December 5, 2019

The Council of Park City, Summit County, Utah, met in open meeting on December 5, 2019, at 2:45 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

Council Member Gerber moved to close the meeting to discuss property and litigation at 2:45 p.m. Council Member Joyce seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek and Worel

CLOSED SESSION

Council Member Ware Peek moved to adjourn from Closed Meeting at 3:40 p.m. Council Member Worel seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek and Worel

WORK SESSION

Discuss Affordable Housing Land Management Code Revisions:
Jared Glidden, Affordable Housing Manager, reviewed that the City had to be aggressive and form partnerships in order to reach its 2022 housing goals. Alex Joyce, Managing Partner for Cascadia, indicated density bonuses were popular around the country, but the balance was crucial and needed to be adjusted according to market demands. He noted there were various dials that could be adjusted to make affordable housing work. The Affordable Master Planned Development (AMPD) was intended for large sites, but it could impact small sites as well. With regard to Park City, most parcels were small. The code was written to encourage small lots in subdivisions. The AMPD would give bonuses, but there wasn't enough land to increase density unless each unit's square footage shrunk.

Mr. Joyce stated parking requirements competed with density bonuses and that was looked at in the analysis. Building height and setbacks were also considered. All these factors could be tweaked to make a project cost effective for a developer. He reviewed the MPD and AMPD findings from his research, including 1) the standards were not
suited for smaller lots, 2) the current density bonuses only allowed for micro units, 3) parking requirements made the density bonuses challenging at affordable levels, and 4) the density bonuses for AMPD would not make the units affordable.

The changes Cascadia recommended was to prioritize code changes for smaller lots, which included using the base zone setbacks and eliminating the large perimeter buffer, achieving active open space that could be used, changing the building footprint standards for AMPD projects, determining the right size of parking requirements for infill projects since they were close to commercial areas and transit, and allowing an additional floor outside the historic district. Mr. Joyce stated he also performed a funding gap analysis. He presented different scenarios based on changes to the AMPD and MPD. He indicated the changes had a dramatic effect on how far the development dollars could be stretched.

Council Member Worel asked if parking could be constructed under a building. Mr. Joyce stated it looked better aesthetically, but the cost was exponentially higher. Council Member Ware Peek asked what models in other areas had been successful with parking reductions that incentivized people from not owning cars. Mr. Joyce recommended going into the project with a parking plan and linking parking reductions to areas served by transit. He also suggested increasing on-street parking fees. Council Member Gerber felt affordable housing in the City on a transit line would promote residents that didn't have cars.

Mayor Beerman asked if cross subsidized units were a good mix. Mr. Joyce stated having part market rate and part affordable units was very appealing to private developers. Park City was a strong housing market which was a plus. Mayor Beerman thought the market rate units would be sold to second home owners, who required amenities. He asked if that kind of development would be managed by two different HOAs. Mr. Joyce stated having different HOAs could work, but the amenities should be market tested. Mayor Beerman felt two HOAs could present an equity issue since the amenities wouldn't be available to all the residents living in the development.

Council Member Henney stated the code served the City well for years, but now he thought the proposed revisions would be best going forward. He hoped the community would agree. He noted land was scarce and he asked if the City should be trying to repurpose that land, or if it should be looking at higher density. Mr. Joyce stated the scenarios he presented could be used by the City and there would be benefits with either one. An amended AMPD would make either scenario more cost efficient. Council Member Henney hoped the community was ready to embrace height, density, setbacks, and open space, and hoped the City could maximize the number of attainable and affordable deed restricted homes.
Council Member Gerber stated there was more than one dial and the community might embrace some things more than others. Council Member Ware Peek talked about the underutilized green space in the City and felt that could be repurposed. Council Member Worel thought the timing for this analysis was perfect. As the 2020 visioning process was wrapping up, the community was requesting bold change. She felt this was one bold change that could be embraced.

Council Member Joyce stated the recommendation felt like a smart move, and gave examples of bad planning. He thought there were some of these things that could be implemented quickly. He wanted the community to have a positive impression when they saw the City's affordable housing. He struggled with building height and didn't want to see a black eye, but thought these changes would be received well in the Bonanza Park and Prospector areas. He also discussed the soil issue and thought the City should do something to make it work financially for the City or developers.

Council Member Gerber suggested a car share program, either through Transit or through a private company, in addition to expanding the Transit program. Council Member Joyce thought those without a parking space would park on the street. Council Member Gerber stated the City might move towards paid parking permits. Council Member Joyce asked staff to bring parking solutions back for further discussion.

Mayor Beerman asked if the City could allow more floors with a height limit. Hannah Tyler, Senior Planner, stated additional floors did not work out financially in all cases. Staff could consider the four story concept. Mr. Joyce stated floor to ceiling height was important. Commercial areas should also be considered differently than residential areas. Design considerations could be made in increasing density.

Council Member Joyce stated there were a lot of buildings that were four stories. Tyler noted staff could identify those buildings around town. Council Member Ware Peek asked if the analysis was on rentals or owned units. Mr. Joyce stated it was performed on owned units. Council Member Ware Peek noted the City's push for employers to provide workforce housing was not currently working.

