



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
AUGUST 27, 2025**

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair Christin Van Dine (arrived at 6:30 p.m.), Bill Johnson, John Frontero, Henry Sigg, Grant Tilson, Seth Beal, Rick Shand

EX OFFICIO: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Alec Barton, Senior Planner; Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner II; John Robertson, City Engineer; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Elissa Martin, Project Planning Manager; Steven Dennis, Capital Projects Manager; Harrison Holley, Public Utilities Engineer

1. ROLL CALL

In the absence of Chair Christin Van Dine, Chair Pro Tem Bill Johnson called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. Chair Van Dine joined at 6:30 p.m.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from August 13, 2025.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson explained that he was not present at the August 13, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting. As a result, he will abstain from the vote on the Minutes.

MOTION: Commissioner Shand moved to APPROVE the Meeting Minutes from August 13, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sigg. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission. Commissioner Johnson abstained.

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, made an announcement about the Planning Commission Meeting agenda. For Work Session Item 5C, the applicant has requested to withdraw the item from the agenda, so it will not be discussed by the Commission.

Last night, the City Council discussed the Bonanza Park Mixed-Use District and continued its evaluation. Some of the initial recommendations from the Commission are being reconsidered, including open space and the 30% requirement, among other items. Director Ward thanked Commissioner John Frontero and Chair Pro Tem Johnson for

participating as liaisons for the project. Commissioner Frontero shared some of the comments that were heard from the City Council. He clarified that some of the comments were from one Council Member, so the comments are not necessarily consensus-based.

There was serious consideration to adjust the open space back to the original 30% standard originally proposed. One or two Council Members felt that 10 boutique hotels in this district would likely be too many. Commissioner Frontero noted that it is possible to consider one for every 20 acres or something similar in order to reduce the overall number. There were also comments about achieving a better balance between office, commercial, and residential, so as to not overwhelm the district with too much residential.

There were a number of comments about legacy nightly rentals under the code change. Commissioner Frontero reported that some Council Members specifically asked how certain the Planning Commission was that those rights would not be infringed upon. There were some code line items cited, so he suspects there will be some time spent making sure there is clarity provided. In addition, there were some comments made about the Level B Project Enhancements. There was concern that the items are not all of equal value, which means developers would likely focus on lower-cost project enhancements.

There was also a suggestion to consider improving traffic congestion in failed intersections before implementing any additional density in the district. Commissioner Frontero thought that made a lot of sense and noted that work can be done to look into some possibilities. Shared parking lots were also discussed. The City Council wants there to be consideration about whether this would change how parking and transit are addressed in the district. The Frontage Protection Zone ("FPZ") did not receive any comments. Overall, there was encouragement from the City Council. He got the impression from many Council Members that the draft was close, but there need to be some minor adjustments made. That being said, he also got the impression from one or two Council Members that considerable work still needs to be done on the draft.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson asked if there were any disclosures to share. Commissioner Henry Sigg disclosed that he had a financial transaction with the applicant of 1500 Kearns Boulevard. It was over 10 years ago and should not impact the decision-making process.

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

5. WORK SESSION

- A. 1500 Kearns Boulevard – Master Planned Development** – The Applicant Proposes to Redevelop 1500 Kearns Boulevard with a Mixed-Use Development Including 113 Units (99 Market Rate and 14 Affordable) and Approximately 11,536 Square Feet of Commercial Space. PL-25-06599.

Senior Planner, Alec Barton, presented the Staff Report and explained that the first Work Session item is related to the proposed Park Meadows Plaza redevelopment at 1500 Kearns Boulevard. He shared an image of the site and explained that the project site is located in the General Commercial (“GC”) Zoning District and the FPZ. The existing site is developed with commercial buildings that are approximately 36 feet in height. The applicant is proposing to redevelop the site with a mixed-use development that includes 113 units, totaling 94,756 square feet. 99 units will be market rate and 14 will be affordable. The applicant is also proposing 11,536 square feet of commercial space.

A rendering of the proposed project was shared with the Planning Commission. Planner Barton pointed out a fire access lane to the left, between the project site and the Wells Fargo site. A proposed multi-use path is in the FPZ adjacent to Kearns Boulevard. There was a rendering shared that shows the proposal from the rear of the site. Planner Barton reported that the applicant is proposing a 30-foot landscaped buffer in the FPZ with a multi-use pathway. As seen in the image shared, there is an existing cul-de-sac off of Kearns Boulevard that is approximately 58 feet wide. The proposed site access off of Kearns Boulevard is reduced by approximately 13 feet, resulting in a width of 45 feet.

Planner Barton reported that the applicant is requesting a building height exception. The height in the GC Zoning District is 35 feet from existing grade. Planning Staff will work with the applicant to complete a determination of natural grade since the site was developed in the 1970s. The applicant is proposing buildings up to 49 feet six inches in height from final grade. The requested building height exceptions are outside of the FPZ, 40 feet from the side lot lines and 50 feet from the rear lot line. An image was shared that shows the areas that would exceed the zone height in gray. The proposed rooftop decks were shown in orange with portions of the building at or under zone height were in white.

The Planning Commission reviews six criteria to determine whether the project meets the requirements for a building height exception. The first criterion is that the increase in building height does not result in increased square footage or building volume over what would be allowed in the zone. The proposed volume of the project is 185,713 square feet and is less than what would be allowed on the site based on the setbacks and open space requirements. Additional review is needed to confirm compliance with the façade variation requirement, specifically on the north façade. Planning Staff will work with the applicant on this before the next Planning Commission discussion on this application.

The second criterion states that buildings have been positioned to minimize visual impacts on adjacent structures. Staff recommends the applicant submit a Site-Specific Analysis prior to the public hearing to establish the project in the context of the surrounding properties. The recommendation is that there be a Solar Study included with the analysis.

Planner Barton reported that the third criterion is that there be adequate landscaping and buffering from adjacent properties and uses. The required setback for a Master Planned Development ("MPD") on a site greater than two acres is 25 feet around the perimeter of the site. The applicant is proposing reduced side setbacks of 10 feet, which is the zone required setback in the GC Zoning District. The project abuts fire access lanes on adjacent properties (HOPA and Wells Fargo). The applicant is proposing landscaping and sidewalks in the rear setback and a multi-use pathway in the front setback.

The fourth criterion is that increased setbacks and separations from adjacent properties are proposed. Planner Barton explained that the requested setback exception will be reviewed in future presentation slides, but Staff requests that the Planning Commission provide input on whether the project meets the criteria for reduced setbacks. The fifth criterion is that the additional building height results in more than the minimum open space required and results in open space that is publicly accessible. The minimum requirement for redevelopment of an MPD site is 30% and the applicant is proposing approximately 36,000 square feet of publicly accessible open space at ground level, which would be in the form of courtyards and plaza areas. That is equivalent to approximately 30.5%. The upper floor amenity spaces and decks are for private use and do not count towards this.

The sixth and final criterion is that the additional building height is designed in a manner that provides a transition in roof elements in compliance with Chapter 15-5. The project includes three buildings that are connected by pedestrian bridges. Portions of each building are proposed to exceed the zone height. Planner Barton shared renderings of the proposed transition in roof elements. He posed the following question to the Commission:

- Does the Planning Commission need additional information from the applicant to evaluate their requested building height exception?

Chair Pro Tem Johnson suggested that the full presentation from Staff and the applicant take place before answering the questions. Planner Barton reported that the next set of criteria is for the requested side setback exception. The required MPD perimeter setback is 25 feet for sites greater than two acres, and the applicant is proposing to reduce that on both of the side lots to 10 feet, which is the requirement in the GC Zoning District.

The Land Management Code ("LMC") includes a provision where the Planning Commission may decrease the required perimeter setback to the zone required setback if it is necessary to provide desired architectural interest and variation. Planner Barton

shared a slide that shows areas of the building that would be located outside the required 25-foot setback. Staff finds that architectural interest and variation may allow for setback exceptions for features like porches and decks, roof overhangs, and similar elements, but does not necessarily contemplate a building footprint encroachment into the setback.

The LMC includes applicable requirements to help the Planning Commission determine whether the setback reduction is necessary to provide architectural interest and variation. The first criterion is related to adequate internal vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation. Planner Barton reported that the buildings are proposed in masses that do not allow pedestrian or bicycle circulation through the site and do not include connections from the Park Meadows residential areas to the north. The second criterion is that the project is compatible in use, scale, and mass with adjacent properties. The proposed uses, which are a mix of residential and commercial uses, are compatible with the GC Zoning District and surrounding land uses. However, he pointed out that the applicant is proposing buildings that are both taller and larger than the existing buildings on the site.

The third criterion is that the project promotes the use of non-vehicular forms of transportation through design and by providing trail connections. As noted earlier, the project includes a multi-use pathway in the front setback. There is also an existing bus stop in front of the site. The fourth criterion is that the project incorporates best planning practices for sustainable development. Planner Barton reported that the applicant has indicated in their plans that the project will target LEED platinum certification.

The LMC also includes criteria for Conditional Use Permits ("CUP"), which this project would require. Two specific criteria are applicable to determine whether the setback reduction is necessary to provide architectural interest and variation. The first of these relates to building mass, bulk, and orientation. The requested setback exception is within 10 feet of the property line. In the locations where the setback reduction is requested, buildings are oriented away from the HOPA development. There is no proposed pedestrian or vehicular connectivity between the two developments. Planner Barton explained that the second relevant criterion is physical design and compatibility with surrounding structures in mass, scale, style, and design. The project includes some architectural elements that are similar to the existing Wells Fargo building and surrounding structures. Planner Barton posed the following questions to the Commission:

- Does the Planning Commission need additional information to evaluate the applicant's requested setback exception?
- Does the Planning Commission find the applicant's requested setback complies with the requirements of the Land Management Code?

