

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 11, 2013**

PRESENT: Jack Thomas, Brooke Hontz, Stewart Gross, Charlie Wintzer, Thomas Eddington, Kayla Sintz, Mark Harrington, Polly Samuels-McLean

WORK SESSION ITEMS

General Plan – Discussion of Task Force recommendation for Small Town

Director Eddington remarked that this work session was the beginning of the General Plan Review and Work Sessions/Public Hearings that would be held over the next few months. He noted that the review schedule for both the Planning Commission and the City Council was very aggressive, but workable.

Director Eddington stated that the Planning Commission would be reviewing the Small Town Section of the General Plan this evening. He reported that the Planning Commission previously reviewed the General Plan section for Small Town on October 10th and October 16th of 2012 as it was in the updating process. He explained that when the draft was completed, Task Force was formed to participate in an eight meeting review process. The Task Force was very productive and it gave the representatives from the Planning Commission and the City Council the opportunity to get into the details and report back to their fellow Commissioners and Council members. The Staff benefits from the Task Force meetings and it helped them begin to make the redline changes to the document, which were attached as exhibits to the Staff report.

Director Eddington remarked that the objective this evening was to choose a Planning Commission liaison for the coordinating committee. If the Staff finds major issues with the schedule, the liaison would be willing to meet with the City Attorney's Office, the Planning Department and a City Council liaison between regular meetings to address issues.

The Commissioners preferred to wait until the other Commissioners were in attendance to see if they would be available to handle the time commitment. Commissioner Gross volunteered to be on the committee in the interim.

Director Eddington reported that the Planning Commission and the City Council addressed three policy issues at the joint meeting on September 4th. The Staff report contained a brief summary of the outcome of that meeting. He asked if the Commissioners had anything specific to address before the Staff drafted the language for the General Plan.

Director Eddington noted that the Outcomes were outlined on page 268 of the Staff report, based on the comments at the joint meeting with the City Council

Policy 1 – Encourage growth inward with regard to the densification. Director Eddington stated that after significant discussion at the joint meeting there was concern about density as a standalone, but there was a willingness to consider it if affordable housing and TDRs were the give/gets. The Staff was directed to modify the policy to include language to that effect relative to goals and strategies.

Commissioner Hontz noted that several in the group were still uncomfortable with density. She felt

they were getting closer to acceptance in terms of tying density to something that would benefit the community. However, they are not able to control sprawl outside of their borders, which is where they do not want sprawl to occur. Commissioner Hontz was not comfortable with the mechanisms that are currently in place to reduce density. She provided a number of scenarios that could occur to support her concern. Commissioner Hontz stated that she could manufacture density in both Summit and Wasatch Counties very easily. Therefore, a TDR density that takes density off of sprawl, may not always be a benefit. Based on her professional experience she understood that the numbers are not always real. Park City is trying to protect itself from both Counties and the TDR numbers are not real in either County.

Commissioner Hontz was concerned that the City had not done the long-term visioning for infrastructure, sewer, water and roads to know whether they could withstand potentially increased density that has not already been built. Commissioner Hontz liked the idea in concept, but it would not work in practice. She was very uncomfortable with the policy language.

Vice-Chair Thomas pointed out that they were talking about an outcome and a modification to clarify that the City is not a goal in its own right; and to include community give/gets that may justify additional density in neighborhoods that can handle the additional load, without compromising keeping Park City Park City. He noted that the Staff was also asking the Commissioners to density in BoPa. Vice-Chair Thomas intended to focus his comments on BoPa. Based on modeling that was previously done, and the land use law that is in place, they have approximately 5.5 million square feet of potential buildout. They currently have 1 million square feet in place. He asked how they could determine whether additional density should be added to the 5.5 million and what basis they should use for measurement. Vice-Chair Thomas was certain that the City would not build 5.5 million square feet of three-story space. He believed they would be going through the MPD process and other processes to see how things work.

