Meeting Notes
2013 Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee Meeting
July 16, 2013

The 2013 Comprehensive Plan Update Steering Committee met at the Council Chambers at Sun Valley City Hall on July 16, 2013.

Call to order

Chairperson Peter Palmedo called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

Committee Present: Doug Brown**,** John Calvert, John Carver, Peter Hendricks, Keith Keim (represents David Holmes), Nancy Humphrey, Wally Huffman, William Merizon, Peter Palmedo, Chuck Rumpf, Tim Silva, Cris Thiessen, Susan Tucker, Liz Warrick, Paul Willis, Daniel Olmstead.

Also Present: City Administrator Susan Robertson, Community Development Director Mark Hofman, Community Development Planning Technician and Associate Planner Isabel Lui, Nils Ribi, Karen Reinheimer, Nicole Jones, Harry Griffith, John Gaeddert, Franz Suhadolnik.

Chairman's Opening Remarks

Chairman Peter Palmedo said this is the seventh meeting of the Steering Committee. The update is entering a critical stage as the Committee will discuss the public outreach program for this summer. He said that community outreach is the foundation of the Steering Committee's work. He encouraged members to reach out to their community and invite input. Chairman Palmedo also pointed out that the City of Ketchum had their 2013 Comprehensive Draft Plan available for public review and that Blaine County has just kick started their Comprehensive Plan Update process. He has talked to the Planning Directors of Ketchum and Blaine County, both of them welcomed the opportunity to dialogue with our Steering Committee to share our goals and objectives with the community at large. This could be included on the agenda for meetings in the near future. In addition, he also said that the City of Aspen had recently completed its 2012 Comprehensive Plan Update which is now available online. He encouraged the Steering Committee to look at it, as Aspen is dealing with similar issues.

Comments and Questions

John Carver remarked that it made sense to have more formalized integration between Ketchum and Blaine County in the City's Comprehensive Plan Update process. Mark Hofman said that there has been participation at various levels in the past with both Ketchum and Blaine County, as reflected in the Action Items in Chapter II. River Run is a prime example. If these issue driven Action Items are to remain in the 2014 update they will be done at staff level. If there is a broader effort needed to integrate with other entities a sub-committee or joint meeting format would be more appropriate.

Comment on Steering Committee Meeting Notes

Chairman Palmedo said that the June meeting notes are not available yet but are expected to be available shortly. He encouraged members to review them when available and provide comment as may be applicable.

LUPA and Master Plan Ordinance Tutorial

Mark Hofman presented the document "LUPA and Master Planning". The purpose of the document is to explain the potential impacts resulting from the eliminating the LUPA concept from the Comprehensive

Plan. He asked the Committee to pay special attention to the text in yellow highlight format which are the key ideas to be discussed. He said that Master Plan Development and LUPA are substantially the same. However, the consequence of removing the LUPA designation is that the community will lose its specified vision for that areas. He read the conclusion on p.5 of the document, "Elimination of the LUPAs would still mean 'large properties' would be master planned under Code Section 9-5B-6, but the area boundaries would be unspecified and become uncertain, may allow piecemeal implementation of development in key areas, and the specific guidelines describing special opportunities and/or constraints specific to that LUPA (e.g. densities, locations, specific land uses, buffer areas, open space, community concerns, density transfers, etc.) would be removed and unavailable as part of the review process."

Hofman said the intention for including LUPA specifications at the Comprehensive Plan level is to capture the visions of the property owners and the community meant to be implemented. Whenever a comprehensive plan is updated, the community vision will require updating to match actual planning. When a master plan is submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission or City Council, they will review the proposal for accordance with the Comprehensive Plan as part of the formal evaluation process. The existence of LUPA specifications thus provides important guidance.

Nancy Humphrey referred to the quotation cited from Chapter III, Section D of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan Update and requested a clarification on the definition of "hotels" as one of the developments exempted from LUPA master plan requirements. Humphrey was concerned whether "hotels" include condominiums and townhouses. Mark Hofman replied that condominiums and townhouses are not considered as hotels.