Mayor Beerman opened the meeting for public input.

Craig Elliott, architect, stated the report was very good. He thought this was an educational component with the community. He reviewed the units in town that had paid parking, and noted Council had these examples to look at. He felt the City should move forward with reduced parking. He stated the community needed to figure out density. The AMPD for parking could be changed. He also talked about the Bonanza Park project and stated that density was all in height. He was currently working with the Canyons’ employee housing project and indicated the units would all be rentals.
Mayor Beerman closed the public input portion of the meeting.

Mr. Joyce stated the conversation around parking was difficult, but it was very necessary in order to have a successful outcome. Council Member Henney asked if developers could build affordable housing if the parking requirements were eliminated. Mr. Joyce stated a developer would never build a 100% affordable housing project because the project profit margins were so small.

Glidden asked which dials the Council wanted to turn to promote affordable housing developments. He noted that even if all the other dials were turned except for parking, the incentives would not work. Council Member Henney asked if Planning would change the setbacks, buffers, open space and lot coverage to jumpstart moving the dials. Council Member Joyce stated the goal would not be achieved without changing height and parking. Mayor Beerman requested changing the AMPD parking requirements to match the MPD parking requirements and Council agreed. Council Member Joyce asked if the AMPD was needed since the City had the MPD. It was indicated the AMPD was for 100% affordable housing developments.

Council Member Joyce asked staff to give Council options for parking with the associated pros and cons. Council Member Worel asked that affordability be considered as the parking options were developed. Council Member Gerber stated the units would be more affordable without the parking requirement component. Mr. Joyce stated the recommendations made by Cascadia were with the assumption that 100% of people had cars. The 50% parking scenario was included to scale the project.

Mayor Beerman stated height and parking would be multiple meeting conversations. Council Member Joyce thought the City should make it easy for infill developments. Mayor Beerman requested a future discussion on infill lots as well.

**Discuss Sundance Film Festival Transportation and Programming:**

Jenny Diersen, Special Events Manager, and Jonathan Weidenhamer, Economic Development Manager, along with Betsy Wallace, Tina Graham and Robert Dick with Sundance Institute, presented this item. Diersen stated staff was focused on goals to mitigate residential impacts during the film festival. Sundance was a great partner and staff knew there were other things going on that also contributed to the congestion. Diersen explained the three alternatives for Park Avenue traffic. 1) status quo - do nothing; 2) One way Park Avenue north bound, including increased Police presence and the removal of parking along the east side of the street, and 3) Two way traffic on Park Avenue with increased security on all side streets. She noted staff recommended Alternative Two and Sundance recommended Alternative Three.

Wallace explained people heading to Main Street could go on Deer Valley Drive or Park Avenue. If Park Avenue was eliminated, traffic would be completely reliant on Deer
Valley Drive. She recommended keeping Park Avenue two ways, but control the side streets through City staff and Police. She noted Sundance had already implemented their mobile app and printed their maps, so the street changes would be closed for those outreach avenues.

Council Member Ware Peek asked where the one way would start and was told it would be extended from Heber Avenue to the light intersection. Council Member Gerber asked how people would be stopped. Diersen stated the mitigation would be at that intersection. She noted this had been done with other events, and Police could determine which vehicles entered by looking at the access pass on the vehicle. Graham stated during the Olympics there were park and rides set up, but the proposed plan did not include that component, so there would still be the same amount of vehicles trying to get into town. In the future, there needed to be park and ride lots. Mayor Beerman stated the buses could not get through Park Avenue during Sundance. He asked if emergency vehicles would have Park Avenue access. Diersen stated they would use the southbound lane. Some employers, film crew, etc. would have access, but a delineation needed to be made with regard to access. Mayor Beerman asserted Park Avenue hadn't been manageable in the past. Wallace thought stronger enforcement along the side streets would help.

Council Member Gerber asked if those exceptions for two way traffic would not back up the street. Diersen stated that would depend on direction from Council. Council Member Gerber asked if parking space could be designated for residents. Diersen thought residents could park at City Park. She felt strongly that new solutions were needed to help with the traffic flow, which was why she favored Alternative Two.

Council Member Worel asked if emergency services would be able to navigate through Old Town if Alternative Three was selected. Weidenhamer thought Alternative Two gave them more options because the traffic would be kept out of Old Town, but Alternative Three was doable if the side streets were controlled. Alfred Knotts stated there was risk and so a contingency plan was necessary. He stated 70%-80% of bus routes went down Park Avenue, and with snow and traffic there was a lot of property damage and damage to the buses last year during Sundance.