Vice-Chair Thomas understood the give/get principles, but he thought it was also reasonable to consider that when someone develops a large parcel, they need streets and store fronts to make the project marketable and to make the project work. The idea of giving streets and store front, as well as additional density, means tall buildings, more height and other elements that begin to impact what they were trying to preserve. Vice-Chair Thomas stated that this was a big issue for him and he was unsure how they could use 5.5 million as a base number to evolve density because the number is hypothetical.

Director Eddington clarified that the 5.5 million assumes the most severe case if everyone puts all the parking underground and everything is maximized. He noted that it could be done now under the General Commercial Zone, which is why the analysis was done. Vice-Chair Thomas stated that when the analysis was being done he never considered the number to be real.

City Attorney Harrington thought the comments were accurate and a good extension of the joint meeting. He believed this was a critical issue and the area where the Planning Commission and the City Council were different in their vision. The vision was not so different in the high level concept, and the commonality was the same in terms of the goals. However, how to get there and what they are willing to sacrifice and preserve is very different. The fact that the minority was the majority this evening forced the conversation to be direct. Mr. Harrington recognized that this was a fundamental shift for some neighborhoods. The proposal is to meet some of the long terms problems, which are

both regional and local, and the Staff's recommendation is one methodology for addressing it. It is a shift and one that would require overt leadership and a very high level of proactive from the City to steer the direction rather than letting the market guide it.

Mr. Harrington thought the broader question is what they want to telegraph as the policy and the vision. Is it willingness to accept these density changes that the market may not deliver on its own, or is that too risky because they do not control the end game. He noted that the higher prioritization is neighborhoods, streets and mitigating traffic. It is important to prioritize how to address the negatives and the deliverables as much as they want to prioritize the long term capacity issue, which is what the Charles Buki vision was trying to address. Mr. Harrington stated that it was equally valid, but it may not be their priority. Rather than look for the commonality where they can agree on the language, the goal should be to flush out the specificity that does not dictate a result for the Land Management Code, but articulates the direction.

Mr. Harrington believed that the City Council was willing to go further to get a result, and the Planning Commission was approaching it differently.

Commissioner Wintzer agreed that BoPa was a good example, as well as the Deer Valley and PCMR parking lots. He felt the statement was so broad that it could have been interpreted into the conversation they had earlier about a different project. He thought they should target three or four areas to move density. The statement was so broad that density could be everywhere rather than be regulated. He felt the statement was saying that as a general plan they were trying to bring density into town, and he could not support that.

City Attorney Harrington stated that as a group, the Planning Commission has struggled to identify receiving zones within town for density they already knew they wanted to move. Commissioner Wintzer referred to the earlier discussion over a project in a neighborhood that was affecting people on both sides, but that the Planning Commission supported. In his opinion, to have a general statement was premature considering how hard it was to deal with 400 square feet of land in one project.

Vice-Chair Thomas suggested approaching it more specifically from neighborhoods and districts and talk about the nature of the height, form and scale and roads in the neighborhood.

Director Eddington asked if the Commissioners would feel differently if the language was revised to say, "We support higher densities in town in defined areas". He defined the areas as BoPa, LoPa, Deer Valley parking lots, PCMR parking lots and Snow Creek. City Attorney Harrington thought the question should be where they want new growth to occur, regardless of its source.

Vice-Chair Thomas thought new growth was more appropriate than higher density. Director Eddington clarified that higher density is higher than what exists. City Attorney Harrington stated that if they focus on new growth as opposed to higher, it could encapsulate both. Vice-Chair was uncomfortable with more density than what exists because it is a staggering number in looking at the density. He starts to think about big, vertical and tall and how it starts to impact the entry corridors. Allowing that would be completely inconsistent with their values and could push them in the wrong direction.

Commissioner Gross suggested that they revise the language to say, "We support growth in town",

and leave out “higher densities in town.” Commissioner Wintzer thought they were several examples of how additional densities could be beneficial or hurtful. He thought they should be very careful about what they support and how they get it into the City. Commissioner Wintzer thought the statement contradicted the four core values.

