



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
OCTOBER 8, 2025**

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair Christin Van Dine, Bill Johnson, John Frontero, Grant Tilson, Henry Sigg (attending virtually)

EX OFFICIO: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Elissa Martin, Planning Project Manager; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney; Becky Gutknecht, Assistant City Engineer; Lillian Zollinger, Planner III; Nan Larsen, Senior Planner; Alec Barton, Senior Planner

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Christin Van Dine called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. All Commissioners are present with the exception of Commissioner Seth Beal and Commissioner Rick Shand. Commissioner Henry Sigg is attending the meeting virtually.

2. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

There were no communications or disclosures.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

4. CONTINUATIONS

- A. Parcel PC-SS-121-X (Clark Ranch) – Zone Change – Ordinance –** The Applicant Proposes a Zone Change from Recreation Open Space to Residential Development Medium for an Affordable Development in the Sensitive Land Overlay. The Planning Commission May Consider Alternative Zone Designations or an Affordable Housing Overlay. PL-25-06656.

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that the applicant has requested that this item be continued to the October 22, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting. The applicant representatives are attending the meeting virtually. If there are any Commissioner questions about the continuation. Commissioner John Frontero asked to share a

comment with the applicant. He understands the applicant's request for a continuance in order to address the previous Planning Commission questions. However, there is something else he would like the applicant to address at the next meeting.

Commissioner Frontero noted that the Planning Commission is being asked to consider a rezone on 10 acres. The rezone that is proposed will result in 20 units per acre, which is much more density than Park City Heights. It seems like a large increase from the neighboring project. The City is donating the land, so there is no land acquisition cost in the financial analysis, but the applicant is still requesting almost 40% market rate unit by square footage percentage. He finds that number to be high, given that there is no land acquisition cost associated with this project. Commissioner Frontero would like to better understand why the 40% market rate unit is needed to make this work when the land is essentially being donated. As for land use, after reading the COSAC report and speaking to some members who were on the COSAC Committee, it seems like market-rate housing is not what this area was intended to be used for. There were discussions about senior housing and other housing to support the community. Commissioner Frontero is struggling with the balance and asked that additional clarification be provided.

Chair Van Dine opened the public hearing. It was noted that written comments can be submitted to planning@parkcity.gov. Director Ward clarified that there are two public hearings related to Clark Ranch. The first is related to the Rezone and the second is related to the Subdivision. Chair Van Dine explained that this hearing is for Item 4(A), which is the zone change. There were no comments. The public hearing was continued.

MOTION: Commissioner Frontero moved to CONTINUE Parcel PC-SS-121-X (Clark Ranch) – Zone Change and the Public Hearing to the October 22, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Johnson. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- B. Parcel PC-SS-121-X (Clark Ranch) – Subdivision –** The Applicant Proposes to Create a Three-Lot Subdivision to Construct 201 Dwelling Units on No More than 10 Acres Through a Master Planned Development in the Sensitive Land Overlay. PL-25-06655.

Director Ward reported that this item is proposed to be continued to October 22, 2025.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to CONTINUE Parcel PC-SS-121-X (Clark Ranch) – Subdivision and the Public Hearing to the October 22, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tilson. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

5. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. 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 with Limits of Disturbance Pursuant to the Robbins Annexation Agreement. PL-23-05882.

Planning Project Manager, Elissa Martin, presented the Staff Report and explained that this relates to the Iron Canyon Subdivision Phase 2 Final Plat. She shared some background information with the Commission. The Final Plat includes three parcels in the Thaynes Neighborhood adjacent to Iron Canyon Drive. The largest parcel that makes up the 1.73-acre lot is Parcel SS-104-B, which was recently annexed into Park City. The Annexation Agreement included several requirements for future development of the lot and the Final Plat. For example, the gross floor area of the single-family dwelling must not exceed 7,500 square feet, the building height is limited to 25 feet, and the Final Plat must address the remnant pieces of IC-MISC. In addition, there was a requirement for a comprehensive Sensitive Land Overlay (“SLO”) Analysis to establish Limits of Disturbance (“LOD”). There was also a requirement for a 10-foot-wide Public Utility Easement (“PUE”) and Public Access Easement to be submitted for a sidewalk.

The Planning Commission reviewed the proposed Final Plat and LOD at the Work Session on August 27, 2025. One of the main points that was brought up at the last Work Session was how to address the remnant pieces. Manager Martin shared a map of IC-MISC. The applicant decided to plat those remnant portions of the parcel and dedicate them to the City as public right-of-way. That is included in the Exhibit for the Final Plat.