Council Member Joyce asked how enforcement would work to turn around the vehicles that would not be authorized to travel on Park Avenue. It was indicated Police would allow the vehicles with passes. Diersen asked if the focus should be increasing Transit authority and reducing traffic on Park Avenue as well as the side streets. Council Member Gerber noted all the satellite lots would be activated to take cars off the road. She asked if there would be a transit lane on Deer Valley Drive. Diersen indicated there would not be a transit lane, and noted the main transit route would be Park Avenue. Council Member Gerber supported Alternative Two, but indicated if it didn't work, staff should work to implement Alternative Three.
Council Member Worel asked if Alternative Two could be implemented the first week of Sundance and then implement Alternative Three the second week. Diersen stated when traffic subsided, traffic patterns would be normal, so it would depend when the traffic diminished. Council Members Gerber and Henney supported Alternative Two, and then Three, Council Member Worel supported Alternative Two for health and safety reasons, Council Member Joyce supported Alternative Two if staff felt it was feasible, and Council Member Ware Peek supported Alternative Three.

Wallace proposed having a bonfire and burning old pallets, engaging the community and promoting storytelling at the Flagpole Lot on the second Thursday of Sundance. Council Member Joyce asked how many people the lot could accommodate. Diersen stated there were many in the past and she could evaluate an approximate number. Council Member Ware Peek asked if there would be a specific program. Wallace stated there would be music and storytelling. Graham indicated there would be pallets around town for people to write on and bring to the lot to build a bonfire. This event would start at 4:00 p.m. Council Member Joyce stated this could be a big event for Main Street businesses as well.

REGULAR MEETING

I) ROLL CALL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendee Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Andy Beerman</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Member Becca Gerber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Member Tim Henney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Member Steve Joyce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Member Lynn Ware Peek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Member Nann Worel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Dias, City Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Harrington, City Attorney</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>Excused</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II) COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

Council Questions and Comments:
Council Member Gerber noted the new bus route going through Park Meadows, and stated she heard that the residents did not know about it until they saw signs going in. She asked for a better way to communicate with the public when transit routes changed. Knotts stated there had been many changes in Transit, including a new communications employee. Council Member Gerber asked for a public open house for Transit route
plans in the future. She also asked for a discussion on event safety and referred to the electric light parade.

Council Member Henney asked for a report on Deer Valley parking. He also noted the best part of guest experience at Deer Valley was having happy employees, and indicated this could be accomplished through employee housing and transit.

Council Members Worel, Joyce and Ware Peek reviewed the activities and events they attended since the last meeting.

Mayor Beerman stated David Buerle would come back for the Council Retreat in February with bold recommendations for Park City Vision 2020.

Dave Thacker, Chief Building Official, introduced the new Deputy Building Official, Ron Haynie. Haynie moved here from Atlanta, Georgia. He praised the Building Department staff and thanked the City for letting him work here.

Caitlyn Barhorst, Historic Preservation Planner, displayed a newly designed public notice sign that would be displayed on properties around town as needed.

**Staff Communications Reports:**

1. **Medical Cannabis Land Use Regulations:**

2. **Food Truck Update:**

**III) PUBLIC INPUT (ANY MATTER OF CITY BUSINESS NOT SCHEDULED ON THE AGENDA)**

Mayor Beerman opened the meeting for public input on matters not being addressed on the agenda.

Angela Moschetta indicated the affordable housing work session item seemed like a broken record, as well as the vehicular flow during Sundance discussion. The traffic would flow better without snow being pushed into the street and vehicles sticking out of driveways. The City could change its code to eliminate these problems. She suggested the Brew Pub lot could have parking with the upper levels developed for affordable housing. She also gave vehicle directional traffic suggestions including dedicated bus lanes for buses, hotel shuttles, and Lyft. Regarding DLS zones, she thought there would be a massive problem because of the $200 permit. She suggested taking away the fee to level the playing field for all transportation vehicles, and making all Main Street a no parking zone except for the DLS zones.
Sandra Morrison stated the historic walls in the City were not listed on the historic sites inventory. One of the walls, Marsac Mill Wall was one of the oldest structures in Park City and built in the 1870s. The other was Judge Loading Station Wall. Both were owned by the City and she hoped staff would apply to list them on the Historic Sites Inventory.

Matt Mullin, Kimball Arts Center, stated he would not be here for the agenda item, but wanted to support the presentation that would be given. He noted Free the Fest was an economic decision that would continue to be considered.

Mayor Beerman closed the public input portion of the meeting.

IV) CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES
Consideration to Approve the City Council Meeting Minutes from November 19, 2019:

Council Member Gerber moved to approve the City Council meeting minutes from November 19, 2019. Council Member Worel seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek and Worel

V) CONSENT AGENDA

1. Request to Approve a Five (5) Year Agricultural Lease with Pace Brothers Excavation LLC on the 129 Acre City-Owned Pace Property, Located Adjacent to the Rail Trail, in a Form Approved by the City Attorney:

2. Request to Authorize the City Manager to Execute a Professional Services Agreement, in a Form Approved by the City Attorney, with Jacobs, Inc., for the 3Kings Water Treatment Plant (3KWTP) Construction Engineering Services Contract in an Amount Not to Exceed $6,500,000.00:

3. Request to Approve Special Event Temporary Alcoholic Beverage Licenses during the 2020 Sundance Film Festival:

4. Request to Approve Type 2 Convention Sales License Applications for Operation during the 2020 Sundance Film Festival:

5. Request to Authorize the Following Annual Insurance Premiums to Fund the City's Insurance Placements for the 2020 Calendar Year: Property Insurance: $188,163 and Auto Physical Damage: $81,117 to Liberty Mutual; Public Entity

Council Member Gerber moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Council Member Henney seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek and Worel

VI) OLD BUSINESS

1. Consideration to Approve Ordinance 2019-58, an Ordinance Approving the Argent at Empire Pass Condominiums Plat Located at 7677 Village Way, Park City, Utah:

Alex Ananth, Planner, Bill Fiveash with East West Partners, and Tom Bennett, Legal Counsel, were present for this item. Ananth gave an overview of the project. She noted a change would be made to Condition of Approval Three, which referred to the Residences and not the Argent.

Council Member Worel asked if the deed restriction would limit the HOA dues in perpetuity, to which it was indicated the deed restricted units would pay 25% of the regular dues, and that percentage would be indicated in the restriction.

Mayor Beerman opened the public hearing.

Sandra Morrison thanked the Planning Commission for changing the Findings of Fact in the ordinance. She was grateful for the opportunity to build awareness of historic preservation of the mining sites. She asked when the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) would come back for review. Harrington indicated there wasn’t a specific date yet, but hopefully sometime in January.

Mayor Beerman closed the public hearing.

Council Member Worel moved to approve Ordinance 2019-58, an ordinance approving the Argent at Empire Pass Condominiums Plat located at 7677 Village Way, Park City, Utah. Council Member Ware Peek seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek and Worel
2. Consideration to Approve Ordinance 2019-59, an Ordinance Approving the Lilac Hill Condominiums Plat at 632 Deer Valley Loop, Park City, Utah:
Alex Ananth, Planner, and Frank Watanabe, Developer, were present for this item. Ananth reviewed the background of this property and stated the owner wanted to sell the units as condominiums.

Council Member Joyce asked about the status of the stairs by that development. Watanabe indicated the agreement was the City would get an easement from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and if they couldn't get it before the completion of the development, he would put up a bond so those stairs could be constructed when the City got that easement.

Council Member Joyce asked when Planning would hear about the property dispersements. Bruce Erickson stated they were receiving communications from BLM and were in the process of receiving seven parcels.

Mayor Beerman opened the public hearing. No comments were given. Mayor Beerman closed the public hearing.

Council Member Ware Peek moved to approve Ordinance 2019-59, an ordinance approving the Lilac Hill Condominiums Plat at 632 Deer Valley Loop, Park City, Utah. Council Member Worel seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek and Worel

3. Discuss Park Silly Sunday Market (PSSM) Two-Year Contract Renewal Request:
Jenny Diersen, Special Events Manager, and Kate McChesney, PSSM Director, presented this item. Diersen stated PSSM was an incredible community partner. She noted there was a date conflict in 2021. Some changes in the contract included bollard installation, no vendor parking on Park Avenue, lowering noise levels and pedestrian management. The City would no longer pay for sustainability measures and PSSM would pay $5,500 in City services.

Council Member Worel stated there was a no new events on July 4th agreement, but noted this was not a new event. She asked how soon the market could set up after the parade was over. McChesney thought the parade could turn left on Heber Avenue from Main Street and continue down Park Avenue so the market could set up simultaneously. Council Member Worel asked if that would affect the number of people that would go to City Park. McChesney indicated there needed to be a collaboration to make sure that area remained sustainable.
Council Member Gerber stated there was discussion on having more event free weekends during the summer and asked how McChesney felt about taking some breaks during the summer. McChesney felt positive that this could happen in the future, after this contract extension. Council Member Ware Peek asked about the bollards. Captain Leatham stated no additional bollards had been installed and they were currently limited to lower Main Street.

Mayor Beerman opened the meeting for public input.

Angela Moschetta stated it was obvious from the community perspective that PSSM was a benefit and added to the City.

Mayor Beerman closed the public input portion of the meeting.

Council Member Joyce struggled with the size of this event, and asked if PSSM could plan something for the local community. McChesney noted the locals were at the market, and it was already a free event. The Chamber did a survey and 50% of locals attended. She was open to suggestions. Council Member Joyce indicated he looked for opportunities to focus on local residents. McChesney indicated she would look for ways to make it easier for locals to attend. The Council members supported the proposed changes.

4. Discuss Kimball Art Festival 2020 Change Request:
Jenny Diersen, Jonathan Weidenhamer, and Canice Harte, Amy Roberts, and Jory Macomber, Kimball Arts Center (KAC), were present for this item. Diersen noted the proposed change requests, including free admission for all, expanding the areas to include 9th Street, Summit Watch Plaza and Zoom Patio, and increasing transportation mitigation.

Staff estimated the costs for this event would increase and KAC thought that increase would be challenging. Macomber indicated the most successful art festivals had no admission fee. This festival couldn't happen without the help of the City. Roberts felt there would be a 10% growth in attendance.