Commissioner Hontz noted that page 272 of the Staff report talks about the 2009 visioning. She believed that the way the policy was written conflicted with the language in the second paragraph. People were asked what would make them leave Park City and the most common answer too much change or growth, followed by loss of natural beauty and environmental decline associated with growth. When people were asked what they wanted Park City to be like in 20 years, the answer was stay the same, small town feel, sense of community, uniqueness, less development, smarter growth, green and open. Commissioner Hontz felt there was a strong message that people were afraid of exactly what Policy 1 would allow. She asked how they would prioritize the negative.

City Attorney Harrington stated that the Planning Commission needed to agree on whether or not this should be the number one policy. Commissioner Hontz did not think it should be. Mr. Harrington stated that as a group they could look at refining a new policy statement that softens the transition from the vision to Policy 1. It is goal one and that is the most important goal. If they could not agree on that point, that would present other issues. He clarified that he was not suggesting that they abandon the policy, but he understood that the preference was to modify the language in a context that transitions from the vision core values into a policy statement which reflects the four principles; and move this to a new highly qualified policy statement, notwithstanding Policy Goal 1. They could progressively entertain smart planning tactics or employ strategies that results in new growth in town, if x-things are met. It allows for the “it depends” win/win, but it is not the first goal. Mr. Harrington emphasized that it would be a deviation from the Staff recommendation and he was not advocating for that. He was only trying to direct the Commissioners to a solution.

Director Eddington stated that the core value of natural setting would be negatively impacted by sprawl and/or development on the outside. However, additional development in an area that is already developed preserves natural setting. He believed there was some compatibility with putting density in an area to preserve open space somewhere else. Commissioner Hontz stated that as written, the policy could also impact the historic character because density could come into the Historic District. Director Eddington replied that the strategies reflect affordable housing and TDRs, but they do not talk about putting density in Old Town.

Commissioner Hontz felt strongly that the intent needed to be clear in the goal language and in the strategies. City Attorney Harrington stated that it begins with regional collaboration. The biggest shift the Staff was recommending was a much higher level of regional collaboration beyond anything they have seen in the past or tried to attempt. The Staff has made good progress in terms of laying the foundation for collaboration to occur, but it all depends on third parties. He noted that the City has been aligned with Summit County even when there have been differences. However, it is much more of a nuance negotiation with Wasatch County because they have a different set of priorities. Mr. Harrington stated that the strategies for the Policy statement as currently written would not work unless that fundamentally changed. The issue was how to integrate the goal without undermining the current planning policy.

Commissioner Wintzer understood that they could not define what occurs in the County, but in some respects, if the City provides housing for people who work in Salt Lake, they would be better off

putting more density at Redstone to mitigate the traffic. He suggested that they find a way to incorporate that into the County's mission as well. Commissioner Wintzer believed that at a certain point traffic will drive what they do. The further they can stop the traffic out of town, they better off they would be.

Commissioner Wintzer was unsure whether he agreed with the statement to support higher density in town because Park City streets are more choked than the County streets. He stated that higher density for affordable housing was different from higher density for commuters who want to live in Park City and commute to Salt Lake. The person who spends money skiing every day is the valuable customer, not the one who works and shops in Salt Lake but lives in Park City. He would be more comfortable if they could define the goal for higher density.

City Attorney Harrington thought the policy question could be summarized by whether there was a scenario in which they could implement a regional TDR program without the necessity of annexation. He asked if the Commissioners were willing to consider a policy goal in which they could achieve a better density outcome without changing the municipal boundaries; and have it be done by interlocal agreement. Commissioner Hontz could only think of one instance where she would be comfortable with that scenario. She thought the people who participated in the visioning spoke clearly and she was uncomfortable with where it would take them.

Commissioner Wintzer did not believe the policy as written reflected what Mr. Harrington had offered. He could possibly support it if the language was modified. Director Eddington stated that the agreement to modify the language was part of the outcome.

City Attorney Harrington asked if the Commissioners still wanted the policy as goal number one if the language was modified. Commissioner Wintzer thought they should discuss all the policies first to see if they should be renumbered.