Peter Hendricks remarked that LUPAs gives the City a higher degree of control over specific land area. He questioned whether this will however create more paperwork or hoops for the property owners to jump through.

Mark Hofman said that "control" is not an appropriate word to describe the use of LUPA by the City. He said that LUPA provides "guidance" and "information" as the City evaluates the application. The process and timeline for Master Plan Development is basically the same whether a LUPA exists or not. When a LUPA exists, in the preliminary development design process the language and the requirements associated with it have to be addressed early and match with the Comprehensive Plan level vision as a guide. If the LUPA concept is waived, the decision makers will lose the benefit of including the community's vision on how a land area should be developed.

Dan Olmstead asked whether Ketchum has LUPAs or not. Mark Hofman said nobody else utilizes the LUPA concept as far as is known. In California, they call them specific planning areas, which are a sub-part of a general plan with identification of a particular neighborhood, commercial area or portion of the overall city. LUPA is unique to Sun Valley as a term.

Comment and Vote on Keeping the LUPA Concept

Nancy Humphrey said that although we are a small city the community does have input. This is especially true for those owners who may not be here full time to present their view. She said LUPAs should be retained.

Cris Thiessen said that an additional benefit that LUPAs bring is the requirement on the developer, in his submission of the master plan, to provide information that addresses the vision of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mark Hofman added that the Comprehensive Plan should be a serious and highly functional tool and the LUPA concept provides specific information on the communities vision. This is a useful tool to decision

makers. If LUPAs are removed, everything in Chapter III will be struck out and the Committee will have to decide the land use designations for all the various areas contained on the future land use map.

Susan Tucker said the importance of LUPAs is that the construct allows community involvement and gives guidance to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council in hearing from the wider constituency. She said that LUPA should be retained.

Tim Silva said that he struggles with the LUPA concept. The smaller the planning area, the more uncomfortable he gets. He said the remaining LUPAs involve land owned by the Sun Valley Company. He agreed that public comment is appropriate. However, since the Resort is a private business, on top of master planning, there needs to be planning at the business and marketing level, such as customer preference, market demand, demographics, etc. to make the Resort successful. He said that it would not be wise to re-master plan the Village Core which is also the reason why he struggles with the LUPA concept.

Bill Merizon asked how the LUPAs were put together at the very beginning. Nils Ribi said that back in 2005, the Steering Committee tried to incorporate the Sun Valley Company/Holding's vision plan into the Comprehensive Plan. During the process they found a disconnect between the vision of the community and that of the Company. He cited the Gateway as an example where the community wanted it to be open space. The Committee realized it would not be able to plan it the way it should be when it went to the Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council. As a result they created the name LUPA for this area. A vision was created for the area which had general principles that met the Holding's plan in terms of density, trading off existing zoning with proposed zoning, which was actually a down zoning. To conclude, it was a negotiation between the citizens and the Company and everybody agreed this is where we will leave it. He cited the Gun Club (White Clouds) as another example and said that if one compares its existing development with that of the Comprehensive Plan there are things that are the same and not the same, but the overall density is less than that of the Comprehensive Plan.

Bill Merizon said that LUPAs have been in place for a number of years and there are no problems. He suggested before discussing individual LUPAs, it is meaningful to get a consensus from the Committee whether to keep or get rid of the LUPA concept.

12 members indicated their support for keeping the LUPA concept.

Areas Dissolved from being LUPAs

The Committee reached a consensus to remove the LUPA designation from the following areas:

- LUPA#6: River Run. This area was master planned and annexed into the City of Ketchum.
- LUPA#2 : Gun Club. This area has been master planned; any changes in development will require an amendment to the approved master plan.
- LUPA#4: Horseman's Center and the Community School. Community School is in the process of formulating their own long term master plan for their developed site. Recommend adding the Horseman's Center area to the Gateway LUPA.