Council Member Gerber stated when sponsors were asked for more money, there was an expectation that there would be a bigger attendance. She feared the KAC Festival would evolve to a massive event. Roberts estimated part of the fee would be recouped by increased artist booths. She also noted there were no sponsors outside of Utah.

Council Member Ware Peek was concerned with the increased City service fee, but she liked the idea of a free festival. Council Member Worel agreed it was nice to make the festival free and available to everyone. She asked how residents would be affected if
there was no bus service on Park Avenue. Diersen responded the riders could go to the stop by Fresh Market or the Transit Center.

Council Member Joyce asked how much the City was willing to spend for transportation on these events. Special events were very different than day-to-day travel, but he didn't see them being treated that way. He hoped Council would think about the big increase in Transit funding for these events.

Council Member Henney thought a different funding mechanism needed to be put in place to cover these costs. He asked KAC to talk about their event that started local and then expanded. Macomber stated as the festival expanded there were fewer local artists because they couldn't make it to the level the committee was looking for. He noted $260,000 in tax revenue went to the City so the City benefited from this event. Council Member Henney didn't want the festival to be over commercialized. He thought this was an opportunity to discuss sustainable tourism. Harte stated when the Arts and Culture district was completed, the festival would change and feel different. Mayor Beerman indicated Friday night was definitely a locals night and was always well attended by the City residents.

Council Member Gerber requested a review of the proposed traffic plan by Memorial Day. Council Member Joyce indicated the impact on locals, with traffic and other factors, had to be looked at as well as the positive financial impact. He thought the visitors from the valley who came to the festival but didn't spend as much money was not as much of a benefit as visitors that stayed in the hotels. Roberts gave an example of visitors from Salt Lake City that made big purchases at the festival. Harte looked at tax revenue with an attendance increase at the festival. He also stated if the art was kept at a high quality level, sales would increase.

Council Member Gerber was concerned that events were getting bigger which wasn't necessarily better. She liked that more people could come, and she liked the locals alley idea for local artists.

Mayor Beerman opened the meeting for public input.

Dan Lemaitre stated he had been on the Kimball Board for nine years. The Arts Festival sold art. The goal was to inspire people through art. He complimented the City for its social equity initiative and he thought the festival was compatible with the City's priority.

Allison Kuhlow, HPCA Executive Director, indicated she hadn't spoken to the merchants, but the idea of a free festival felt right. She gave options for transit and felt it would work for the locals.

Mayor Beerman closed the public input portion of the meeting.
Council Member Gerber stated that after having had the discussion she favored moving forward. Council Member Joyce liked the expanded booths, but the City services were beyond what the contract covered. Diersen summarized there was support for staff to further explore the operational details of freeing the festival and staff would bring the details back to Council in February.

VII) NEW BUSINESS

1. Consideration to Approve Ordinance No. 2019-57, an Ordinance Approving the Little Maggie Subdivision Located at 57 and 59 Prospect Avenue, Park City, Utah: Bruce Erickson, Planning Director, presented this item. Council Member Worel asked how the Planning Commission voted, to which Barhorst responded they voted unanimous and no conditions were amended.

Mayor Beerman opened the public hearing. No comments were given. Mayor Beerman closed the public hearing.

Council Member Ware Peek moved to approve Ordinance 2019-57, an ordinance approving the Little Maggie Subdivision located at 57 and 59 Prospect Avenue, Park City, Utah. Council Member Worel seconded the motion.

RESULT:  APPROVED
AYES:  Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek and Worel

2. Consideration to Continue an Ordinance Approving the Lilac Hill East Subdivision Plat, Located at 622, 652, and 660 Rossie Hill Drive, Park City, Utah: Bruce Erickson indicated this item would be continued while details were worked through.

Mayor Beerman opened the public hearing. No comments were given. Mayor Beerman closed the public hearing.

Council Member Ware Peek moved to continue an ordinance approving the Lilac Hill East Subdivision Plat, located at 622, 652, and 660 Rossie Hill Drive, Park City, Utah, to January 9, 2020. Council Member Henney seconded the motion.

RESULT:  CONTINUED TO JANUARY 9, 2020
AYES:  Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek and Worel

3. Consideration to Approve Ordinance 2019-60, an Ordinance Approving the 245 Woodside Plat, Located at 245 Woodside Avenue, Park City, Utah:
Liz Jackson, Planner, presented this item and stated this plat would remove a lot line through the property. There was an encroachment and that would come before Council at a future date.

Mayor Beerman opened the public hearing. No comments were given. Mayor Beerman closed the public hearing.

Council Member Gerber asked if the building would continue as a duplex, to which Jackson responded affirmatively. Council Member Gerber asked if Council could require one unit be occupied year round. It was indicated that could not be a requirement. Council Member Worel stated the letter indicated it was a single family residence. Jackson indicated it was later disclosed it would continue as a duplex. Justin Keyes, attorney, indicated the property was always used as a multifamily property, but in 2010 it was reduced to a duplex. The building was partly in the City right-of-way and all the encroachments couldn't be removed, but the owner was trying to mitigate as much as possible.