Planner Barton highlighted some other components of the project. The applicant is proposing that all of the parking for the development be underground. The project, based on the current mix of uses, would require somewhere between 205 and 220 parking spaces. That number will vary based on the final number of units and the mix of

commercial uses. Currently, the applicant is proposing 211 parking spaces, which is within the anticipated range that would be required. The next steps would be for the applicant to submit a Parking Analysis and a Transportation Impact Study ("TIS") to evaluate the impacts of the development on the street network. He pointed out the underground parking location.

Planner Barton reported that the applicant has submitted a Housing Mitigation Plan and is working with the Housing Team to address the requirements of the Affordable Housing Ordinance. Currently, the applicant is proposing 14 affordable units, totaling 12,150 square feet of livable space. There will be a mixture of studio one- and two-bedroom units. The proposal would meet or exceed the affordability requirements at 80% Area Median Income ("AMI"). Planner Barton reiterated that this is under review by the Housing Team.

Some preliminary comments were received from the Development Review Committee. Utah Department of Transportation ("UDOT") has requested that the access to the site line up with Sidewinder Drive. If this is the case, the Committee requests right-in, right-out access only to the site to eliminate traffic conflicts. There were also some comments related to sidewalks and parking on the deeded right-of-way between the property and Wells Fargo and coordinating fiber easements and other easements with the City and relevant agencies. In addition, the applicant should co-locate new telecommunications facilities where possible or locate those facilities on the tops of the proposed buildings.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson asked for clarification about the sidewalk recommendation. Planner Barton explained that there is no sidewalk suggested on the private road. There can be additional clarification requested from the Development Review Committee if necessary. It was noted that the applicant's presentation will take place next. Following that, the questions posed by Staff can be discussed by the Planning Commission.

The applicant representatives introduced themselves to the Commission. Ed Lewis explained that he is the CEO of Kensington Investment Company. Shane Rensmon is the President of Real Estate Development for Kensington Investment Company and Jared Wright and Van Lewis are the design team from Method Studio. Mr. Ed Lewis stated that Kensington Investment Company is a family-owned business. There is a commitment to the community and he looks forward to working to improve the site.

Mr. Rensmon presented the Site Plan and referenced one of the comments made during the Staff presentation about the sidewalk along the Wells Fargo side. It is imperative to have the sidewalk there for access to certain spaces. Not having a sidewalk there would create safety issues. He suggested that there be additional discussions about the sidewalk. As for the right-in, right-out, there has been contact with UDOT and there is support for the current drop-off area. Mr. Rensmon clarified that it is not for parking but is strictly for drop-offs. He discussed the setbacks next and reiterated that there is a request for reduced setbacks. There is a desire to create an open area space between

the three buildings. After speaking to the Fire Marshal, there was support for wide open space so an apparatus could be driven in there in the event of an emergency. There will be two access points into the garage, one to the northeast and one to the southwest. The intention is to keep queueing off of Kearns Boulevard and Monitor Drive, as those streets are often busy. There is a desire to be respectful to the surrounding properties.

Mr. Rensmon shared an image of the second level of the building. He discussed the pedestrian bridges and explained that the goal is to allow tenants to access the amenity spaces without needing to walk outside during the colder months of the year. Something mentioned during the Staff presentation was the architectural interest. He reported that balconies were added so the project steps in and out, which provides architectural interest. Mr. Rensmon shared additional images with the Commission. He explained that the idea is that if someone is standing near the building, the fourth floor will not be seen.

The parking is planned to be underground, so it is contained. Mr. Rensmon reported that there will be superchargers and regular Tesla chargers available for the public as well as the tenants. He shared an additional rendering to illustrate the architectural interest. There is a lot of green space, because there is a desire for there to be park-like settings.

Another rendering was shared to illustrate the courtyard that leads into the building. The idea is for it to be activated, which the three separate buildings allow for. Mr. Rensmon explained that the commercial space will be in the two main buildings. The far-right building will have some amenity space on the ground floor. The idea is not to have tenants on the ground floor, because there could be disturbances from headlights.

Mr. Rensmon shared a rendering from a different perspective. He explained that the bridges were placed in a certain location to accommodate the fire truck heights. The southeast corner was turned into more of a deck space for tenants, so there is not a large wall visible when someone drives down Kearns Boulevard going west. This opens up the building and ensures that it does not look like a solid block. He pointed out the location of the underground parking on the rendering. Mr. Rensmon reported that there will be benches for members of the public to use. There will also be bicycle racks available.

Additional renderings were shared with the Planning Commission. The rendering at grade level illustrates what the development would look like when entering from the drop-off area. Mr. Rensmon reported that water consumption will be minimized as much as possible on the site. He pointed out the location of the commercial spaces, further discussed the landscaping that is envisioned, and shared information about materials. He noted that flat roofs were included to minimize the heights as much as possible.

Commissioner Rick Shand asked about the approximate width of the sidewalks that front Kearns Boulevard. Mr. Van Lewis stated that the colored concrete for maintenance and snow removal is 12 feet wide. The other would be 8 feet. Commissioner Shand asked if bicycles are envisioned on the brown path as opposed to the straighter, light-colored path.

He would personally like to see a straighter orientation for bicycles. It would also be beneficial for it to be slightly wider, so if there were pedestrians there, the bicycles could pass. The brown path is something that he believes would be used more by pedestrians. Mr. Lewis offered to pass along those comments to the Landscape Architect.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson noted that the sidewalk comment from the Development Review Committee is substantial. Part of the argument for the application relates to internal circulation throughout the property. He believes the project should be designed for the site. Both height and setbacks are being discussed during the Work Session. 15-6-5(F) speaks to the height and the criteria, but 15-6-5(G) speaks to the setbacks as well. He needs to hear a better argument for the setback reductions proposed on the sides. Chair Pro Tem Johnson thought the project was beautifully designed and expressed support for the architecture. However, reducing the setbacks seems to go against the height exception argument. He would look to the applicant to reduce either setbacks or height.

Mr. Wright shared information about the intention of the design that has been presented. One method seen a lot in Salt Lake City is when there is a large building that runs the façade. In this case, there was a desire to design something that fits within the Park City massing and aesthetic. Mr. Wright explained that the intention is to scale back the massing that someone would see from Kearns Boulevard. This is achieved by reducing the amount of building on Kearns Boulevard and replacing it with more pedestrian areas. He noted that this was done by placing the middle building between the large C-shape. That was able to fit onto the site by reducing the setbacks on the side yards. Essentially, what was taken from the side yard was added to the courtyard area instead.

It was noted that Chair Van Dine joined the Planning Commission Meeting at 6:30 p.m.

The applicant team explained that the setback request comes out of a desire to minimize the overall appearance on Kearns Boulevard. There is no intention for it to look like one large building. Commissioner Johnson understands the rationale and likes the design but also likes the idea of additional buffering. He would also like to know how wide the sidewalk would be if it were allowed to be included. Part of the criteria is to have circulation, and he is having a hard time seeing the circulation based on the Committee feedback.

Commissioner Johnson is not opposed to additional height but pointed out that when something above zone height is requested, the Affordable Master Planned Development ("AMPD") is a tool that can be used. If there is a large amount of affordable housing, that tool could be considered. There are currently 14 affordable housing units proposed. It was noted that the units are larger than what is allowed by code, so there will be some adjustments made. That will result in some additional affordable units on the site.

Commissioner Sigg asked about the internal courtyard space that surrounds the inner building. He wondered whether that was considered part of the open space, which was

confirmed. Commissioner Sigg asked about the value of open space along Kearns Boulevard. It is important to determine whether that is quality open space. He pointed out that the circulation is all peripheral, and he would like to see more connectivity so it is more inclusive and community-centric. Without multiple ways to access that internal courtyard space, it might not serve the community as well. Commissioner Sigg commented that there is a mechanism to obtain increased height through the AMPD. He commends the commitment from the applicant that there will not be nightly rentals.

Commissioner Sigg reported that he asked the City Engineer earlier about the spacing between curb cuts. He wondered whether the applicant had looked into this, as he wants to ensure that the separation works. Commissioner Sigg discussed the site visit that took place ahead of the Planning Commission Meeting. One of the main takeaways was the amount of traffic in the area. Without pedestrian crossing mitigation, there could be serious issues. He would like to see some enhancements for pedestrian circulation, particularly as it relates to Kearns Boulevard. The applicant team reported that there was a discussion with UDOT about that, which is the reason for the median in the roundabout. This will allow pedestrians to stop if there is heavy traffic in the area. It was noted that work is continuing to be done to reduce unit sizes and address the AMI.

Commissioner Sigg asked whether a parking reduction is something the applicant team plans to request in the future, but which was denied. The only reason there would be a parking reduction would be if the side yard were increased to 25 feet. That increase would result in a loss of parking. Commissioner Johnson asked if there is a way to grant a setback exception for underground but not above ground. Director Ward stated that under the current code, the setback exception is for architectural variation and interest.

Commissioner Grant Tilson referenced the Monitor Drive portion of the building. He would like to see more architectural interest and variation there to support the side setback reduction. In terms of the cul-de-sac, it seems a bit large to him. He understands the Fire Marshal's concerns but wonders if there is a way that it could be reduced. There are already two other entrances to the parking garage, so it might be possible to eliminate the public curb cut. The traffic in the area would likely support that. This change would contribute further to the open space in the courtyard. As for circulation, if there were another entrance to the courtyard on the Monitor Drive side of the building, it would further tie together the different neighborhoods and create a more inclusive and architecturally varied design. During the site visit, it was stated that the internal portion of that courtyard will be private for residents only. He does not see the benefit of open space if it is only for residents and suggested that this be opened up for the general public.