Manager Martin shared what was proposed and discussed at the last Work Session. The plans included LOD that had 10,888 square feet of hard surface paved area, including the driveway and 15 additional parking spaces. The single-family dwelling building footprint was 6,400 square feet and the accessory building footprint was 731 square feet. The total LOD was 18,019 square feet, which was 24% of the 1.73-acre lot. The Staff Report included an analysis that the driveway did not meet the standards of Land Management Code (“LMC”) 15-3. The Planning Commission direction provided at that Work Session was for the applicant to reduce the hard surface paved area so it was compatible with the surrounding LOD and to lessen the impacts in the SLO.

At the last Work Session, there were some comparisons provided for the surrounding neighborhood LOD and driveways. Based on the Work Session discussion, Staff refined the data slightly to focus on lots that were comparable and similar in size to the 1.73-acre applicant lot. The highlighted entries on the table in the Meeting Materials Packet reflect lots within one acre. The remaining data points are for lots that are one-half acre and higher. Manager Martin explained that the highlighted sections represent lots that are

most comparable to the applicant lot. The average LOD for those is 18% of the total lot size.

The updated LOD information was shared. Manager Martin reported that there is a reduction proposed. The driveway is now proposed to be 6,400 square feet and there are no additional parking spaces. The single-family dwelling will have a building footprint of 6,500 square feet and the footprint of the accessory apartment is 900 square feet. The total LOD is 13,800 square feet, which is 18.2% of the 1.73-acre lot. There is a Condition of Approval in the Draft Final Action Letter that allows for a slight adjustment, because the applicant is still working to finalize the design of the single-family dwelling and the accessory apartment. The intention is to provide a little bit of flexibility to the applicant. However, the applicant would not be allowed to exceed the 18.2% total mentioned earlier.

Commissioner Frontero asked if the applicant would need to submit information in writing for Staff approval. He wanted to better understand the flexibility described. Manager Martin explained that once a plat is approved by the Planning Commission, it goes through the plat redline process. This is where it is reviewed by the Engineering Department and the City Attorney. During that process, there are some minor changes that might happen. In this case, it is proposed that the applicant will have the ability to finalize the LOD lines on the plat during that phase. The design of the home is not completed at this time, so there might be some slight changes proposed. She reiterated that this flexibility will not change the total LOD of 13,800 square feet.

Commissioner Frontero pointed out that the Staff Report has two different Plat Note 4 listed and asked if that is a typo. Manager Martin confirmed that it is a typo. She wanted to provide numbers in the Staff Report so it was possible to make references during the discussions. Commissioner Sigg had a question about the 1,000-foot buffer. He believed that if the driveway was increased by 1,000 square feet, then the building would be reduced, which was confirmed. Manager Martin reported that the modifications for the boundary that have been expressed by the applicant will focus on the dwelling itself.

Commissioner Sigg asked about the verification process. Manager Martin reported that the Planning Department will handle the verification. When the Building Permit is submitted, the Planning Department will review the submitted plans and ensure that the building footprint lines up with what was platted. Director Ward discussed the language for Condition of Approval #5, which mentions any minor modifications to the LOD based on the final design of the single-family dwelling. Her interpretation of that is that the area around the home might be modified slightly, but the driveway will not be. Manager Martin pointed out that if the building footprint of the single-family dwelling is expanded, the applicant would need to take away from something else, like the accessory apartment or the driveway. She further discussed the 1,000 square foot threshold.

Commissioner Johnson noted that there is a lot of flexibility being provided to the applicant. Manager Martin shared information about the platting process. There is a

general location of the footprint and driveway determined, but without the final design, some flexibility is needed. Commissioner Johnson understands wanting that flexibility, but expressed concerns about allowing the flexibility based on the previous discussions.

Commissioner Frontero agreed with the comments shared by Commissioner Johnson. He is leaning towards not making a recommendation until he feels more comfortable with the Final Plat. He finds it unusual that a Subdivision would be approved prior to seeing the final design. Commissioner Sigg agreed with the concerns that have been expressed. There will likely be some amendments and tweaks made, but the Planning Commission is being asked to sign off on a Final Plat. He is hesitant to move this forward, as it is not final. Chair Van Dine disagreed with the comments from the other Commissioners. There is not a lot of flexibility being requested. Considering the reductions that have been made and that previous Commissioner comments were taken into account, she believes the flexibility request is reasonable. She does not think this is a significant ask.