Policy 2 – Increase opportunities for local food production within City limits. City Attorney Harrington believed the direction from the joint meeting was to de-emphasize it in the General Plan and handle it through confirmation, implementation and the LMC. People can do these things but it does not need to be stated affirmatively as a visionary component of the General Plan.

Commissioner Gross noted that the principles talk about sustainable agriculture practices. City Attorney Harrington stated that the language would be pulled from the principles.

Policy 3 – Continue to provide necessary commercial and light industrial services within the City limits by allowing a range of commercial uses within the City limits; including industrial uses in appropriate areas. Director Eddington stated that when they first looked at this policy there was a discussion with regard to businesses in the Light Industrial Zone and whether those businesses would be appropriate in other areas. The only opportunity is right outside the City in the Park City Industrial Park for auto related businesses or light industrial businesses. Within the City, the only area is the Bonanza Park Light Industrial zone where those businesses could be accommodated. The Staff recommendation was to still keep it and allow for it in the Bonanza Park area and do it via character zones under Form Based Code. Director Eddington stated that the Planning Commission generally agreed to that at the joint meeting. He asked if they wanted to clarify any of the ideas or language.

Commissioner Wintzer thought the area on the edge of town was appropriate. He did not believe it was worth writing if it was not incentivized.

Planning Manager Sintz believed everyone understood the LI zone, but there was also the LI uses. As pointed out during the joint meeting, gas stations and other important businesses in town are in the GC zone. She suggested that they think of the uses separate from just the zone designation for Light Industrial. Commissioner Wintzer pointed out that they were also in the process of doing Form Based Code with the only place that is Light Industrial. He thought they should deal with it in that zone and see if it is acceptable in that location. Director Eddington clarified that it was the Staff's recommendation and they wanted to make sure the Planning Commission agreed. The Staff also recognized that the goal would have to have economic development incentivization because it will not work without an incentive.

City Attorney Harrington suggested that they include in the strategies an analysis of the existing uses in LI which may make the LI zone incompatible. He noted that most of the LI zone is in residential use. He suggested that they could rezone it to residential. Director Eddington clarified that the Staff recommendation for form based code. The character zone for Fireside would not recommend gas stations or automotive. It would recommend it in the other character zones on the opposite side of Bonanza Drive.

Commissioner Wintzer was concerned about the potential of losing the last gas station in town. He pointed out that two other gas stations were taken out to accommodate development. City Attorney Harrington thought his concern related to Policy Issue # 5 in terms of allowing increased flexibility in existing subdivisions. He recalled strategies that specify increased commercial area in the existing neighborhoods. He asked if part of the incentivization would be to allow more support commercial into the existing neighborhoods. He noted that they have struggled with that in the past in terms of whether or not a gas station should go into Park Meadows or Upper Deer Valley.

Commissioner Wintzer stated that he was disappointed with the City for not putting a restaurant back in the Racquet Club. Not having watering holes and local restaurants within a neighborhood encourages driving. Commissioner Wintzer thought the City should do whatever it could to keep as much light industrial in town as possible. He stated that one of the traffic problems is the number of people who drive to the junction to launder sheets and towels to take to Deer Valley. They could solve that problem by having those services in town. City Attorney Harrington thought they could state that in a vision, but the two were different. One is to have consolidated traditional zones that are focused on the use. The second is to spread it out and create opportunities in limited and distinct locations within neighborhoods. Commissioner Wintzer thought they were short-sighted when they did not put in support industrial in the Deer Valley, Upper Deer Valley and the Empire Pass area. The City encourages people to drive to and from places like laundromats and Home Depot. For future annexations he thought the developer should be required to provide their own support commercial.

Commissioner Hontz asked if there was consensus to modify the language in Policy #3 to address the issues with the current Light Industrial, strengthen language in Form Based Code and additionally find appropriate locations within other zones on a neighborhood, by neighborhood basis. Vice-Chair Thomas was unsure how that could be done in historic neighborhoods. Commissioner

Hontz thought they could identify those neighborhoods as places where it would not work. Commissioner Wintzer thought they could find create ways to allow it in the Historic District.