Mr. Ed Lewis reiterated that some of the design choices were a result of the feedback from the Fire Marshal. That is the reason for the location of the pedestrian bridges and the circulation. In addition, the drop-off area brings people into the building rather than drop-offs taking place on Kearns Boulevard. The idea behind the courtyards was to have quiet time for tenants after hours, so there would not be people wandering and making

noise. He explained that there is a desire to be open as much as possible to the public, but it is also important to respect the tenants. The tenants deserve to have quiet enjoyment of their space. Security is another factor that needs to be taken into account. Mr. Lewis offered to look further into the Monitor Drive side. The design mirrors what currently exists in that area. He shared information about the unit types envisioned.

Commissioner Seth Beal echoed the comments made about the design. He stated that it looks wonderful, but he struggles with the way height interacts with the proposed setbacks. He mentioned the criteria that must be considered during this process. This particular site might require some compromises as far as the amount of square footage.

Commissioner Frontero stated that the code requires the Planning Commission to be certain that the applicant is meeting the six criteria for a height exception. He finds the proposal is currently failing on two of the six criteria, which are numbers four and five. Commissioner Frontero asked Planner Barton what was not counted as open space. Planner Barton reported that the interior courtyard and the multi-use pathway area were both included in the open space calculations. Any of the upper-floor amenities spaces that are strictly for tenant use only were not included in the open space calculations.

Commissioner Frontero explained that due to the two criteria that the proposal does not currently meet, it will be a challenge for him to be comfortable with the height based on this version of the proposal. When it comes to the side setbacks, he finds this is a well-thought-out design and noted that there is a lot to applaud the applicant for. However, there are some challenges. He finds that Building A along the north side is a challenging building mass. He wondered whether the applicant would consider a break that is similar to what is seen between Building B and Building C, so there is space for circulation. It was noted that the applicant team has looked into the break mentioned by Commissioner Frontero, but there are safety concerns that need to be taken into account.

The questions posed by Staff were reviewed by the Planning Commission:

- Does the Planning Commission need additional information from the applicant to evaluate their requested building height exception?
- Does the Planning Commission need additional information to evaluate the applicant's requested setback exception?
- Does the Planning Commission find the applicant's requested setback complies with the requirements of the Land Management Code?

The first question was discussed. Commissioner Beal echoed the comment made by Commissioner Frontero and stated that the arguments for criteria four and five need some clarification. He would also like some more clarification about the rules that will be imposed on the courtyard space. When looking at the definition of open space, he would not consider something that can be closed off when convenient for the building. 30.5% open space is essentially the minimum, so it is necessary to discuss how to overcome

that challenge. He has some similar questions related to the setback exception and pointed out that there is an interplay between height, setbacks, and open space.

Commissioner Sigg appreciates the comments that have been shared by other Commissioners. He agrees that there is an interplay between height, setbacks, and open space. Circulation is something that needs to be discussed further as well. Commissioner Frontero had no additional comments to share. Chair Van Dine agrees with the comments shared and explained that she has a difficult time with 10-foot setbacks. She would prefer a parking reduction to a setback exception. When it comes to height, significant height exceptions are a challenge. There needs to be a good rationale for the request. She likes the preservation of the FPZ and pulling the height back from the street. The design also maintains the entry corridor, which is appreciated.

Chair Van Dine would like to see how this interfaces with the HOPA project to the north. She has similar comments about the Monitor Drive area. While she loves that the section mirrors that neighborhood, she would like to see some more variation there. There is some room for improvement, but she appreciates that the main entrance to the garage will be kept off of Monitor Drive, since the HOPA project will have an entry over there.

Commissioner Johnson referenced 15-6-5(F) and stated that he supports a lot of what has been said by other Commissioners. He reiterated the Staff recommendation for a Site-Specific Analysis and Solar Study. It is important for the Commission to see how the proposal interacts with adjacent properties through a stronger visual representation. Commissioner Johnson thinks this is a solid design but believes some alterations and additional clarifications are needed for certain items. The side setback concerns him. It might not need to be the full 25 feet, but having a sidewalk is important for circulation.

Commissioner Shand mentioned the frontage on Monitor Drive. He likes the landscaping and the balcony and believes it provides some relief in the façade. The setback is a concern, but his concern mostly has to do with how it relates to the HOPA project. The street between Wells Fargo and this project is a private road. It would be nice to see what could be done there to increase the setback a little bit. Commissioner Shand likes the way that the height has been stepped back and that all of the parking is underground.

Commissioner Tilson agrees with much of what has been said already. He applauds the design of this project because it minimizes the massing on Kearns Boulevard. His concerns largely relate to the circulation in the internal courtyard. The Planning Commission must ensure it is adequate in order to grant setback and height exceptions.

The Planning Commission took a five-minute break before hearing the next item.

- B. Land Management Code Amendments** – The Planning Commission will conduct a Work Session Regarding Updates to the Traffic Impact Study Guidelines and Potential Code Amendments Related to Transportation Demand Management. PL-25-06513.

Planner Barton presented the Staff Report and explained that this Work Session item relates to some Land Management Code Amendments. For this item, he is being joined by Planner II, Jacob Klopfenstein, and City Engineer, John Robertson. There is an ongoing project that is being led by the Engineering Team to update the TIS guidelines and to establish Transportation Demand Management (“TDM”) strategies that can be used to mitigate traffic impacts associated with new developments.

There were no City standards for TIS submittals prior to 2023. The guidelines that were adopted in 2023 have helped to establish criteria that the Planning Commission can review when looking at new developments. Planner Barton noted that there is an opportunity to establish clear TDM strategies, consistent and measurable criteria, annual reporting, and flexibility for future modifications. This aligns with the adopted 2014 General Plan and the Draft 2025 General Plan, which encourages alternative transportation modes and calls for aligning transportation goals with sustainability goals.

Planner Barton reported that the current process under the 2023 guidelines starts with a Scoping Memo prepared by the applicant. The City reviews that memo to determine whether a TIS is required. The baseline for establishing whether that study is required is 25 or more net vehicle trips. The study would analyze the five main intersections:

- Park Avenue/Kearns Boulevard;
- Bonanza Drive/Kearns Boulevard;
- Comstock Drive/Kearns Boulevard;
- Park Avenue/Deer Valley Drive;
- Bonanza Drive/Deer Valley Drive.

The TIS can require additional intersections at the discretion of City Staff based on the project location, size, or land use type. These studies have provided the community with a better understanding of how development will impact the existing street network, but the guidelines do not include adopted standards to mitigate traffic impacts through TDM strategies. That is what the current project is looking into. The project goal is as follows:

- Update the TIS guidelines to establish standards for measurable traffic reduction strategies through TDM plans that prioritize transit, pedestrian and bicyclist connections, carpooling, and other strategies to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips generated from new developments.

Planner Barton reported that the project goal aligns with one of the stated purposes of the LMC, which is to provide for well-planned commercial and residential centers, and safe

and efficient traffic and pedestrian circulation. There are some opportunities to update the code to better align with the work that is being reviewed as it relates to the TIS updates and the TDM strategies. For example, under LMC Section 15-3-7, the Planning Commission may reduce an MPD or CUP parking requirement if parking uses overlap, if the commercial spaces would serve residents rather than the general public, or if the Planning Commission finds there are other factors supporting a reduction in parking. The recommended update to this section of code is that the Planning Commission could determine whether to reduce parking based on the TIS and TDM plan from an applicant.

LMC Section 15-6-5(E) looks at the off-street parking requirements for MPDs. The Planning Commission may increase or decrease the required parking based on an applicant's parking analysis. There is a provision for projects to pay an in-lieu fee if they are located within three blocks of a bus stop or on a public transit route. The parking analysis must be comprehensive and evaluate the demand for parking on a site based on both the proposed use and occupancy. Planner Barton explained that there are opportunities here for updates. This includes clarification that the parking analysis the applicant provides must be consistent with the requirements of the TIS guidelines. The analysis must also include TDM strategies to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips.

Another section of code that has been explored is LMC Section 15-6-1.9, which has to do with the AMPD requirements. In this section of code, non-residential uses must meet the LMC parking requirements, but the Planning Commission can reduce that requirement if it would increase the feasibility of an AMPD, if the applicant funds and submits a parking and traffic study, and if the AMPD sufficiently addresses parking demands generated by the project. There are multiple criteria included in this section of code that the Planning Commission can look at to justify a reduction in parking. A recommended update is to require the submittal of a TDM plan with an AMPD application.

Planner Barton posed the following question to the Planning Commission:

- Are there other factors the Planning Commission would like Staff to evaluate in the updates that connect parking reductions to TDM plans?

Commissioner Frontero finds the Staff suggestion to update the TIS to be consistent with the direction that has been received from the community. He expressed support for the updates that have been discussed for the TIS and TDM. Commissioner Frontero does not find the in-lieu fee to be an effective mitigation factor. If a development is going to bring more than 25 vehicle trips per day, then the TIS is required. To allow a project manager to write a check and not have to deal with mitigating their own traffic is a failing strategy, so he does not support a pay-in-lieu option. He believes there needs to be a more concrete plan and the applicant needs to be dedicated to executing that plan.

Engineer Robertson clarified that the 25 vehicles are not per day. It is 25 additional vehicles during the peak hour. 25 vehicles per day is not a lot, but 25 vehicles during the

peak hour is much more significant. Commissioner Shand asked for Staff feedback on the in-lieu fee. He wondered whether it had been effective in the past. Engineer Robertson does not recall a time when an in-lieu fee was collected. There have been impact fees collected, which are used for the various capital projects that have been identified.