Commissioner Sigg asked the City Attorney for feedback on this matter. Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, explained that parameters are being established. This approach might be a little uncommon based on more recent applications, but in other subdivisions, there have been broader delegations. Staff has tried to allow for flexibility for a relatively nominal amount, which is a 1,000 square foot adjustment. If there are particular areas of the site the Planning Commission would like to protect, this can be communicated and Conditions of Approval can be drafted. He agrees with the comments from Chair Van Dine and cautioned the Commission against being overly restrictive.

Manager Martin shared information about the parking and driveway standards. The revised driveway complies with the Off-Street Parking requirements in Chapter 15-3 for a circular driveway. The single-family dwelling requires two parking spaces and then there is one space per room for the accessory apartment. The attached single-family dwelling garage provides four spaces. There are areas in the driveway that will accommodate additional parking as well. The 15 parking spaces that were proposed in the first iteration have been removed and now there is a compliant circular driveway that meets all of the dimensional standards. The driveway access has been reviewed by Engineering and there is support for the access point on Iron Canyon Drive. There is a Condition of Approval that states that if there is a requirement from the Engineering Department to shift it slightly during the redline phase, it can be shifted. However, it has been reviewed and the Engineering Department has expressed approval for the proposed location.

Staff found that there is Good Cause for the Final Plat, as the proposed lot meets the requirements of the Single Family Zoning District. In addition, the plat dedicates a 10-foot-wide public access easement for a sidewalk that connects the neighborhood with the existing sidewalk along Payday Drive. The plat dedicates remnant portions of Parcel IC-MISC to the City as public right-of-way, ensuring that the Subdivision does not create remnant parcels. The plat includes LOD compatible with the surrounding neighborhood

and mitigates the impacts of development within the SLO. The Staff recommendation is to:

- 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 Sensitive Land Overlay;
- Conduct a public hearing; and
- Consider approving the Final Plat based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter.
 - Amend Condition of Approval 13 to state: "Design must show connection points to existing Park City water infrastructure."

Manager Martin reported that the applicant representative, Brad Mackay from Ivory Development, LLC, is present at the Planning Commission Meeting to answer questions.

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

Director Ward asked if the applicant representative had heard the Planning Commission discussion, since he had just stepped into the room. This was denied. Mr. Mackay asked for a summary of the concerns. Chair Van Dine explained that the concern raised by some Commissioners related to the 1,000 square foot flexibility. Some of the Commissioners would like more details about the final structures and placement.

Commissioner Frontero is still uncomfortable with the way the language is written. He noted that 1,000 square feet of flexibility is a lot. He asked the applicant to explain why the 1,000 square feet is needed and wondered whether 500 would be possible. Manager Martin clarified that the 1,000 square feet did not come from the applicant. It was an estimation from Planning Staff about what would be reasonable. At this point, the driveway is designed to meet the standards of the code. She does not see how the hard-surface paved area could be increased without going beyond the code requirements. The 24-foot width is already the maximum width there can be for a circular driveway. Commissioner Johnson asked if it would be possible to increase the size of the single-family dwelling from 6,500 square feet to 7,500 square feet and reduce the hardscape, which was confirmed. He noted that the Commission needs to think of the worst-case scenario. It might be possible to adjust Condition of Approval #5 to address concerns.

Mr. Mackay asked what would happen if the Commission wanted 500 square feet, but there was a buyer on the lot who wanted to do something different. It was noted that the applicant would need to return to the Planning Commission. The Condition of Approval states that any major modifications to the LOD would require Planning Commission review and approval. As currently written, within 1,000 square feet, that threshold could be approved by the Planning Department. Discussions were had about the numbers that

could shift. Manager Martin explained that if one is adjusted, then something else would need to compensate. She reported that the LOD includes the building footprint.

Mr. Mackay does not understand the concerns expressed by the Planning Commission about whether the overall LOD percentage will remain the same. He believes it makes sense for the Planning Department to handle the flexibility, since the overall percentage of LOD will remain. It does not make sense for this to return to the Planning Commission as long as it all remains within the percentage maximum. Commissioner Johnson stated that he trusts the Planning Department and expressed support for Condition of Approval #5.

Chair Van Dine pointed out that there will still be a staff-level review that takes place. She trusts Staff to make thoughtful decisions about this application. Commissioner Sigg also trusts Staff with the verification process, but asked that this be done prior to the mylar preparation. Manager Martin confirmed that this can be done. There was discussion about amendments to the Draft Final Action Letter and the Conditions of Approval.