Director Eddington summarized that the direction was to look at additional neighborhood sites for potential support facilities or neighborhood services. Commissioner Wintzer clarified that if that was what they wanted, they needed to be specific in requiring it. Vice-Chair Thomas agreed. The ability to purchase goods and services in town makes it a complete town.

City Attorney Harrington compared it to the analogy of complete streets. They have their pluses and minus, depending on the prioritization. Part of it comes from natural evolution as the community changes, and in some cases it is a drastic change in a short period of time. They have to pick and choose what they want to facilitate. The real question is whether they want to encroach upon existing neighborhoods for that, or whether they want to segregate and keep it in defined areas.

Commissioner Wintzer thought there could easily be a commercial laundromat on a lower floor of an apartment structure in Bonanza Park. He provided other examples to show how commercial support could be accomplished in the existing zones. Vice-Chair Thomas remarked that it would have to be incentivized for someone to do it. Commissioner Wintzer concurred.

City Attorney Harrington understood from the comments that support commercial should be tied to the limited uses they specifically want rather than a broad support commercial definition. Commissioner Wintzer thought it should also be tied to reducing traffic.

The Commissioners discussed Policy Issue #2, and whether annexation should be encouraged or discouraged and whether the annexation policy declaration boundary should be expanded to protect undeveloped land. Director Eddington referred to the annexation map on page 281 of the Staff report and noted that the black boundary was the Park City Boundary. The red boundary is the existing annexation declaration area boundary. The blue boundary was a potential proposed boundary for the ADA. Director Eddington stated that for the first time they were recommending crossing over Highway 40 to the east and south into Wasatch County looking down near the Brighton Estates, Bonanza Flats area. He explained that the Staff thought it was important to expand the boundaries in an effort to better define what could be in their boundaries. He noted that page 283 of the Staff report identifies the nodes of development that are in existence or on the way. In looking at those areas, they want the ability to define what goes into the Park City boundaries. The Staff felt that the east side of Highway 40 is an area that is important to the future entry corridor to Park City. However, they left the boundaries alone near Jordanelle.

Commissioner Hontz indicated a portion by the St. Regis and asked if that could be captured. City Attorney Harrington was unsure whether they could unilaterally move it under the existing agreement with Wasatch County. He would try to find the answer. At a minimum he believed it would have to be amended. Commissioner Gross asked if they could show it and then work through the conditions and details. Commissioner Hontz questioned whether it might create a political downside in terms of relations with the County. Commissioner Wintzer thought it would. City Attorney Harrington suggested that it would have to be done delicately and jointly with the County in the spirit of cooperation. It was a hard fought compromise and an elegant solution in terms of the bifurcation of the tax structure that remained with the County, as well as the planning goals that restricted what the County could do in the future. Mr. Harrington thought it would be appropriate for the Planning

Commissioner Hontz provided input to the City Council in terms of how they would like to see the agreement modified with the potential goal for annexation. He advised against moving the line on the map.

Commissioner Wintzer stated that he was the most concerned with Bonanza Flat because it is a problematic area in terms of getting in and out of town. It is a sensitive issue and by identifying it on the map they need to be careful not to imply that the City intends to annex Bonanza Flat as an area for density. He agreed that it was better for the City to control it.

Vice-Chair Thomas disclosed that he had done early planning studies regarding Bonanza Flats before it became an MPD. Commissioner Hontz disclosed that she had done the entitlements but it was a long time ago. Vice-Chair Thomas stated that the impact of any development in that area coming through town would be horrendous. Director Eddington noted that when UDOT chip sealed Guardsman it became a much easier road to access.

Commissioner Hontz asked if the City was suggesting Mountain Top because that area was undeveloped and not part of Round Valley. Director Eddington stated that the linear lots are developed, but the Mountain Top section is in the existing ADA boundary and the Staff recommended keeping that line. Commissioner Hontz believed an area identified to the right of that boundary line was on the other side of the ridgeline. Director Eddington stated that the area was included for an accessibility route. Commissioner Hontz pointed out that accessibility would promote development on those lots. They would need to have clear language to explain why that ADA boundary was changing.