Commissioner Sigg asked for additional information on the in-lieu fee. City Attorney, Mark Harrington, explained that it is established by Resolution and is approximately \$40,000 right now per space, which was recently raised. There are several application examples. Commissioner Sigg wanted to know what happens when someone pays the in-lieu fee. For instance, if the funds are earmarked specifically for transportation. Attorney Harrington clarified that the funds are typically earmarked for public parking projects. Commissioner Sigg commented that his concern with in-lieu fees is whether those public parking projects will actually be built. Attorney Harrington stated that the original in-lieu fee was not built on replacement costs like parking and construction, but on management. That has changed and the current fee is based on the replacement construction costs.

Planner Klopfenstein provided an overview of the potential new process that the Engineering Department and consultant, WCG, have been working to develop. The potential new process would still include a Scoping Memo, similar to what is required now for a TIS. That would estimate the vehicle trips that the new developments would generate and provide other details related to site access. The City would use that Scoping Memo to determine the number of trips generated by the new development that the developer would be required to mitigate. Under the draft framework, there would be three TIS levels of varying intensity. The idea is that larger developments that are generating more vehicle trips would have to complete a more intensive TIS than smaller developments that would not be generating as many associated vehicle trips.

Once the developer and the City have worked to determine the number of trips the development is generating that need to be mitigated, the developer would be able to choose from a TDM Menu of options. Essentially, the developer can choose strategies related to TDM that best work for their site. Some of the categories are as follows:

- Site Design and Layout:
 - Built environment elements of the site that are designed to reduce trips.
- Site Programs:
 - Programs to incentivize reduced trips, such as car/bike shares, shared parking agreements, and shuttle services.
- On and Off-Site Features/Infrastructure:
 - Features or infrastructure at the site or elsewhere (activating streetscapes, enhanced crosswalks, etc.)
- Implementing Elements of Park City Forward:
 - Developers can choose to contribute to capital projects outlined in the plan.

Planner Klopfenstein posed the following question to the Planning Commission:

- Are there additional strategies the Commission would recommend we evaluate?

Commissioner Beal expressed support for measuring traffic and looking into mitigation strategies, but asked if there is a mechanism to determine whether those strategies are effective. 12 months after a project is done, it might be possible to determine whether the strategy worked. If something does not work, there could be a mechanism in place to make changes. Engineer Robertson reported that nothing has been identified at this time, but it is something that can be considered. The challenge would be to determine how to retroactively change something that was not working, but there could be some sort of evaluation implemented. Commissioner Beal agreed that it would be difficult to retroactively change something, but the evaluation process could still be useful. Attorney Harrington reported that for more complex applications, the Commission has imposed a Condition of Approval for a one-year review. That has been an effective tool in the past.

Commissioner Shand noted that this is a complex challenge because there is traffic that varies based on the time of year and the time of day. While there are challenges that currently exist, it is important to start somewhere. Commissioner Sigg asked whether the location is taken into account with the TIS and TDM. Engineer Robertson explained that some TDM strategies would apply in certain locations and some would not. As a result, there will be some consideration of the location of the development in this process.

Commissioner Frontero stated that when a new project is proposed, there are two different aspects of the traffic impact. One is the build-out, because that process creates a lot of traffic. Once that is completed, there are the guests that the project is being built for, as well as any ongoing employees. He asked if one TIS would cover both of those scenarios. Engineer Robertson reported that the TIS looks at the long-term use, but there are opportunities to require certain mitigation strategies during construction. Director Ward explained that a Construction Mitigation Plan is required as part of the Building Permit, but that is generally not something the Planning Commission reviews. Snow Park Village was a unique application that was part of the Planning Commission review, but in general, that is not something that is discussed at the Commission level.

Planner Klopfenstein explained that the last topic of discussion during this Work Session item is whether or not to codify the TDM strategies. As noted in the Staff Report, City Staff and the Engineering Department's consultant team looked at several comparable communities, but most do not codify TDM requirements. In Utah, State Code requires "objective standards set forth in an applicable ordinance." Staff recommends codifying the TDM strategies in accordance with the State Code requirement. The question is whether the Planning Commission is supportive of incorporating objective TDM standards into the applicable LMC sections. All of the Commissioners expressed support for this.

Director Ward mentioned mixed-use developments and pointed out that certain uses can change over time. The demand for parking and the impact on traffic could change in the future, which could require modifications to the plan. Staff recommends building that in as part of an ongoing review process, so there is a trigger when an approved project changes. Commissioner Beal believes that whatever moves forward should have some amount of flexibility built in. He pointed out that there is a complex traffic environment.

- C. 10 Augusta Court – Plat Amendment** – The Applicant Proposes a Plat Amendment to Amend the Fairway Meadows Subdivision Plat to Reflect Existing Conditions and Accommodate an Addition to a Single-Family Dwelling on Lot 47 of the Fairway Meadows Subdivision in the Residential Development Zone. PL-25-06611.

The applicant asked that this item be withdrawn from the current meeting agenda.

- D. Parcel SS-104-B, Iron Canyon Drive – Subdivision Final Plat** – The Applicant Proposes Creating a 1.73-Acre Lot for Development of a Single-Family Dwelling in the Single-Family Zoning District and the Sensitive Land Overlay Zone, Based on the Approved Preliminary Plat and Robbins Annexation Agreement. PL-23-05882.

Project Planning Manager, Elissa Martin, presented the Staff Report and explained that the Work Session item relates to the Iron Canyon Subdivision. The proposed plat combines three parcels to create one 1.73-acre lot for the development of a single-family dwelling and an affordable accessory apartment. The property is accessed from Iron Canyon Drive in the Single-Family Zoning District and is in the Sensitive Land Overlay (“SLO”). She reported that it is also within proximity to the Northern Entry Corridor.

At the end of last year, the City Council approved the annexation of Parcel SS-104-B, which makes up the majority of the proposed lot. The annexation approval included several Conditions of Approval, which are reflected in the terms of the Annexation Agreement. Manager Martin reviewed some of the terms, which include the following:

- Gross Floor Area maximum: 7,500 square feet;
- Building height limited to 25 feet;
- Final Plat shall include/address remnant pieces of IC-MISC;
- Comprehensive SLO Analysis to establish the limits of disturbance;
- Dedication of a 10-foot-wide PUE and public access easement for sidewalk.

The majority of these requirements are being met with the current proposal, but there are two items that require further attention. This includes the proposed limits of disturbance and the remnant pieces of IC-MISC. Manager Martin shared information about Parcel IC-MISC. On a map of the area, the remnant pieces that are not incorporated into the

1.73-acre lot are shown in orange. These are the pieces that would either need to be dedicated as public right-of-way, open space, or somehow addressed in another manner.

The applicant submitted their updated SLO Analysis, including a visual assessment. This included the conceptual design of the massing of the single-family dwelling and accessory apartment superimposed on the site and viewed from various vantage points. The proposed single-family dwelling is described as a one-story rambler, with the first level below grade and the main level above grade. The visual assessment shows the single-family dwelling is not visible from SR-224, as it is shielded by evergreens on the site. Manager Martin shared several example images and explained that the home is partially screened by the existing stand of aspen trees in the front of the property. The roof maintains a low profile and does not obstruct the views of the surrounding mountains.

The applicant proposes a large driveway and hard surface parking areas. While the off-street parking standards require only two parking spaces for a single-family dwelling and one parking space per room of the accessory apartment, the proposal includes a four-car garage and 15 additional parking stalls around the site. As proposed, the driveway exceeds the LMC maximum required 27-foot width for driveways and does not meet the exceptions for expansion of the driveway to access a garage for safe egress and ingress.

Manager Martin reported that the limits of disturbance include the building footprint of the single-family dwelling, the accessory apartment, and the hard surface paved areas. The proposed limits of disturbance are approximately 18,000 square feet, which is 24% of the lot area. The lot is 75,669 square feet. She noted that in the Staff Report, the numbers for the building footprint did not include the accessory apartment. The body of the Staff Report includes the updated numbers, but the table was not updated accordingly.

Manager Martin shared an updated table with the Commission, which compares the limits of disturbance with the surrounding lots. It is important to consider similarities in scale. Based on the analysis of the comparable lots and the fact that the property is in the SLO, Staff recommends reducing the proposed limits of disturbance to meet LMC driveway standards, to protect vegetation, reduce stormwater runoff, and to align with the average limits of disturbance percentage of comparable lots. Staff recommends the Commission:

- Review the proposed Iron Canyon Subdivision Phase 2 Final Plat to create a 1.73-acre lot for one single-family dwelling and an affordable accessory apartment in the Single-Family Zoning District and SLO;
- Conduct a Work Session;
- Provide input to the applicant to prepare for a public hearing.

The applicant representative, Brad Mackay from Ivory Development, is present at the meeting to answer Commissioner questions. Commissioner Frontero asked to first discuss the remnant lots. He noted that Manager Martin suggested potentially dedicating those to the public right-of-way, but asked about other possible alternatives. Mr. Mackay

explained that his hope was that rather than including those remnant pieces on a plat, those could be deeded so they are subject to dedication prior to recording the plat. That might be easier than creating a plat with remnant pieces. The intent is for all of those parcels to be deeded to the City in some manner. Commissioner Frontero thought this approach made sense so there would be a clean plat without the remnant lots included. Manager Martin believed that deeding those pieces prior to the Final Plat would work.

Mr. Mackay provided some perspective on the parking that is proposed. When the annexation process took place, there were originally three lots, but it switched to one lot. There is now one owner, and that owner has five married children and eight grandchildren. This will be a vacation home for the owner and his family, which means there needs to be adequate parking available for everyone. The idea is to provide enough off-street parking so that there is no parking taking place on the street. Mr. Mackay read the language from the code related to street access and circulation. The intention behind the circular drive is to provide the ability for vehicles to come out facing forward rather than backing out.