Council Member Henney thanked Planning Commission for requesting a discussion on encroachments. This was an interesting topic and needed to be addressed. Council Member Joyce thought a broad discussion needed to take place, and asked if it was common to have buildings in the right-of-way. Erickson gave examples of driveways and parking lots in rights-of-way.

Council Member Ware Peek moved to approve Ordinance 2019-60, an ordinance approving the 245 Woodside Plat, located at 245 Woodside Avenue, Park City, Utah. Council Member Gerber seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek and Worel

4. Consideration to Approve Ordinance 2019-61, an Ordinance Approving the Lift Lodge at Town Lift, Second Amended Plat Located at 875 Main Street, Park City, Utah:
Hannah Tyler, Senior Planner, presented this item and indicated the walls would be moved, but the overall number of units would not change.

Mayor Beerman opened the public hearing. No comments were given. Mayor Beerman closed the public hearing.

Council Member Ware Peek moved to approve Ordinance 2019-61, an ordinance approving the Lift Lodge at Town Lift, Second Amended Plat located at 875 Main Street, Park City, Utah. Council Member Henney seconded the motion.
RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek and Worel

Council Member Ware Peek moved to close to discuss property at 8:25 p.m. Council Member Henney seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek and Worel

CLOSED SESSION

Council Member Gerber moved to adjourn from Closed Meeting at 8:50 p.m. Council Member Ware Peek seconded the motion.

RESULT: APPROVED
AYES: Council Members Gerber, Henney, Joyce, Ware Peek and Worel

VIII) ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder
Park City, Utah

Land Management Code Changes - Affordable Housing

Alex Joyce | Cascadia Partners
Why Evaluate the Code?

PARK CITY AFFORDABLE/ATTAINABLE HOUSING
Goal: 800 City & private obligation units by 2026

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNITS COMPLETED</th>
<th>UPCOMING UNITS</th>
<th>UNIDENTIFIED &amp; UNFUNDED UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125 CITY FUNDED UNITS</td>
<td>169 PRIVATE OBLIGATION UNITS</td>
<td>120 POTENTIAL PUBLIC/PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP UNITS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GOAL 800

Help Achieve Critical Council Priorities

- Middle Income, Attainable & Affordable Housing
- Park City's commitment to 800 City & private obligation units by 2026
- Inclusive & Healthy Community
Background

Density Bonuses as a Tool

- Common Tool
- Effectiveness depends on calibration of incentives vs. requirements

How Density is Defined Matters

- Existing and draft AMPD standards focus almost entirely on increasing housing units per acre
Multilayered Regulations

- Intended for large sites
- Most sites are small
- Regulations change depending on base zone – 3 zones tested

79% of parcels less than 9,800 sf

7 parcels larger than 65,100 sf

MPD < Existing MPD < Draft AMPD
Draft AMPD Bonus

Draft AMPD Density Bonus Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Total Housing Units Affordable</th>
<th>Density Bonus 1</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

= TOTAL DENSITY BONUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Median Income Served by Affordable Units</th>
<th>Density Bonus 2</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Low End
- Attainable housing = 100% (doubling) of base units

Upper End
- Deeply affordable housing = 200% (tripling) of base units
- For this project, we assumed 50% of units were affordable at the 101 – 150% AMI level
Code Audit Approach

Site Selection

- Zone: Historic Residential (HR1) Size: 0.5 acres
- Zone: Recreational Commercial (RC) Size: 1.5 acres
- Zone: General Commercial (GC) Size: 2 acres
Findings + Observations
- Maximum Buildable Area Standards

Max building footprint standards favor small lot subdivision

- More efficient to subdivide large lot into smaller lots
- Allows required open space to be more effectively distributed
- Even after subdivision, max building footprint standards still strongly favor single-family and duplex rather than other multi-unit building types
Findings + Observations
- Maximum Building Footprint Standards

Unable to change building footprint as unit count grows

- With max building footprint standard still applying in AMPD, the only way to fit additional affordable units is to shrink unit square footage or include fewer units
- In HR1 example, unit sizes must be cut in half
- Shrinking units results in all micro-units suitable only for 1 person households
- AMPD requires very high income single-person households to cross-subsidize affordable units
  - Even accounting for higher income allowances of AMPD (150% AMI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Units:</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Price of Affordable Unit:</td>
<td>$460,000</td>
<td>$670,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Size:</td>
<td>1,000 sq ft</td>
<td>500 sq ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings + Observations
- Open Space Requirements

High open space requirements increase housing costs

- Unit prices must absorb entire amount of site not in building footprint, sometimes upwards of 73%
- Over $5 million just for land that cannot be built on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Units:</th>
<th>64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Size:</td>
<td>275 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price of Land:</td>
<td>$21.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Room Occupancy Market Rent:</td>
<td>$5,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings + Observations
- Off-Street Parking Standards