Assistant City Attorney Harrington recalled that Mountain Top was rejected two or three times based on police and water service limitations, and he suggested that the Staff look at the record on past decisions. Director Eddington recalled that managed growth was the reason for including Mountain Top.

Director Eddington continued reviewing the annexation boundaries and noted that some of the boundaries were along private property lines. He stated that for the next meeting the Staff could put markers on the map to help clarify and identify specific properties. Commissioners Thomas and Wintzer requested that the Staff print a large version of the map to have on the table in front of them.

Commissioner Hontz asked if it was possible to extend the blue line in the northeast corner all the way up behind the jail and Home Depot. Director Eddington explained that the reason for stopping the line was because the Silver Creek area has some entitlements and it has started to develop as its own node and the node is within the County. They were looking at whether there was an opportunity to separate nodes rather than to just have corridor sprawl. The Staff could look at Commissioner Hontz's suggestion. However, the initial thought was if the City could work with the County to protect open space and corridor sprawl, the give/get would be for the County to get the commercial base.

Commissioner Wintzer pointed out that they would need to be careful about inheriting toxic dirt soils. The current advantage is that the land cannot be developed because of the toxic soil and the City would not want that liability.

City Attorney Harrington asked if annexation was addressed in any other goal in the existing General Plan. Director Eddington was unsure of the goal number, but it addresses land use and talks about annexation. Mr. Harrington directed the Staff to look for an opportunity for additional follow-up, as well as outreach with both Counties, and come back with facts based on feedback and the existing agreements. Director Eddington stated that in terms of the ADA boundaries, he doubted that the Planning Commission would have clear answers before making their recommendation to the City Council. Mr. Harrington believed the Staff would have feedback on whether the policy could be shaped without offending the Counties. The goal would be to either stay the status quo and establish a process for future modifications, or have consensus at the onset to formerly include it in the ADA without it being perceived as jurisdiction overstepping. The Staff should have at least a generic answer before the Planning Commission forwards their recommendation to the Council.

Director Eddington referred to Policy Issue #6, which talks about additional accessory uses and apartments in residential zones. He believed this related to the discussion relative to Goal Policy #1, the densification issue. Director Eddington stated that this idea stemmed from past discussions relative to historic sites in Old Town. One specific discussion talked about the square footage of a detached garage on a historic site not counting towards the footprint of the building if it also contained a studio or an affordable unit above. Director Eddington clarified that the policy spreads further than the Historic District. It could be in Park Meadows or anywhere else in town. He emphasized that the accessory use would be long term leases and not nightly rental.

City Attorney Harrington thought they needed to be clear on this policy issue because it would change the ordinance and allow accessory uses where it is not currently permitted. Commissioner Wintzer recalled that it was currently not permitted in any neighborhood. Commissioner Hontz replied that it was permitted in Old Town. Mr. Harrington clarified that it is permitted in Old Town with restrictions. There can only be a certain number within a certain area. Accessory uses were also permitted within one zone in Prospector with the stipulation of a 300 foot separation.

Commissioner Wintzer thought it was worth exploring. He pointed out that it was a fragile issue with ramifications if it is done wrong, and they would have to do it in a way that works without offending anyone. Commissioner Wintzer was unsure whether he could support the subdivision of lots to create additional structures. He agreed with the idea of accessory apartments or affordable units, but the question was how to make it work.

Commissioner Hontz remarked that it goes back to the parking component and whether it was suitable for an area or if they would be cramming more into an already crowded area. Commissioner Wintzer concurred. They would need to find a way to reduce the number of cars associated with those properties to avoid putting more pressure on the neighborhood. Commissioner Wintzer stated that if the City wanted affordable housing units, this would be a way to pick up additional units.

The Commissioners discussed the pros and cons of allowing accessory uses and the areas where it would work best or not work at all. Director Eddington understood that the direction was to leave in the accessory use language but to look at specific zones and qualifications.

Director Eddington returned to Policy Issue #5 to discuss the subdivision of existing properties.