Commissioner Johnson believed the proposal was to have 19 parking spaces on the site, which was confirmed. It was noted that there will be seven bedrooms, but there is also family nearby. The parking that is proposed would accommodate the family members staying at the house as well as visitors. Mr. Mackay shared a map with the Commission and pointed out Country Lane and the lot that is 8,727 square feet. There are three lots to the east that were not included in the Staff analysis, but those all have limits of disturbance of 20%. Those are most closely related to this new parcel. He reiterated that the intention of the proposal is to provide off-street parking to accommodate guests.

Chair Van Dine understands the rationale behind the proposed parking, but believes this is an excessive amount of hardscape. 19 parking spaces is a lot for this property, though she understands the arguments that have been made by the applicant representative. She would like to see this be more in line with the surrounding homes. Commissioner Johnson agreed. He believed the applicant representative has indicated that if the parking spaces are not provided, there could be roadside parking taking place. Commissioner Johnson pointed out that Park City is trying to reduce the number of personal vehicles coming into town and wants to promote public transit for residents. While he understands the argument made by the applicant representative, the parking proposal is high. In addition, there is 24% proposed while the average for similar parcels in the area is between 16% and 18%. He believes the parking can be reduced.

Mr. Mackay pointed out that the newer homes in the area have limits of disturbance that are around 20%. He asked if a target between 18% to 20% would be acceptable to the Commission. Commissioner Johnson believed that would be a reasonable compromise. He reiterated that there is a desire to reduce the number of vehicles and expressed concerns about the parking that is envisioned on the site. Commissioner Shand stated that 19 parking spaces is excessive. He does not think that limiting the parking would

force a lot of vehicles to park on the street. If the driveway was 27 feet wide, there would still be plenty of parking available on the side of the driveway. Mr. Mackay confirmed that it is possible to create a new layout takes into account the Commissioner comments.

Commissioner Beal does not support the number of parking spaces that have been proposed. If there are seven bedrooms, then this would result in two and a half cars per bedroom, which is excessive. He struggles with that part of the proposal and feels there should be consistency with the other houses in the area. The 16% to 18% range makes sense for the limits of disturbance, as that is consistent with the lots identified by Staff.

Mr. Mackay stated that the parking can be reconfigured. He is more concerned with the limits of disturbance percentage. There is a desire to maintain some flexibility. He wants to understand a percentage that is consistent with the neighbors, including those new homes that he identified in the 19% to 20% range. Director Ward noted that there were restrictions in the Annexation Agreement about future development and accessory uses and structures. There can be some clarification about that before the public hearing.

Commissioner Frontero noted that the applicant representative mentioned some neighboring lots that are 20%. He asked Manager Martin to verify that information. Manager Martin confirmed that she can look into this ahead of the next discussion.

Commissioner Frontero agreed with the other comments shared by the Commission, including the point made by Commissioner Shand. The driveway could be wide enough to handle additional parking on the occasions when there are extra visitors. He believes limits of disturbance at 16% would be appropriate, but if there is other evidence shared, he would consider something that is slightly higher. Commissioner Sigg finds the proposed parking to be excessive and agrees that an alternate strategy of a wider driveway would make sense. He is also leaning towards a percentage between 16% and 18%. Commissioner Sigg further discussed parking and explained that he is concerned about a subsequent owner. He pointed out that the amount of parking sets the precedent.

Commissioner Tilson agrees that the parking that is proposed is excessive for a single-family home with seven bedrooms. He worries about the future uses and would be in favor of a limit of disturbance percentage more in line with the rest of the neighborhood. Mr. Mackay stated that he will work with Staff to reach the correct percentage and parking numbers. There can be a new Site Plan presented to the Planning Commission in the future.

6. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. 1884 Three Kings Drive (Thaynes Drive Pathway and Water Treatment Facility) – Conditional Use Permit –** The Applicant Requests a Conditional Use Permit for a 600 Foot-Long Net Along the Thaynes Pathway in the Urban Park Zoning District and a 60 Foot-Long Net at the Three Kings Water Treatment Plant in the Urban Park Zoning District. PL-25-06644.

Planner Barton presented the Staff Report and explained that this is an application for a CUP at 1884 Three Kings Drive. The property includes both the Park City Golf Course and Three Kings Water Treatment Plant. In the interest of public safety, the applicant is proposing two nets to protect people from errant golf balls in this location. The Thaynes Net is proposed to be 600 feet long and up to 50 feet in height along the new multi-use pathway adjacent to Thaynes Canyon Drive. The net would range in height from 20 to 50 feet above final grade in this location. The net would be supported by poles spaced every 50 feet. The applicant proposes screening the net with Engleman Spruce trees.

Planner Barton reviewed additional steps proposed to reduce visual impacts associated with the net. This includes: the use of dark netting materials, locating poles behind existing trees, reducing the diameter of the poles by 25% relative to the original design, designing the net to work with natural grade, and eliminating the need for guy wires.

The second net is at the Three Kings Water Treatment Plant. Planner Barton explained that the applicant proposes a 100-foot-long net that would reach a maximum height of 50 feet. He shared a conceptual design that shows the net in relation to the treatment plant. A portion of the net is screened by existing 40-to 50-foot evergreen trees. Both sites are in the Urban Park Zoning District. The maximum height in the district is 28 feet. The applicant is requesting an exception to allow the net to be up to 50 feet in both locations.

Planner Barton reported that the proposal requires a CUP because fences greater than 6 feet in height require a CUP in this zoning district. The proposal also required a variance because the nets exceed the zone height of 28 feet. On August 19, 2025, there was unanimous approval from the Board of Adjustment. The approval had some Conditions of Approval, including one that states the maximum height will not exceed 50 feet from final grade and a CUP will be required prior to construction. Staff is recommending that some additional Conditions of Approval be tied to the CUP approval. Staff recommends the Commission review and consider approving the CUP based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter.

Capital Projects Manager, Steven Dennis, reported that great lengths have been taken to minimize the visual impacts. One of the steps that has been taken is another iteration of drawings, which were shared with the Planning Commission. One of the poles has been eliminated, so now there are 12 poles instead of 13. The guy wires have been eliminated from the ends. Additionally, the diameter of the poles has been reduced. Public Utilities

Engineer, Harrison Holley, added that extra steps have been taken to provide protection. Four additional trees were planted and are shown in Exhibit E. There was discussion about the vegetation that provides protection and screening.

Commissioner Shand understands the smaller screen by the treatment plant. He believes that it needs to be there for the protection of the employees. There has not been a fence along Thaynes for a long time and he assumes this has been contemplated for the benefit of the homeowners as well as people using the multi-use path. This was confirmed. Commissioner Shand likes that the screen is on the driving range side rather than the street side and appreciates the attempts to focus on additional planting for screening.

Chair Van Dine opened the public hearing.

Suzette Robarge gave her zip code as 84060 and explained that her home is behind the driving range. She is in favor of the netting because there have been issues in the area. However, she still has concerns. There have been some slight changes to the configuration of the driving range over the years, which has been difficult. She wants her home to be protected, as she recently lost a window. Ms. Robarge shared information about what she has dealt with living in the area. She supports the addition of the nets but still has some outstanding concerns about the protection of her home.

Director Ward reported that between the site visit and the Planning Commission Meeting, an email was received. It was not included in the Meeting Materials Packet due to the time it was submitted, but it has been forwarded to all of the Commissioners.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Johnson likes the revisions made to the netting along the driving range. He also likes that it is on the inside of the trees that have been there for some time. He asked if there is a way to ensure those trees remain healthy and are well-maintained. It was confirmed that the trees will be monitored. Commissioner Frontero asked if any of the homeowners in the area have installed their own nets or fencing for protection. There was confirmation from Staff that at least two homes in the area have installed nets.

Commissioner Frontero asked if it would be beneficial to add a Condition of Approval that addressed the comments made during the public hearing. There was discussion about the issues that face nearby residents. Commissioner Frontero expressed support for the netting because it will increase safety for homeowners, visitors, and workers. Director Ward asked about the date on the updated plans that were shared with the Commission. Manager Dennis reported that they are dated August 25, 2025. There was further discussion about possible amendments to the language included in the Draft Final Action Letter.

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to APPROVE the Conditional Use Permit for the Thaynes Net and Three Kings Net, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval, as amended:

Findings of Fact:

1. The Applicant proposes two safety nets, both up to 50 feet in Height, at the Park City Golf Course and Three Kings Water Treatment Plant at 1884 Three Kings Drive. The nets are requested to provide protection from errant golf balls.
2. 1884 Three Kings Drive is a 67.75-acre Lot in the Park City Golf Course Back Nine Subdivision and Urban Park Zoning District (UPZ). The property is part of the Hotel Park City Master Planned Development (MPD).
3. The net proposed along Thaynes Canyon Drive is 600 feet long and ranges in height from 20 to 50 feet from Final Grade and is proposed to provide protection for users of the new multi-use pathway installed along Thaynes Canyon Drive.
4. Existing spruce trees line Thaynes Canyon Road and the Applicant proposes landscaping with Engleman Spruce trees to screen the net.
5. The net proposed for the Three Kings Water Treatment Plant is 100 feet long and a maximum of 50 feet tall and is located northeast of the Three Kings Water Treatment Plant to provide protection for the facility.
6. On June 26, 2025, the City Council authorized a construction agreement for a 50-foot-tall net along the new Thaynes Canyon Drive multi-use pathway.
7. On July 25, 2025, the Applicant applied for a Variance from maximum UPZ height for two nets—one for the multi-use pathway and one for the Water Treatment Plant—at 1884 Three Kings Drive.
8. On August 19, 2025, the Board of Adjustment held a public meeting and approved the Variances for a maximum height of 50 feet from Final Grade.
9. On August 5, 2025, the Applicant applied for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to install the nets in the UPZ.
10. The proposal to install two nets complies with the Urban Park Zoning District Requirements outlined in Land Management Code Chapter 15-2.26.

