session notes for ease of reference.

Chris Larson, Chairman of the Historic District Commission discussed the double standard for new construction and remodeling applications before them. He emphasized that the proposed amendments are exactly what is needed and that the floor area ratios were not effective. The Commission tried to mitigate height and mass with design elements, but 33 foot high structures were still the result. He stated that the HDC has a very coherent vision of what they are trying to do, have covered their bases, and done their homework and urged Council to do the right thing for the Historic District by approving the amendments.

Quinton Scott, architect, stated that the amendments will not affect what was discussed in February and asked Council if they have seen a written complaint about a residence built in the last eight months. The Mayor countered that that was not a fair statement as the Council should have enough common sense and expertise about the community to make changes. Mr. Scott took exception to Mr. Putt's contextual arguments through the slide presentation as there were buildings that were not illustrative of buildings allowed under the current code and stressed that this was misleading. He urged Council to look at structures that have been built under the current code restrictions adopted in February rather than adopting more restrictive guidelines. He warned that development rights of owners in Old Town are threatened. Mr. Scott reported that 33 garages will be constructed on Woodside Avenue alone, and there needs to be more discussion before it is "rammed" down the population's throat. It would be a terrible mistake to rush this, and Council has

not been listened to by staff of its past direction. He again discussed buildings shown to Council under old provisions during work session and suggested that staff illustrate current buildings that present perceived problems. Mr. Scott stated that he has major problems with the 30 foot setback because the 20 foot has not shown that it doesn't work; this would result in a 20% reduction in the size of homes. He urged Council to entertain more public comment and added that the present guidelines have not been given a chance to work. The Mayor assured Mr. Scott that there will be ample time for discussion the next meeting this is scheduled.

Mr. Putt felt that it would be helpful if Council could give direction on aspects of the ordinance, but the effective date is important for applicants. The Mayor wasn't comfortable giving direction on the setbacks, garages, or the FARs, but felt that the application should be complete to be grandfathered. Mr. Ross clarified that the effective date of the ordinance is when it is adopted by Council, but the deadline for applications is at Council's discretion. Ruth Gezelius agreed with the setbacks as currently people cannot park on their property. She felt that application should be complete to be vested and elimination of FARs on single family lots is a good direction to take. She felt that these amendments are timely and pointed out that there are no neighborhood associations to express Historic District residents' concerns. Ms. Gezelius reported that she has regularly attended HDC meetings for several years and the direction is to address the issue of compatibility in the Historic District. The scale of homes and multiple units is not working and the diversity people are seeking is incompatible within the Historic District, which doesn't necessary need to accommodate all types of single family housing in this area. Ms. Gezelius stressed that the District provides housing for singles, people who have grown children, rentals and roommates; there are all types of housing options for families in the community. She pointed out that the Planning Commission is hearing from people in subdivisions who now want one acre lots and are complaining about current densities there. The desire to maximize the square footage of interior living space for nightly rentals is not the intent of maintaining our historic integrity. She discussed snow shedding and storage problems because of inadequate setbacks and the City's expense in hauling snow. Additionally lack of front setbacks affect parking and pedestrians.

Ms. Kerr stated that if in fact historic preservation is a value in the community and there are additional burdens on the owners of property in the Historic District, there should be benefits. Council should go out of its way to make sure that those who came after and choose to live next to the historic structures meet all the requirements to safeguard historic structures and currently that is not the case. Presently, the new home comes in and is built independently of the integrity of the structure that we as a community say is our value. As a Council, Ms. Kerr urged the protection of the Historic District and take a firm stand in meeting standards that are very strict. She agreed with Ms. Gezelius in that not everyone can live in Old Town; those that chose to have a 25' x 75' lot need to build accordingly. She added that those who buy steep lots knew what it looked like when they bought it and should design around it. Ms. Kerr felt that this is the first of step to really preserve Old Town and would be in favor of looking into contextual issues. Snow shedding has been an issue

for her, and she will continue to support ideas that help to preserve what the community has identified as a value. Ms. Kerr was supportive of full building permit approval for vesting.

Roger Harlan felt that the issue is preserving historic structures and didn't think that all future applicants will be pleased with the new guidelines. Mr. Harlan supported the direction of the amendments. He didn't have a strong opinion on the effective date but it should be fair to people in the process.