Commissioner Wintzer was not interested in having that argument. The Staff had only identified eight lots and he believed the Planning Commission had more important issues to address. Vice-Chair Thomas agreed.

Director Eddington reviewed the revised layout for the General Plan outlined on page 269 of the Staff report. The revised layout would make the General Plan an easier document to reference. Commissioner Wintzer requested that the Staff conduct a session for the Commissioners on how to use the General Plan. It would strictly be a learning session and not a policy discussion. Two or three short sessions could be scheduled in the Planning Department to make sure they did not have a quorum.

Commissioner Hontz suggested that the introduction include instructions on how to use the General Plan. Director Eddington stated that there would be instructions on how to use the document. He noted that the Executive Summary section talks about a short stand alone executive summary which would outline what the General Plan is, how to use it, what it contains, the core values and the primary goals and strategies. He asked if the Planning Commission favored that idea or whether they preferred a more detailed introduction.

Vice-Chair Thomas preferred a more detailed introduction and one book instead of two. Commissioner Wintzer could see problems with people only reading the small book and claiming that they did not know there was a more detailed document. However, he recognized that printing the large book was a significant cost for someone who only wanted a summary of what the town is like. Director Eddington believed that the majority of people would use the electronic version online because it would be hyperlinked with definitions. If someone only wanted a specific section, they would not have to print the entire document. Director Eddington summarized that the preference was for a detailed introduction and only one book.

The Commissioners discussed the General Plan schedule. City Attorney Harrington stated that they could choose one liaison or rotate Commissioners. The Commissioners favored the suggestion to rotate. Commissioner Gross reiterated his earlier offer to be the interim liaison and offered to take the first two weeks. As the Commissioners read through the redlined version they should email their comments to the assigned liaison.

The Commissioners set the following schedule for the remaining meetings:

Stewart Gross – Small Town – 9/11
Nann Worel – Sense of Community – 9/25
Adam Strachan – Natural Setting – 10/9
Charlie Wintzer – Historic Character – 10/23
Jack Thomas &
Brooke Hontz - Neighborhoods – 11/6

Vice-Chair Thomas called for public input.

Mary Wintzer disclosed that she was married to Commissioner Charlie Wintzer. Ms. Wintzer stated that her comments were only an observation, but it related to what Commissioner Hontz's read earlier about what was said during Visioning. Ms. Wintzer noted that she had attended every

meeting starting with the first meeting with Charles Buki. At that time Mr. Buki commended them and said how more people than ever before had attended Visioning. After a series of meeting over a period of several months, at the final meeting with Mr. Buki he presented stark flashing numbers without pretty pictures. If that was done as a scare tactic she recalled the feeling in the room and how the mood became somber. Ms. Wintzer believed the Mayor's finest hour was when he said he would take it with a grain of salt. Ms. Wintzer stated that from the time of that meeting they have gone away from and were negating the very first meeting where people said what they wanted Park City to be. People were very concerned about changing the lifestyle that they had come to Park City for or what they expected to be able to have. When they talk about loading density they would destroy the happiness of people and why they came to Park City. Loading people on top of load is great if you live in Virginia like Mr. Buki, because people are used to that, but they are not used to it in Park City. She was very concerned about the movement towards density. Ms. Wintzer understood that Mr. Buki had convinced the Planning Department and others to take that direction, but it was totally opposite from what the citizens asked for during Visioning.

Hope Melville recognized that the Planning Commission has a difficult job putting this all together in a usable document. However, she was surprised that Goal 1 was increasing density because it was totally opposite from the four goals of small town, community, and keeping Park City Park City. She could not understand how they could possibly say that the goal is to increase density in Park City and she was very concerned if that was the direction of the new General Plan.

Ruth Meintsma was bewildered by the process. She agreed with Ms. Melville on the difficulty of putting it into one document. Ms. Meintsma understood the density because Mr. Buki was actually talking about making housing and living in Park City available to a group of people that is it not available to currently. She believed that was what the density issue was trying to address. Ms. Meintsma remarked that density is a scary word, but affordability to middle income people is also important.

The Work Session was adjourned.