**Increased parking is hard to accommodate; raises costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of Units</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>120</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of Parking Spots</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Size:</td>
<td>650 sq ft</td>
<td>320 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent of Affordable 1-bedroom SRO:</td>
<td>$990</td>
<td>$2,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Automatic 10-space reduction in parking requirements when proposing an affordable housing development
- AMPD allows large increase in units, but off-street parking requirements remain the same
- Underground or structured parking adds tremendous costs
Findings + Observations
- Maximum Height Allowance

Increased height allows more units, but no space for parking

24 units cannot fit because of parking

- Increasing height is politically and financially challenging
- Four stories requires additional stairwell
- Five stories favors concrete base and not cheaper wood frame construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Stories:</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units:</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>152 (24 not able to fit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Spaces:</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings + Observations
- Setbacks

Front Setbacks
- HR1 zone, setbacks generally less for single-family units and larger for duplex. Results in inconsistencies within overall site plan

Increased Setback Buffer
- Difficult fitting bonus units and creating engaging streetscapes with larger study sites that require 25’ buffer
Findings + Observations

Key Findings

> AMPD affordable housing density bonus relies only on increasing units; lacks other changes to dimensional standards

> Fixed dimensional standards makes shrinking unit sizes only option for achieving affordability

> AMPD projects currently incentivized to use “micro-unit” apartments (<500 sq ft)

> MPD and AMPD standards not suited for smaller infill lots; hence regular exception requests

> Parking makes fitting density bonus units challenging at affordable levels

> MPD has far lower affordability requirement; AMPD density bonus does not bridge the gap necessary for private builders
Recommendations: AMPD Standards

Prioritize Changes for Smaller, Infill Lots

- Most lots in Park City are smaller, infill lots
- Accommodating bonus units is very difficult on smaller, infill lots
- MPD standards originally established for large lots

Predictable, By-right Standards

- Make regularly granted exceptions by-right standards
- Time and financial costs in permitting process to pursue exceptions
Recommendations: AMPD Standards

Use Base Zone Setbacks

- MPD building footprint and setback standards can differ greatly from underlying base zone
  - Results in building inconsistent with others in zone

Eliminate Large Perimeter Buffer

- MPD standards include 25’ perimeter buffer
  - Renders smaller sites unbuildable
Recommendations: AMPD Standards

Achieve Active Open Space

• Current 40% open space requirement results in suburban building forms and higher costs for housing
• A 15% open space requirement can help achieve active and useable open space

Change Lot Coverage / Building Footprint Standards for AMPD Projects

• Affordable housing units need to physically fit on site
• Maximum lot coverage for AMPD should increase to 85%
• 3,500 sq ft footprint limitation in RC zone should be eliminated
Recommendations: AMPD Standards

Right Size Parking for Infill Projects

- Reduce off-street parking standards in areas walkable to commercial services or transit
- Reduce off-street parking standards for all bonus housing units to 0.5 spaces per unit
- Allow on-street parking that abuts the property to count towards meeting off-street requirements

Allow One Extra Floor Outside Historic Districts

- Extra floor will better accommodate affordable and bonus units
- Four story, wood frame buildings are very cost-effective building type
Recommendations: AMPD Standards

Stories: 4
Setbacks: Keep setback consistent
Buffer: 25 ft
Open Space: 0 ft
Lot Coverage: 100%
Parking Per Unit: 1:1

Draft AMPD Standards vs. Recommended AMPD Standards

% of additional homes

% of project cost
Recommendations: AMPD Standards

Draft AMPD Standards on a RC zone parcel

Recommended AMPD Standards on a RC zone parcel
Funding Gap Analysis

Scenario 1: 100% Affordable Units

Proposed AMPD Standards to Recommended AMPD Standards
- 30% reduction in required gap funding per unit
- $51,000 to $36,000 per unit

Recommended AMPD Standards to Recommended AMPD Standards + 1 Story
- Additional 32 affordable units
- Minor decrease in required funding gap per unit
Scenario 2: 50% Affordable Units

Proposed AMPD Standards to Recommended AMPD Standards

- 70% reduction in required gap funding per unit
- $231,000 to $70,000 per unit

Recommended AMPD Standards to Recommended AMPD Standards + 1 Story

- Accommodates 100% of allowed bonus units
- Additional $37,500 reduction in required gap funding per unit
Sundance Transportation & Programming

Goals Identified based on 2019 Debrief
1. Reduce Residential Impacts and Increase Transit Priority
2. Alleviate traffic, reduce congestion/traffic times/single occupant cars

**Focus on Park Avenue Alternatives**
1. Alternative 1: Do nothing – Status Quo from last year.
2. Alternative 2: Unanimous staff recommendation. One Way Park Ave North (outbound). This includes increasing Police presence, and security positions and removing parking from the East side of Park Ave. Cost estimate $68,000.
3. Alternative 3: Sundance recommendation. Two way traffic on Park Ave, and increase security positions at all side streets. If this alternative is chosen, staff recommends parking on both sides of Park Avenue is removed for traffic flow. Cost estimate $48,000.