- a. Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-15-1 defines a Fence as “[a] Structure to separate or divide outdoor Areas. The term Fence includes, but is not limited to, net Screening for golf balls, and masonry walls. A Fence need not be sight-obscuring or light tight.”
 - b. Fences greater than six feet in Height above Final Grade are Conditional Uses and require a CUP in the UPZ. Both golf nets are proposed to reach a maximum of 50 feet in Height above Final Grade.
 - c. Fences greater than six feet in Height above Final Grade are Conditional Uses and require a CUP in the UPZ. Both golf nets are proposed to reach a maximum of 50 feet in Height above Final Grade.
 - d. LMC § 15-2.26-4 establishes the UPZ Height at 28 feet from Existing Grade. The Applicant is proposing golf nets with a maximum Height of 50 feet above Final Grade. On August 19, 2025, the Board of Adjustment granted a Variance establishing the maximum height from Final Grade allowed for both nets was 50 feet.
11. The proposal to install two nets complies with the Fences and Retaining Wall requirements outlined in LMC Section 15-4-2.
- a. LMC § 15-4-2(A)(2) limits Fences to no more than six feet in height in Side or Rear Setbacks unless approved through an MPD, CUP, or Administrative CUP. The Thaynes net is within a Setback and the Applicant is seeking approval through this CUP.
12. The proposal to install two nets complies, as conditioned, with the Conditional Use Permit criteria outlined in LMC Section 15-1-10(E).
- a. Size and location of the Site
 - i. Thaynes Net:
 - 1. The Thaynes net would be 600 feet long and range from 20 to 50 feet in height from Final Grade. It is located along the Thaynes pathway to the south, a minimum of 46 feet from the actual pathway, with a landscaped buffer in between.
 - ii. Three Kings net:
 - 1. The Three Kings net would be 100 feet long and would be 50 feet i height from Final Grade. It is located on the south- east side of the Treatment Plant.
 - b. Traffic considerations including capacity of the existing Streets in the Area

- i. The nets will not lead to an increase in traffic heading to the site as they will not bring about an increase or create a new Use.
- c. Utility capacity, including Storm Water run-off.
 - i. Utility capacity is not needed for the nets, and there is already water capacity for the irrigation systems for the landscaping.
- d. Emergency vehicle Access
 - i. Neither net is in a location that would obstruct or impact existing emergency vehicle access.
- e. Location and amount of off-Street parking
 - i. LMC § 15-3-6 does not impose a parking requirement for Fences.
- f. Internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation system
 - i. Neither net is located on an existing vehicular road. The net along Thaynes Canyon Drive is proposed to enhance safety of pedestrians/bicyclists.
- g. Fencing, Screening, and landscaping to separate the Use from adjoining Uses.
 - i. Thaynes net:
 - 1. On the matter of screening and landscaping, the Applicant states: "The proposed net will impact existing views, which are partially blocked by landscaping. That said, the net is not solid, and while it will be visible, so will the mountains behind it. Additionally, we will work with the installer to locate poles behind existing trees and choose color schemes that will work with the existing environment. Robust landscaping, including dozens of trees, shrubs, and landscape boulders, is included in the plan to further screen the net from public view at ground level."
 - 2. Staff recommends Condition of Approval 4, which requires the planting of additional vegetation of sufficient size to substantially screen the net during all seasons.
 - 3. A Condition of Approval was considered requiring the net to be stored when the golf course is not operating to reduce visual impacts and potential impacts to wildlife. The Applicant expressed concerns with this requirement:
 - a. The net is not designed to be taken down and put up seasonally. Routine installation and takedown would compromise the expected useful life of the net.

- b. The necessary staff time and resources to do this annually create an unanticipated burden on Golf staff.
 - c. The Golf Course lacks sufficient storage space for the net.
 - d. Base components that cannot be removed would be at risk of damage from lawn mowers, weed whackers, or snowcats.
 - e. Annual installation and takedown of the net could damage landscaping.
 - ii. Three Kings net:
 - 1. There are existing 40- to 50-foot-tall pine trees by the net that provide partial screening. A section of the net is not screened by existing vegetation. Staff recommends Condition of Approval 4, which requires the planting of additional vegetation of sufficient size to substantially screen the net during all seasons.
 - 2. The Applicant planted four additional trees in front of the location of the proposed net to help address visual impacts.
 - 3. The Applicant expressed similar concerns regarding the seasonal removal of the net.
- h. Building mass, bulk, and orientation, and the location of Buildings on the Site; including orientation to Buildings on adjoining Lots
 - i. Thaynes net:
 - 1. The Thaynes net is oriented to run parallel to the Thaynes pathway and will be screened by landscaping from the homes on the other side of Thaynes Canyon Drive.
 - ii. Three Kings net:
 - 1. The net is oriented in a location to prevent balls coming from the 12th hole and to provide protection for the Treatment Plant operations.
- i. Usable Open Space
 - i. The proposal will not expand the Footprint of the existing buildings on the Lot.
- j. Signs and lighting
 - i. The Applicant is not proposing any new Signage or lighting.
- k. Physical design and Compatibility with surrounding Structures in mass, scale, style, design, and architectural detailing.
 - i. The style of net is UV-treated polyester, similar to other nets that are used around the Golf Course.
- l. Noise, vibration, odors, steam, or other mechanical factors that might affect people and Property Off-Site

- i. The Applicant must comply with the City's noise regulations in Municipal Code of Park City (MCPC) Chapter 6-3.
 - m. Control of delivery and service vehicles, loading and unloading zones, and Screening of trash and recycling pickup Areas.
 - i. Neither net is in a location that would interfere with existing loading and unloading zones.
 - n. Expected Ownership and management of the project as primary residences, Condominiums, time interval Ownership, Nightly Rental, or commercial tenancies, how the form of Ownership affects taxing entities.
 - i. The nets are proposed to be installed on property owned by the City.
 - o. Within and adjoining the Site, Environmentally Sensitive Lands, Physical Mine Hazards, Historic Mine Waste and Park City Soils Ordinance, Steep Slopes, and appropriateness of the proposed Structure to the existing topography of the Site.
 - i. The Park City Golf Course is not within the Park City Soils Ordinance Boundary, there are no known Physical Mine Hazards or Historic Mine Waste, and the nets are not proposed to be installed on a Steep Slope. The Thaynes net is proposed to be adequately screened. Condition of Approval 4 requires the planting of additional vegetation for the Three Kings net to substantially screen the net during all seasons.
 - p. Reviewed for consistency with the goals and objectives of the Park City General Plan; however, such review for consistency shall not alone be binding.
 - i. Thaynes net:
 - 1. Strategy 3.4 of the General Plan recommends creating "safe bike/pedestrian pathways between all public spaces within City limits." The Thaynes pathway enhances a safe bike/pedestrian experience.
 - ii. Three Kings net:
 - 1. Objective 14.C of the General plan is to "[p]rovide safe drinking water to residents and visitors." The Three Kings Water Treatment Plant treats the water that comes from the Spiro Mine Tunnel to ensure it is safe for residents and visitors to drink. The net will ensure that the equipment for the facility, and the people who work there, are themselves, in turn, safe.
- 13. The Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal on August 5, 2025, and confirmed that it meets their standards.

14. Staff published notice on the City's website and the Utah Public Notice website and posted notice to the property on August 13, 2025. Staff mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 300 feet on August 13, 2025. *The Park Record* published courtesy notice on August 13, 2025.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposed CUP, as conditioned, complies with the requirements of the Land Management Code requirements outlined in LMC Chapter 15-2.6 *Urban Park District*, LMC Section 15-4-2 *Fences and Retaining Walls*, and LMC Section 15-1-10(E) *Conditional Use Permits*.
2. The proposed CUP is compatible with surrounding structures in use, scale, mass, and circulation.
3. The effects of any difference in use or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the final plans submitted to the Planning Department and reviewed August 27, 2025, by the Planning Commission and attached to this Final Action Letter as Attachment 1.
2. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning Department prior to making any changes to the approved plans. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with applicable standards by the Planning Director prior to construction.
3. The maximum height for the nets is 50 feet from Final Grade.
4. The Applicant shall submit an updated landscape plan that complies with the water-wise and Wildland Urban Interface codes with additional vegetation of sufficient size to be planted to screen the nets.
5. The Applicant shall obtain a Building Permit prior to commencement of any work for the project.
6. The Applicant shall obtain a Building Permit within one year of project approval, or the approval is void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the Planning Commission.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sigg. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

B. Parcel PC-SS-88 (Southeast Quinn's Junction East of HWY 40, South of the Rail Trail) – Conditional Use Permit – The Applicant Proposes a Conditional Use Permit for a Freestanding Telecommunications Facility to Replace Six Panel Antennas with Three Panel Antennas and Necessary Ground Equipment Located in the Recreation and Open Space District and Sensitive Land Overlay. PL-24-06268.

Planner Klopfenstein presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a CUP application for telecommunications facilities on Parcel PC-SS-88. This is located in the Richardson Flat area on the east side of Highway 40, just south of where the Rail Trail intersects with the freeway. He shared some images to indicate the location of the site and the existing infrastructure. The applicant proposes to reduce the number and size of panel antennas. There are currently nine and this would be reduced to six. Planner Klopfenstein highlighted an image that shows the existing size of the antennas. On the right of the presentation slide is the proposed size, which is just over 5 square feet each.

Planner Klopfenstein shared an image that shows the base of the poles. The top image is the existing conditions and the bottom image represents the proposed conditions. There are no changes proposed to the footprint of the base area. Some background information was shared with the Planning Commission. This was originally in the Summit County jurisdiction but was annexed in 2022. In 2000, there was a Site Lease. In 2013, the telecommunications providers replaced six antennas. There was another Building Permit in 2021. The site was then annexed into Park City in 2022. The applicant submitted the current application in December 2024, then applied for a variance with the Board of Adjustment on July 22, 2025. The variance was approved on August 19, 2025.