David Chaplin, Historic District resident, heartily endorsed and supported staff's recommendations. He added that the Planning Commission was positively moved to make a recommendation to the City Council. Mr. Chaplin noted that he has written the City Council about a design which is allowable under the current code. The architect states that the house is 27 feet and the height of the house, is in fact, under the current guidelines 40 feet high. He reminded Council that from the point of view of Historic District residents, that the Historic District is currently being sold to the developers and the designers. He sympathized with the designers because some of the guidelines being proposed will reduce their fees if enacted and that is not a small concern to them.

Briggeta Wrey stated that she was a resident in another historic district and at that time residents fought very hard to preserve the area. She urged Council to lower the height limit and reduce the size of structures. Ms. Wrey felt that buyers should be aware of the limitations of the properties they are buying.

Don Bloxom, designer, felt that if this takes two more years, it should be provided the time. He pointed out that this would reduce square footage on the lots which have increased in price. Mr. Bloxom stated that Council cannot arbitrarily make a more restrictive usage on the downhill side of the street than the uphill side of the street and warned of lawsuits. He pointed out that new technologies are not being taken into account regarding snow shedding and storage and perhaps mansard roofs should be considered as a design option. More restrictive covenants create "mundanity" insaneness which was never the nature of historic Park City. There was eclectic architecture; mansard and shed roofs, and all kinds of different facades. That was the nature of mining towns. He felt that Pat Putt did a good job but presented a very slanted view and showed many buildings that couldn't be built today under the existing guidelines.

Leslie Miller stated that she has lived in the Historic District for 22 years and is a graphic designer who has an understanding of design, scale, context, and color. She reported that she has taken photographs of examples that meet the existing guidelines. Conceptually, she stated that she doesn't mind the result of smaller homes, but asked everyone to consider the homes they live in and ask how you would feel if someone living in a 2,400 to 3,000 square foot home was dictating to people what size homes they must live in. The amendments will result in subterranean living standards, and we want these buildings to be liveable. She felt that the proposal is moving us in the right direction, but is not convinced today that "we have nailed it", but absolutely convinced that

more input from technicians will produce solutions. Ms. Miller felt it important to identify what specifically we are trying to cure. The problems, as presented, are that the appearance of mass and scale of the newer homes in the Historic District are incompatible with the original historic character and existing historic homes. Sometimes new homes built under the current ordinance create safety and health issues to abutting structures due to snow shedding and lack of snow storage. Sometimes homes on single family lots are designed in way that are insensitive to surrounding structures but are constrained by geographic limitations of the site. She saw the challenge to consider the differences in building on steep uphill, steep downhill, or flat lots that are 25' x 75' and to encourage variation of structural shapes and sizes and Ms. Miller emphasized variation. She continued that the challenge is to prevent the loss of interior light and air for the residents as well as to promote the recovery of exterior light and air. The challenge is to allow modern necessities, such as off-street parking and ensure the safety and integrity of existing buildings in proximity to new construction and to promote design compatibility within the context of the existing and the original Historic District; we cannot go back in time, and economics is another issue. Ms. Miller continued the other challenges are to use as a guide the traditional design standards within the Historic District that do not create similar or additional problems to the Comprehensive Plan. The ordinance should be user-friendly and when applied to lot owners with varying degrees of site restrictions can still meet all of the criteria as stated.

Ms. Miller recommended the following options. She felt the City needs to consider flexibility in the height standards that allow for site characteristic differences inherent in uphill, downhill or flat lots. She encouraged identifying steep grades, either by inventory or slope percentage, amending the Historic District Guidelines to specifically identify design elements and structural restrictions for uphill, downhill, or flat lots, eliminating the LMC requirements for garages, and allowing off-street parking. She recommended considering snow shedding and other design issues to be reviewed by the Building Inspector and an amendment to the LMC and Historic District Guidelines that permit original historic homes to be modified or renovated to match the new guidelines and codes for new single family construction so there isn't a double standard. Ms. Miller felt that duplicative architectural design should be allowed for new construction for single family homes and duplexes and eliminating the FARs on single family units. She suggested completing and publishing the new inventory of the vacant lots and the original structures for planning purposes and that a comprehensive approach be taken.

Council member Ruth Gezelius pointed out that a public process has been underway for two years and that the residents in Old Town are feeling a sense of urgency as construction of incompatible buildings continue to occur. Leslie Miller committed to the time required to get this resolved by the end of the year, but will not approve something "that deserves to be better".

Prepared by Janet M. Scott