LUPA#1 Sun Valley Resort/Village Core

Mark Hofman said that the Village Core has never been master planned. When the Pavilion was built, a master plan was not required by the City. The purpose of the vision and provisions of the 2005 Comprehensive Plan is to prevent piecemeal development. There has been a struggle between piecemeal development and the requirements to master plan large areas with vision and public process.

Cris Thiessen said the Village Core is developed and suggested that it be dropped from being a LUPA. Peter Hendricks agreed.

Mark Hofman said that the Village Core is one property, without a LUPA, it will be hard to define the boundary that requires a master plan. One day a new owner of the Resort may come in and decide to tear down the core or large portions of it. The City Council would have a hard time to determine the criteria for master planning 2000 acres. LUPA designation helps define density of development and in the end will help the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council to evaluate and make decisions.

Nancy Humphrey asked if the density in the Village Core can go up as a trade for open space.

Chairman Palmedo said the original Commercial Core is 77 acres with 30 units per acre and total allowable zoning of2100 units in total density. In 2004 the Sun Valley Company proposed to reduce the density by 1200 units along with a reduction of density in White Clouds. The offset was to increase the density in OR-1 areas on the acreage of the Proctor Hill area, i.e. 77 acres on Proctor, 15 acres at the entry way and 30 acres on the eastern side. In other words, it is the increase of density of the 120 acres of OR-1 areas and the reduction of density in the Commercial Core that achieve the density balance.

Tim Silva asked for clarification about the difference between LUPAs and the zoning map. Mark Hofman said that the property owner can request a zoning map amendment and can proposes any zoning district on the 2000 acres. They can apply for a master plan, rezone and design review. Without LUPA criteria, five people from the City Council will make a decision based on their feelings and experience versus Comprehensive Plan guidance that reflects the community's vision.

Chuck Rumpf said that the master plan process and LUPAs are consistent. Given that the negotiation of density does not preclude areas in LUPAs, he thought that the removal of the LUPA designation will not have an impact.

Chairman Palmedo said that LUPA designation gives an added level of guidance to the Planning and Zoning Commission and the City Council. He quoted an example on p.III-14, "Future development in the area will incorporate a mix of uses including, but not limited to, additional full service hotel(s), restaurants, market(s), post office, convention and cultural/theatre performance space, entertainment, storage and maintenance facilities, other Resort support facilities, small-scale cottages and cabins…". The level of guidance in the LUPA is specific and the consideration is strong when someone comes in.

Paul Willis cited Las Vegas and Park City as example of cities which are extremely developed and out-of-control. He said that Sun Valley Company has been a great steward; however there are uncertainties when a new owner may come in. As a citizen and property owner, he said he would like to see some protection. Doug Brown concurred with Willis and said he is in favor of keeping the core as a LUPA. Mark Hofman remarked that LUPA designation creates some certainty to help all stakeholders but also needs balance in regard to aesthetics, view preservation, level of traffic, and hillside preservation, all of which need to be included in the diagram and narrative.

Paul Willis asked whether the construction of a gondola in between the Village Core, Ketchum and River Run will require a total redo of the LUPA scenario.

Mark Hofman said that in 2011 there were 15 amendments to the existing Comprehensive Plan proposed by the Sun Valley Company, some of which specifically dealt with the gondola issue. The amendments would be needed to facilitate the design and pathway of such a system, all at the Comprehensive Plan level. The Comprehensive Plan currently has supporting Action Items and accommodation for a gondola in the Transportation sections but does not have a specific route or linkage of the Village Core to Ketchum. The specific Action Item states that investigation is needed for the use of a gondola as a transportation amenity to

ensure the use fits the land use designations in each of the three affected LUPAs. If the Committee eliminates the Community School/Horseman's Center LUPA and the Village Core LUPA, what is left will be the Gateway LUPA. The current zoning map will determine whether a gondola is allowed. A development code amendment may be required.