This is located in the Recreation Open Space Zone, which has a 28-foot height limit. The variance that was approved by the Board of Adjustment grants a height exception up to 76 feet for the existing poles. It also grants a variance for the size of the panel antennas. The code requires each base of the panel to be a maximum of 5 square feet. The applicant indicated that the industry standard for the panels is slightly over 5 square feet.

The applicant obtained variance approval to install panels that are 5.02 square feet each. Planner Klopfenstein reported that the panels themselves are located half an inch off of the mounting poles. As mentioned in the Staff Report, this application complies with the CUP criteria outlined in the code. After the Meeting Materials Packet was published, Staff received some additional feedback from the Environmental Regulatory Program Manager recommending an additional Condition of Approval, which is as follows:

- Condition of Approval #7:

- Any activities that disturb dirt shall comply with the Site Management Plan. If no Site Management Plan exists, the applicant shall work with the Environmental Protection Agency to confirm any additional requirements.

The applicant has indicated that at this time, there is no proposal to disturb dirt, but Staff recommends considering the additional Condition of Approval. Planner Klopfenstein reported that Staff recommends the Planning Commission review the CUP application, hold a public hearing, and consider approval based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval in the Draft Final Action Letter, as amended.

Commissioner Shand believed that essentially what is happening is that the antennas are being replaced. He assumes there is a new technology that enables them to reduce the number of antennas from nine to six, which was confirmed. Additional discussions were had about the 76-foot height variance that was granted by the Board of Adjustment.

Chair Van Dine opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Beal asked for clarification about the size of the poles and the placement of the antennas. Commissioner Johnson referenced Attachment 1 in the Meeting Materials Packet and explained that this shows the elevations. Planner Klopfenstein clarified that the 76-foot height refers to where the antennas are located on the pole.

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to APPROVE the Telecommunication Facility CUP for Parcel PC-SS-88 according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval, as amended:

Findings of Fact:

1. Parcel PC-SS-88 is a 145.59-acre metes-and-bounds Parcel in the Recreation and Open Space (ROS) Zoning District and Sensitive Land Overlay (SLO).
2. The Applicant proposes to upgrade an existing Telecommunications Facility east of HWY-40 and south of the Rail Trail.
3. The Applicant requests a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the replacement of older equipment and a reduction of the antenna from nine to six. The overall square footage is also reduced from 120 square feet to a proposed 63.6 square feet.
4. The Applicant proposes changes to the ground-level equipment but does not propose any changes to the Structure's Footprint.

5. In 2000, a site lease was signed between United Park City Mines, the then title owner of PC-SS-88, and VoiceStream PCS II Corporation, the tenant at the time, for the creation of a Telecommunications Facility.
6. At the time, PC-SS-88 was in unincorporated Summit County. VoiceStream was later rebranded as T-Mobile.
7. Although land use and Building Permits were required under the Summit County Code, the Summit County Planning Department was unable to locate any initial approvals for this Telecommunications Facility.
8. In a May 28, 2013 email, Summit County informed T-Mobile that it did not need land use or Building Permits for a scope of work to replace six existing antennas with six new antennas.
9. In a September 30, 2021 email, Summit County informed T-Mobile that it did not need a land use permit for the replacement of a microwave dish antenna. On December 16, 2021, Summit County issued a Building Permit for the antenna.
10. On June 16, 2022, the City Council of Park City approved Ordinance No. 2022-18 annexing Southeast Quinn's Junction, including PC-SS-88. The parcel was zoned ROS and SLO.
11. On December 16, 2024, the Applicant submitted a CUP application for the proposed upgrades to the Telecommunications Facility. Because there is no documented approval for the original facility, Planning staff determined a Variance is required. On July 22, 2025, the Applicant submitted PL-25-06224 requesting a Variance for the Telecommunications Facility.
12. On August 19, 2025, the Board of Adjustment held a public meeting and approved a Variance allowing a Building Height up to 76 feet from Existing Grade and allowing the antenna face area to be a maximum of 5.02 square feet.
13. The proposal to replace Telecommunications equipment complies with the Recreation and Open Space District requirements outlined in Land Management Code (LMC) Chapter 15-2.7.
 - a. The Applicant proposes replacing existing Telecommunications antenna and support equipment. LMC § 15-2.7-2(C)(22) establishes Telecommunications antenna as a Conditional Use requirement Planning Commission review and approval.

- b. LMC § 15-2.7-3 establishes a 25-foot Setback for the ROS. The existing facility is 55 feet from the Lot Line and all proposed work will be located within the existing Footprint.
 - c. LMC § 15-2.7-4 establishes a Height of 27 feet above Existing Grade for the ROS Zoning District. The top of the proposed new antenna would be 76 feet above Existing Grade. On August 19, 2025, the Board of Adjustment approved a Variance allowing the antennas installation up to 76 feet above Existing Grade.
14. The proposal to replace Telecommunications equipment complies, as conditioned, with the Sensitive Land Overlay Regulations in LMC Chapter 15-2.21.
- a. The facility is not located near Steep Slopes or a Ridgeline.
 - b. The facility can be seen from two of the Designated Vantage Points in LMC § 15-2.21-3(6):
 - i. The roundabout at the Park City Hospital (900 Round Valley Drive).
 - ii. The intersection of the Rail Trail and Richardson Flat Road.
 - iii. While the Telecommunication Facility has visual impacts, the proposal reduces them because the Antenna are reduced from nine to six and the square footage is reduced from 120 square feet to a proposed 63.6 square feet.
 - c. As the facility's Building Footprint will not be expanded, no Wetlands or Wildlife habitats will be impacted.
15. The proposal to replace Telecommunications equipment complies with the Telecommunication Facilities Regulations in LMC Section 15-4-14.
- a. LMC § 15-4-14(F)(2) establishes the allowed height for Telecommunications Facilities as the Zone Height. LMC § 15-2.7-4 establishes a Height of 27 feet above Existing Grade for the ROS Zoning District. The top of the proposed new antenna would be located 76 feet from Existing Grade. On August 19, 2025, the Board of Adjustment approved a Variance allowing the antennas to be installed up to 76 feet above Existing Grade.
 - b. LMC § 15-4-14(F)(3) states that a Telecommunications Facility shall be an ancillary Use on the Lot which it is placed. The main uses for PC-SS-88 are Open Space and recreation.
 - c. LMC § 15-4-14(F)(4)(C) establishes that Panel Antennas shall be no more than five square feet in Area per face, unless otherwise approved through a Variance by the Board of Adjustment. The proposed Panel Antennas are 5.02 square feet in Area per face. On

August 19, 2025, the Board of Adjustment approved a Variance raising the maximum square feet in Area per face to 5.02 square feet.

- d. LMC § 15-4-14(F)(4)(d) requires Freestanding Antennas to be mounted a maximum of 12 inches from the pole. The proposed antennas are located half an inch from the mounting poles.
16. The proposal to replace Telecommunications equipment, as conditioned, complies with the Conditional Use Permit criteria outlined in LMC Section 15-1-10(E).
- a. Size and location of the Site
 - i. The proposed facility is in the same location as the existing Structure. The proposal reduces visual impacts because the Antenna are reduced from nine to six and the square footage is reduced from 120 square feet to 63.6 square feet.
 - b. Traffic considerations including capacity of the existing Streets in the Area
 - i. There is no paved access to the site but there is a dirt service track that is used for maintenance of the facility.
 - c. Utility capacity, including Storm Water run-off.
 - i. On July 1, 2025, the Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal and found it conformed with their requirements.
 - d. Emergency vehicle Access
 - i. As the location will not change, the methods of access by emergency services will not change either. The Park City Fire District reviewed the proposal on July 1, 2025, and confirmed it meets their standards.
 - e. Location and amount of off-Street parking
 - i. LMC § 15-3-6 does not require parking for Telecommunication Facilities.
 - f. Internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation system
 - i. The proposed location is not accessible to passenger vehicles. The site will only be accessed for maintenance.
 - g. Fencing, Screening, and landscaping to separate the Use from adjoining Uses.
 - i. There is an existing chain metal Fence surrounding the ground equipment of the facility. The Applicant is not proposing to modify this Fence.
 - ii. While the facility can be seen by those on HWY-40 and engaging in recreation activities in Richardson Flats, the overall visual impact is reduced from existing conditions because antenna will be reduced from nine to six and the

- square footage is reduced from 120 square feet to 63.6 square feet.
- iii. No Landscaping is proposed with this application.
 - h. Building mass, bulk, and orientation, and the location of Buildings on the Site; including orientation to Buildings on adjoining Lots
 - i. The proposed Structure is in the same location as the existing Structure and the overall square footage of Antenna is being reduced.
 - i. Usable Open Space
 - i. The proposal will not expand the Footprint of the existing facility.
 - j. Signs and lighting
 - i. The Applicant is not proposing any new Signage or lighting.
 - k. Physical design and Compatibility with surrounding Structures in mass, scale, style, design, and architectural detailing
 - i. The antenna is of the same design as the existing antenna, a white panel antenna. It will be reduced in size from what is existing.
 - l. Noise, vibration, odors, steam, or other mechanical factors that might affect people and Property Off-Site
 - i. The Applicant must comply with the City's noise regulations in Municipal Code of Park City (MCPC) Chapter 6-3.
 - m. Control of delivery and service vehicles, loading and unloading zones, and Screening of trash and recycling pickup Areas
 - i. The methods of delivery and pickup will not change.
 - n. Expected Ownership and management of the project as primary residences, Condominiums, time interval Ownership, Nightly Rental, or commercial tenancies, how the form of Ownership affects taxing entities.
 - i. The ownership will not change.
 - o. Within and adjoining the Site, Environmentally Sensitive Lands, Physical Mine Hazards, Historic Mine Waste and Park City Soils Ordinance, Steep Slopes, and appropriateness of the proposed Structure to the existing topography of the Site.
 - i. The proposed Telecommunication Facility is proposed to be installed where the existing Structure stands. It is not within the Park City Soils Ordinance Boundary, there are no known Physical Mine Hazards or Historic Mine Waste, and the Structure is not proposed to be installed on a Steep Slope. Visual impacts are reduced.
 - p. Reviewed for consistency with the goals and objectives of the Park City General Plan; however, such review for consistency shall not alone be binding.