It was noted that there is consensus for Condition of Approval #5 to remain as written, but the Plat Note numbers referenced earlier were amended. The previously mentioned amendments to Condition of Approval #13 were made. Commissioner Johnson discussed Condition of Approval #6 and asked what the minimum sidewalk width would be. Assistant City Engineer, Becky Gutknecht, reported that it is 6 feet. She explained that this means a minimum of a 6-foot sidewalk could be placed in this right-of-way.

Mr. Mackay reported that he had been forwarded some of the public comments from neighbors who asked for an asphalt trail for bicycles in lieu of a sidewalk. There is a willingness to do an 8-foot asphalt trail in lieu of the sidewalk as long as it is adjacent to the street. Commissioner Johnson thought it made sense to provide flexibility to the Engineering Department. Additional discussions were had about Condition of Approval #6. Commissioner Frontero asked Engineer Gutknecht to comment on an 8-foot-wide asphalt trail. Engineer Gutknecht explained that there could be work done with the applicant to determine what would be best for the surrounding area. Some people prefer sidewalks and some people prefer pathways, so there could be discussions with the neighborhood. Amendments were made to Condition of Approval #3 based on the feedback received.

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to APPROVE the Subdivision Final Plat for Iron Canyon Phase 2 Subdivision according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval, as amended:

Findings of Fact:

1. The Applicant submitted an Annexation petition application on September 28, 2023, for Parcel SS-104-B, a 0.94-acre vacant parcel that was an island

of unincorporated Summit County, surrounded by land previously annexed into the Park City Municipal Boundary.

2. The Applicant submitted a Subdivision application on January 9, 2024, to create three Lots from Parcels SS-104-B, PCA-105, and portions of adjacent Parcel IC-MISC, in accordance with Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-8-3, which requires review and final action of a Preliminary Plat if the Annexation petition includes property intended for future development.
3. The City Council considered the Annexation petition and Subdivision preliminary plat for three Lots on May 7, 2024, and voted to accept the Annexation petition for continued processing, advising the Applicant that they would consider approving the Annexation and preliminary plat for creation of one Single-Family Dwelling (SFD) Lot.
4. The Applicant amended their Subdivision application with a preliminary plat to create one 1.73-acre Lot.
5. On October 23, 2024, the Planning Commission recommended approval to the City Council, of the Subdivision preliminary plat, Zoning Map Amendment, and Annexation Agreement, which included terms for the future development of the property to comply with the goals of the General Plan, the stated Annexation Purpose in the LMC § 15-8-1, and the zoning requirements of the Single Family (SF) Zoning District and the Sensitive Land Overlay (SLO).
6. On December 19, 2024, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2024-22, approving the annexation of Parcel SS-104-B and a zoning map amendment to zone the property SF within the SLO.
7. On August 14, 2025, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2025-18, approving an amendment to Ordinance No. 2024-22 to correct the legal description and implement an effective date of August 14, 2025.
8. As conditioned, the proposed Final Subdivision Plat meets the requirements outlined in the Robbins Annexation Agreement:
 - a. Condition of Approval 4 requires that plat notes be added to the Final Plat, which include all required plat notes in the Annexation Agreement.
 - b. A Final Subdivision Plat to create a Lot was submitted to the Planning Department and reviewed by the Planning Commission for Final Action.

- c. The remnant portions of Parcel IC-MISC have been addressed as part of the Final Plat application; the proposed Iron Canyon Subdivision Phase 2 plat includes remnant portions of Parcel IC-MISC as Parcels A, B, C, and D for dedication to the City as public right-of-way.
 - d. A comprehensive SLO Analysis was completed at the time of Final Plat that establishes the platted LOD for the SFD, Accessory Dwelling, driveway and hard surface areas, for neighborhood compatibility and to protect viewsheds and the northern entry corridor.
 - e. A plat note is included on the proposed plat that states: all Structures and hard surface paved areas shall be contained within the platted Limits of Disturbance.
 - f. The Final Plat dedicates a ten-foot-wide, non-exclusive, public easement across the Petitioner's Property along the frontage of Iron Canyon Drive, for the purposes of public access, utilities, irrigation, storm water drainage, and snow storage.
9. The proposed driveway LOD meets the standards outlined in LMC § 15-3-3(H) Driveway Widths and Spacing, which requires a maximum total width of 27 feet at the curb, through the length of the driveway, with the exception of circular driveways, which must provide one leg leading directly to and from a legally located garage or carport, be paved with a hard surface, have a minimum width of twelve feet (12') and a maximum width of twenty-four feet 24", and provide a Landscaped Area at least fifteen feet (15') in depth from the Front Property Line to the inside of the drive.
- a. The proposed circular driveway is 27 feet in width at the curb, then splits into two 12-foot-wide drives with a landscaped Area in the center that begins 15 feet from the Front Property Line and extends to the inside of the drive. The circular drives widen to 24 feet and the area directly in front of the garage widens to approximately 44 feet to access the four-car garage, in accordance with the driveway width exception stated in LMC § 15-3-3(H), which allows driveways to widen beyond 27 feet in front of an approved garage to allow safe ingress and egress to the garage.
10. As conditioned, the proposed Final Plat meets the requirements of the SF Zoning District and the Sensitive Lands Overlay by:
- a. The proposed plat will create one Lot for the development of an SFD and an affordable Accessory Apartment, which meets the maximum density of the SF Zoning District of three units per acre.