Programming: Festival Celebration and Bonfire at Flagpole Lot:
Build second half of the Festival by celebrating storytelling and bringing the community together back to Main Street.
Sundance Transportation & Programming

Costs: Change order for services will be required at a subsequent meeting. Council should discuss their cost recovery goals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options to Consider</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Additional City Services</th>
<th>Additional Hard Costs/Contract Services</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>$24,000 (Kane Security)</td>
<td>If this alternative is approved, staff recommends City take on such costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Sundance Recommendation</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$41,000 (Kane Security)</td>
<td>If this alternative is approved, staff is not supportive of City taking on all the costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programming</td>
<td>Staff and Sundance Supportive</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
<td>$1,000 (Park City Fire District)</td>
<td>Staff recommends City taking on such costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exercise Mutual 2 Year Contract Extension Option for Park Silly Sunday Market

Extension Terms: (2021 & 2022)

1. Date conflict in 2021 with 4th of July – PSSM program lower main.
3. City services costs estimated at $79K. Per contract:
   - Bollard Installation $14,000 will be put towards cost of City Services
   - City no longer pay for Sustainability Measures ($15K), but PSSM required to meet extraordinary efforts per contract.
   - Estimated PSSM will pay $5,500 in City Services
4. HPCA Open Houses – Supportive of moving forward

If Council agrees with recommendation to extend our mutual options, we will return at a subsequent meeting for contract approval.
Kimball Arts Festival 2020 Changes

**Council Policy Question:**
Balance Community, cultural and economic benefits of Kimball Art Center with recent changes in Council’s policy related to Special Events & Community priorities including transportation and social equity.

**Requests from the Kimball Art Center**
1. Free the Festival (FTF)– No Admission.
2. Expand Use Areas – 9th Street, Summit Watch Plaza & Zoom Patio.
3. Increase Transportation, Circulation and Traffic Mitigation Resources on Swede Alley.

**Analysis**
1. FTF for everyone (drive market) v locals - not sure consistent with policy/current contract goals?
2. Anticipated attendance increase is challenging to estimate. Likely somewhere in between, tough balance.
3. Costs for increased City Services (estimated up to $99K) at a worst case scenario. These are preliminary, high level first estimates.
4. Kimball concerned about paying for increase City Services. KAC covering costs from not receiving admission at gate through increased sponsorship, branding and increased booth space.
5. Such changes will require amendments to current contract, and budgeting requests in FY 2021 if they exceed $28k.

Is there additional Information Council needs to make an informed decision? Refining details and costs as a next step.
7677 Village Way – Condominium Plat
Overview
7677 Village Way, The Argent at Empire Pass

- Conditional Use Permit and Condominium Plat
- 28 Unit Residential Condominium Building
- Lot 2 Village of Empire Pass North Subdivision
- Utilizing up to 32 UEs
- Building 4 Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development
- 1 ADA unit, 2 Deed Restricted Employee Housing Units
- Zoned RD-MPD
Village at Empire Pass MPD (VEP MPD)
Condo Plat

- Complies with lot and site requirements of Zoning District, the VEP MPD and VEP Subdivision Plat.
Study Session November 7, 2019, City Council considered compliance matters regarding Technical Reports 5 & 6 including outstanding work requirements, a priority list, whether CC wishes to create additional funding mechanisms.

The City Council determined that there are outstanding work requirements for two structures, including the Judge Mining and Smelting Building.

At the Planning Commission meeting on November 13, 2019, the Commission directed Staff to amend the Findings of Fact to incorporate a number of Sandra Morrison’s recommended Findings as submitted on November 11, 2019. Staff has made these changes in the attached Ordinance in red.
Findings and Staff Recommendation

- Staff finds there is Good Cause for the Condo Plat which complies with Land Management Code Chapter 7, and applicable State law regarding Condo Plats, as Conditioned.

- Staff recommends the City Council conduct a Public Hearing, review the application and draft Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval, and approve the Condominium Plat.

- Small Tweak to COA #3
Background

- Subdivided under Ordinance 2018-04 which created two legal Lots of Record, each approved with a Duplex Dwelling, including the existing historic house at 632 Deer Valley Loop
- 4 units currently under construction
- Upon completion applicant intends to sell the units as Condominiums
Staff finds there is good cause for this Condominium Plat as it will allow for the sale of the four (4) units as Residential Condominiums, is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code, and does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Staff recommends the City Council review the Condominium Plat, hold a Public Hearing, and consider approving the Plat based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval subject to the Ordinance.
245 Woodside Plat Amendment

December 5, 2019 City Council Meeting
PL-19-04209
Current Conditions

- Right-of-Way Encroachments:
  - North and south stairs
  - Front deck
  - Concrete retaining walls
- Lacking parking
- Lot too small for Duplex and Building is within Front and Side (north) Setback
Council Considerations

- Removal of Lot Line won’t increase the aspects on Site that don’t conform to the Code.
- Plat Amendment is first step in remedying what doesn’t conform on Site.
- Planning Commission requests Council review this Encroachment Agreement, in addition to City Engineer.
- How the City reviews encroachments in Historic Districts moving forward.
- Applicant submitted a proposed plan, which staff is reviewing.