Chairman Palmedo asked the Committee by show of hands if they are in favor of having the Village Core remain as LUPA. 11 members were in favor. 3 members would like to see the LUPA designation removed from the Village Core. Chairman Palmedo said that everything can be revisited after the public input process.

LUPA #5: Dollar Mountain, Prospector Hill, and Sun Valley Municipal Complex

Mark Hofman presented the LUPA #5 exhibit and said that in the 2011 proposed amendments Sun Valley Company wanted not to increase density in the Land Use Planning Area but move the existing density around. The amendment was for the south east side of Elkhorn and Fairway Roads, but no City action was taken. These proposed amendments prompted the decision for an early update of the entire Comprehensive Plan. Hofman showed the current zoning map and said that the majority of the current zoning for the Land Use Planning Area is OR-1. OR-1 exists only on the zoning map and the section for zoning map amendment requirements in the Development Code requires a rezone to OR-1 zoned land prior to or in conjunction with any proposed development. An Action Item in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan created the Open Space and Recreation zoning districts but the City does not proceed with a formal rezone on its own. However, when development is proposed on OR-1 lands the City processes the required zoning map amendment. Slowly the zoning map starts to look like the designations on the Future Land Use Map. For example, the areas in the White Clouds, on Dollar Mountain, and some of the SVEA property in Elkhorn are now zoned as Open Space.

Hofman then gave an overview on this LUPA. He said that Dollar cabin predates the 2005 Comprehensive Plan adoption. City Hall has not been enlarged. The projects on Wedeln Lane were existing residential lots that have now been developed. There are no other significant activities, other than one trail segment being developed, on land in this LUPA. The 2011 amendment requests from Sun Valley Company have no standing other than as a withdrawn application. The question to the Committee is whether this should be retained as a LUPA, and if so, what is the envisioned boundary, density and land use designation layout for the area.

Nancy Humphrey proposed to retain the LUPA and would prefer to see the OR-1 as current zoning be implemented.

Chairman Palmedo said that he is a property owner in the area. To avoid the conflict of interest, he opted to recuse himself and have Cris Thiessen as Vice-chairman lead the discussion.

Cris Thiessen said the discussion today is on whether we want a LUPA or not for this area. He encouraged members to come up with pro and con arguments for retaining the LUPA.

Tim Silva said the fundamental issue in this process is that the Holdings took the property through reduction in density in the 2004 vision plan. With the extent of reduction in density, we have to ask where it goes. The density allowed in the current Commercial Core includes workforce housing. As an order of magnitude of potential growth and cushioning for future development, the density in the Village Core is consistent with the current vision plan in the long term. The magnitude of density has been reduced in the 2004 process and there is a tremendous amount of density to put somewhere which still offers a tremendous amount of reduction. He thought there were not many options.

Cris Thiessen asked the Committee by a show of hands if they want to keep Dollar Mountain, Prospector Hill, and Sun Valley Municipal Complex as a LUPA. A majority of the Committee was in favor of keeping it as a LUPA.

LUPA#3: Sun Valley Gateway

Mark Hofman gave an introduction about this LUPA. He said that everyone seems to agree to keep the Gateway pristine as open space. However, the Sun Valley Resort is not in a position to give away property rights for free. The Holdings have been excellent stewards with a vision similar to the community's. This LUPA is a real challenge to the Steering Committee and the community.

Chairman Palmedo suggested going around the room so that everyone has a chance to express their view on this LUPA. There was a unanimous agreement to keep the Gateway as a LUPA. The following is a summary of the views expressed.