- i. Goal 1 of the General Plan is “Park City will protect undeveloped lands, discourage sprawl, and direct growth inward to strengthen existing neighborhoods.” The proposed CUP supports this goal by maintaining an existing Structure, eliminating the need for new facilities on undeveloped lands. The proposed project also reduces the visual impacts of the facility by incorporating fewer and smaller panel antennas.
17. Staff published notice on the City’s website and the Utah Public Notice website and posted notice to the property on August 13, 2025. Staff mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 300 feet on August 13, 2025. The Park Record published courtesy notice on August 13, 2025.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposed CUP, as conditioned, complies with the requirements of LMC Chapter 15-2.7 *Recreation Open Space Districts*, LMC Chapter 15-2.21 *Sensitive Land Overlay Regulations*, LMC Section 15-4-14 *Telecommunication Facilities*, and LMC Section 15-1-10(E) *Conditional Use Permits*.
2. The proposed CUP is compatible with surrounding structures in use, scale, mass, and circulation.
3. The effects of any difference in use or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the final plans submitted to the Planning Department and reviewed August 27, 2025, by the Planning Commission and attached to this Final Action Letter as Attachment 1.
2. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning Department prior to making any changes to the approved plans. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with applicable standards by the Planning Director prior to construction.
3. The maximum height for the existing Telecommunications Facility is 76 feet from Existing Grade.

4. The maximum area per face allowed for panel antennas at the existing Telecommunications Facility is 5.02 square feet.
5. The Applicant shall obtain a Building Permit prior to commencement of any work for the project.
6. The Applicant shall obtain a Building Permit within one year of project approval, or the approval is void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the Planning Commission.
7. Any activities that disturb dirt shall comply with the site management plan. If no site management plan exists, the applicant shall work with the Environmental Protection Agency to confirm any additional requirements.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Shand. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- C. 340 Main Street – Conditional Use Permit Modification** – The Applicant Proposes to Install Upgrades to the Existing Telecommunications Equipment on the Roof of the Structure in the Historic Commercial Business Zoning District. PL-25-06517.

Manager Martin presented the Staff Report and explained that this is an application for a CUP Modification for a telecommunications facility at 340 Main Street. The original CUP was approved in 2017 by the Planning Commission. This approved the telecommunications facility on the roof of the building at 340 Main Street. The existing equipment is not visible from Main Street or Swede Alley, but it is visible from Marsac Avenue and the China Bridge Parking Structure. The modification is for upgraded equipment, which will be located in the same 21 square foot leased area on the rooftop. The upgraded equipment maintains the setback of 15 feet from the roof parapet on Swede Alley and one inch under the tallest plane of the Main Street facing parapet.

LMC 15-4-14 – Supplemental Regulations for Telecommunications Facilities requires documentation detailing the need for upgrades. The applicant submitted the justification, explaining that the upgrades are needed to ensure compliance with current safety and performance standards, reduce the number of dropped calls and improve data speeds, and support public safety communications and emergency response. Some vantage point images were shared with the Commission. As conditioned, there are no unmitigated impacts per the LMC CUP criteria. One of the Conditions of Approval is to require upgraded equipment to blend with the building exterior and surroundings. The Planning Commission may require an additional condition to install screening of the antennas to mitigate the visual impact. Staff recommends the Commission review the CUP

modification, conduct a public hearing, and consider approval based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval in the Draft Final Action Letter.

Commissioner Shand referenced the possibility of screening and mentioned Figure 3 in the Staff Report. He asked about the height comparison between the existing equipment and the new equipment. It was clarified that the height is the same. There are elements of the new upgraded equipment that will actually be reduced slightly in height.

Chair Van Dine opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

The applicant representative, Keleigh Adams, stated that she works for Centerline Communications. Lucas Sanders is also available to answer any Commissioner questions about the application. Commissioner Johnson asked whether the other Commissioners were interested in discussing additional screening, which was denied.

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to APPROVE the CUP Modification for 340 Main Street, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. 340 Main Street is located in the Historic Commercial Business Zoning (HCB) District and is a non-Historic Site.
2. In the HCB Zoning District, a Telecommunications Facility requires compliance with Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-4-14, *Telecommunications Facilities* and a Conditional Use Permit, pursuant to the review criteria outlined in LMC §15-1-10(E).
3. On May 10, 2017, the Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use Permit for a Telecommunications Facilities on the rooftop of the non-Historic building at 340 Main Street.
4. The Applicant submitted a request to modify the 2017 CUP to install upgraded Telecommunications equipment in the same location as the existing Telecommunications Facility.
5. The proposed upgrades include replacing the OVP Unit, relocating the existing microwave Antennae, swapping out the Omni Antenna for a new Verizon Panel Antenna, replacing the two Verizon RRH Units, and adding one new C-Band Antenna.

6. The proposed CUP modification to install equipment upgrades to an existing Telecommunications Facility complies with the HC Zoning District and meets the criteria outlined in LMC § 15-4-14, *Supplemental Regulations for Telecommunication Facilities*.
 - a. The Applicant submitted documentation detailing the need for the upgraded Telecommunications Facility, per LMC § 15-4-14(B)(1).
 - b. The HCB Zoning District has no minimum required Setbacks.
 - c. The proposed new Roof Mounted Antennas meet the height requirements because the Antenna Setback is greater than the height of the Antenna.
 - d. The rooftop equipment is entirely hidden from view of Main Street and Swede Alley behind the roof parapet.
 - e. Condition of Approval 4 requires that Antenna and associated equipment shall incorporate materials and colors present in the context of the surrounding Area and Panel Antennas shall be no more than five square feet (5 sq. ft.) in Area per face.
7. The proposal to modify the Conditional Use Permit to install upgraded Telecommunications equipment on the roof of the Structure at 340 Main Street complies with LMC § 15-1-10(E) CUP Criteria.
8. The CUP review criteria findings in the Analysis Section of the Staff Report are incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposal, as conditioned, satisfies all Conditional Use Permit review criteria as established by the LMC's Conditional Use Review process (§15-1-10(E), Criteria 1-16).
2. The proposed upgrades the existing Telecommunications Facility meet the criteria in LMC § 15-4-14, *Supplemental Regulations for Telecommunication Facilities*, as conditioned.
3. The effects of any differences in use or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The scope of this approval includes the upgrading of the Telecommunications Facilities on the rooftop of the non-Historic commercial Structure at 340 Main Street, as well as additional support

equipment on the rooftop and within the top floor of the building, as shown on the approved plans.

2. The rooftop equipment shall be entirely contained within the 21 square foot 'Lease Area 1' as shown on the plans. The interior equipment shall be entirely contained within the 16 square foot 'Lease Area 2' as shown on the plans.
3. The Antennas shall not project above the building parapet as seen from Main Street and Swede Alley and shall be set back a minimum of 15 feet from the edge of the roof.
4. The upgraded Telecommunications equipment shall blend with the building's exterior and surroundings. Final design is subject to approval by Planning Staff during the Building Permit application stage.
5. All necessary cable chases shall also be painted to blend with the existing building.
6. Signs shall only be installed on site if necessary for the health and safety of the general public and shall not be visible from Main Street or Swede Alley.
7. Prior to installing the equipment, the applicant must apply for and procure a Building Permit from the Building Department

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sigg. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

7. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Commissioner Shand moved to ADJOURN. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.

From: Jennifer Adler <js_adler@yahoo.com.au>

Sent: Wednesday, August 27, 2025 3:38 PM

To: planning <planning@parkcity.gov>

Cc: Michelle Kellogg <michelle.kellogg@parkcity.gov>; Rebecca Ward <rebecca.ward@parkcity.gov>; Jaron Ehlers <jaron.ehlers@parkcity.gov>

Subject: [External] For tonight - Public input Planning Commission. Re Thaynes nets

Warning: Replies to this message will go to js_adler@yahoo.com.au. If you are unsure this is correct please contact the helpdesk.

[CAUTION] This is an external email.

Could this note please be distributed to Planning Commission members as I am not able to make tonight's meeting, and added to the public record?

Dear Planning Commission members,

I am a resident of Thaynes Canyon and drive up/down Thaynes Canyon Drive daily in addition to walking.

I am writing to oppose the proposed netting along Thaynes Canyon Drive.

Firstly, I am concerned about the impact on the neighborhood of the net's height and scale, especially as Thaynes is known for its more "rural" (for want of a better word) setting and views. A large and extremely high net is a detriment to surrounding homes and resident's enjoyment of Thaynes's setting.

Secondly, I don't think protecting the new walking/biking path is sufficient justification for the size of what is proposed. This is not a high use path (in fact, I have been opposed to the path since the beginning due to lack of need/low foot traffic and the option of walking along the golf course verge). Additionally, there is a lot more vegetation that could be planted to provide a shield that would fill in gaps, be more visually appealing and not block views.

I wasn't able to provide input earlier in the process due to my absence for a family funeral but wanted to let you know through my input tonight that there isn't broad-based support for the netting. Additionally, a lack of previous public input doesn't indicate support for the proposal.

Thank you,

Jennifer Adler