- LUPA can do no harm. LUPA designation offers guidance for future development and community input is important. (Liz Warrick)
- Suggest including the Horseman's Center into the Gateway LUPA. (John Calvert)
- The Gateway is an iconic entrance to Sun Valley represented by historical architecture, open space, horses in the meadow, happy kids feeding horses, and sledding on Penny Hill. (Nancy Humphrey, Peter Hendricks)
- The Gateway is a sensitive area and community input should be allowed in reviewing development in this area. (John Carver, Tim Silva, Chuck Rumpf)

Wrap Up on LUPA Discussion

Mark Hofman concluded the discussion of LUPAs. He said that of the three areas that remain designated as LUPAs in the draft recommendation a lot more work needs to be done, such as where to put density and open space while at the same time maintaining a balance of property rights, aesthetics and implementation of a community vision. For these three LUPAs, the Committee needs to review and potentially update the boundaries, densities and narrative text.

Liz Warrick asked what the size of the Gateway LUPA was. Mark Hofman said that it is 53 acres and the maximum allowable density for multi-family is 125. One Committee member asked how many acres the Horseman Center will add to the Gateway LUPA. Mark Hofman said that the Horseman Center adds about 33 acres to it.

Public Outreach Discussion

Isabel Lui gave an overview of the document titled "Public Outreach Proposal for the Summer". She said that the document focuses on utilizing various communication channels to promote high awareness within the community about the update process and to encourage participation. Lui also said that it is planned to send all property owners and persons living in Sun Valley a Town Hall meeting invitation by mail. Therefore, in selecting the date for the Town Hall meeting, the Committee has to consider the lead time for printing and advance notice to the recipients. Lui also talked about meeting venue options and recommended the Sun Valley Opera House, given its dates of availability, seating capacity, audio/visual/IT capability, and parking facilities. Lui recommended August 13th from 4:00 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. when there is no scheduling of Summer Symphony events.

Upcoming Town Hall Meeting

Susan Tucker said that there will be a party for those who host the musicians of the Summer Symphony on August 13th. She also suggested scheduling the Town Hall meeting after 5:00 p.m. so that people can join after work. After an exchange of ideas, the Committee came to the following consensus for the Town Hall meeting:

- Date: August 14, 2013 (Wednesday)
- Time: 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.
- Venue: Sun Valley Opera House

The Committee also agreed on the preliminary format of the Town Hall meeting:

- Mayor to give a short opening remark.
- Chairman Palmedo to talk briefly about the work of the Steering Committee.
- Staff to give an overview of the agenda and introduce various options, including the City website, for sending comments and questions to the City after the Town Hall meeting.
- Polling questions.
- Discussion of results.
- Public comments and questions.

Chairman Palmedo asked about the number of polling questions and how long it will take. Mark Hofman said the process for answering the questions is quick and he expects around 20-25 questions. Harry Griffith cited City of Ketchum as an example. He said that they asked about 26 to 30 questions with the results captured instantaneously, each used for facilitating discussion. It took an hour and a half.

Nancy Humphrey suggested limiting the introductory comments to 15 minutes so that more time would be reserved for the polling questions, discussions and public input. Chairman Palmedo said that the Town Hall meeting is the best opportunity to get the broad empirical information when 250 to 300 expressions are made to the critical questions that we will raise. He would like to see the Town Hall meeting focus on the quality of this process.

Chuck Rumpf asked if the Town Hall meeting will be recorded. Isabel Lui said yes.

Susan Tucker said the public should be provided with easy-to-find background information such as the definition of a LUPA prior to the Town Hall meeting. Isabel Lui said that staff has created a new tab called "Invitation for Public Comment" under "2013 Comprehensive Plan" on the City website. Under this new tab, draft documents of the Vision Statement and Executive Summary, Chapter II Goals, Objectives and Action Items, and Chapter III Future Land Use are available. Staff also plans to issue a press release three weeks before the Town Hall meeting that provides background information on the Comprehensive Plan update and cites ways to provide public input.

Chairman Palmedo emphasized the focus of the Town Hall meeting is to get a high level consensus on such areas as the strength to the Vision Statement and get a clear consensus on the identified Goals and Objectives, without going too much into details.

Mark Hofman said there were three ways to collect public input: 1) a simple survey attached with the invitation to Town Hall meeting; 2.) the actual polling during the Town Hall meeting; and, 3.) Survey Monkey, an online survey questionnaire for those who are not able to attend the Town Hall meeting. All data collected will be submitted to the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council.

Isabel Lui presented three size options for the post card invitation, their respective costs, and a brief outline of the content.

In addition, Isabel Lui said she had contacted the Summer Symphony office about the possibility of advertising on the big screen and setting up an information booth. The Summer Symphony Office said that it is their policy to confine the use of the screen to information pertaining to the symphony and the Sun Valley Resort. Tim Silva agreed to follow up on this.

Public Outreach Sub-Committee

Chairman Palmedo suggested having a sub-committee help on the outreach program. Liz Warrick, Nancy Humphrey, Peter Hendricks, Chuck Rumpf, Paul Willis and Chairman Palmedo volunteered for the public outreach sub-committee. Liz Warrick was named chairman of the sub-committee and she will coordinate the meeting time.

Second Town Hall Meeting

The Committee discussed the need and timing for a second Town Hall meeting. Mark Hofman said the second Town Hall meeting may focus on hot topics such as land use in the Gateway. We may consider using the polling paddle format for this Town Hall meeting. Regarding the date, the Committee agreed that it should be sometime in September, after Labor Day and before September 15th. Chairman Palmedo suggested having the second Town Hall meeting held the second week of September and preferably on September 10th (Tuesday). He asked staff to check venue availability and said that a smaller venue, like Dollar Lodge, would be more appropriate as he would expect a smaller crowd.

Introduction to Section IV

Mark Hofman said Section IV does not involve any policy, goals and objectives. It is mainly a summary of Action Items and an Appendix. Hofman said that he would update the information and encourage the Committee to make suggestions if any notes need to be added. He further pointed out that more discussion will take place in future meetings regarding the update on Addendum A: Special Sites. As for Addendum B: Figure 12 Slope Natural Resource Map and Figure 13 Vegetation Type Natural Resource Map, Hofman said these two maps will not require any updating as they are general information. Any application for development will require a site specific slope analysis and natural resource analysis. Hofman said that addition of more exhibits is possible as may be needed and suggestions from the Committee are welcome. Lastly, Hofman said any City resolution that has updated the Comprehensive Plan will be reviewed and verified as accurate in the Comprehensive Plan update.

Public Comment and Questions

Liz Warrick asked in addressing workforce housing whether it is more appropriate to use the term "community housing". Mark Hofman said that with the Inclusionary and Linkage Ordinances repealed, it may be more appropriate to use "community housing" for individual housing projects. Cris Thiessen questioned if community housing implies it is provided by the government versus workforce housing that is provided by private company.

Karen Reinheimer said that she tried to track down the Gun Club parcel documents that made up the master plan. She said that there might have been a rezoning of the open space which pushes out the boundaries, which is part of a 1991 request made by Sun Valley Company for doing that. She asked how one can get more information on this.

Mark Hofman responded that Open Space as a zoning designation came into place as an Action Item in the 2005 Comprehensive Plan. The only zoning that has taken place involved converting OR-1 zoned land into other zoning districts. Hofman said that OR-1 is not Open Space. The White Clouds area was almost entirely zoned as OR-1 and now is zoned as Open Space, Recreation and Residential. Hofman said that he was not aware of any Open Space District of the White Clouds area being rezoned as something else.

Karen Reinheimer said that she was specifically looking at the Gun Club because she thought the Sun Valley Company had originally wanted to rezone the OR-1 to Residential and she was interested to find out the acreage that was re-zoned. She said that this is in response to the thought that Sun Valley has a certain amount of density and Sun Valley Company has over time rezoned OR-1 lands to other designations. Thus, the City of Sun Valley has already given hillsides or density to Sun Valley Company in some respects. She said that this is an important point as we go forward, that concession has been given and the community should be aware of what those reasons are.

Way Forward

Chairman Palmedo concluded the meeting and said that the next meeting is going to be held on August 14th with a focus on community outreach.

Adjourn

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.