- b. The proposed plat includes Limits of Disturbance to minimize impacts of development on environmentally sensitive land within the Sensitive Lands Overlay, in accordance with LMC § 15-2.21. As conditioned, impacts to existing vegetation are mitigated by requiring any Significant Vegetation that is approved for removal to be replaced with equivalency and all disturbed vegetation to be replaced to existing or improved conditions.
- 11. As conditioned, there is Good Cause for the proposed Subdivision, in accordance with the requirements of LMC § 15-7.1-6 *Final Subdivision Plat*, based on the following:
 - a. The proposed Lot meets the requirements of the SF Zoning District by platting a 1.73-acre Lot for development of one SFD and Accessory Dwelling, which meets the maximum Density for Subdivisions of three units per acre.
 - b. The plat dedicates a ten-foot-wide public access easement for a sidewalk that connects the neighborhood with the existing sidewalk along Payday Drive.
 - c. The Plat dedicates remnant pieces of Parcel IC-MISC to the City as public ROW, ensuring that the Subdivision does not create remnant parcels.
 - d. The plat includes Limits of Disturbance compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, which mitigate impacts of development within the Sensitive Lands Overlay.

Conclusions of Law:

- 1. The Final Subdivision Plat to create one 1.73-acre Lot for development of a Single-Family Dwelling and Affordable Accessory Apartment complies with the SF Zoning District and the Sensitive Land Overlay.
- 2. There is Good Cause for the Subdivision Final Plat, consistent with Land Management Code Section 15-7.1-6, *Final Subdivision Plat*;
- 3. Approval of the Subdivision, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval:

- 1. The City Planner, City Attorney, and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the Plat for compliance with State Law, the

Land Management Code, and the Conditions of Approval, prior to recordation of the Plat.

2. The applicant shall record the Final Plat within one year from the date of this approval. If the Final Plat is not recorded within one year's time, this approval for the Final Subdivision Plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the Planning Director.
3. The Applicant shall dedicate the remnant pieces of IC-MISC to the City upon recordation of the Final Plat as Public ROW.
4. The following plat notes shall be included on the Final Plat:

Plat Note 1: Nightly Rentals are prohibited.

Plat Note 2: Development of the Lot is limited to one Single-Family Dwelling and one affordable External Accessory Apartment.

Plat Note 3: The Lot shall not be subdivided further.

Plat Note 4: The Single-Family Dwelling shall be limited in size with a maximum Gross Residential Floor Area of 7,500 square feet with the second level Floor Area not to exceed 35% of the overall Gross Residential Floor Area. The External Accessory Apartment shall not exceed 1,000 square feet in Gross Residential Floor Area.

Plat Note 5: Building height of the Single-Family Dwelling shall be limited to 25 feet from Existing Grade. Building height of the Accessory Apartment shall be limited to 18 feet from Existing Grade. Building Height exceptions outlined in Land Management Code § 15-2.11-4 apply to the Single-Family Dwelling, and do not apply to the External Accessory Apartment. Additional External Accessory Structures are prohibited.

Plat Note 6: All Structures and hard surface paved areas shall be contained within the platted Limits of Disturbance. The total Limits of Disturbance of the home, the External Accessory Apartment and hard surface paved areas, including the driveway, shall not exceed 18.2% of the total area of Lot 1, or 13,800 square feet.

Plat Note 7: Temporary construction disturbance shall be limited to 20 feet beyond the platted Limits of Disturbance, and such disturbed area shall be revegetated with landscaping.

Plat Note 8: The affordable External Accessory Apartment is subject to the approved Housing Mitigation Plan and deed restriction recorded with the Summit County Recorder in accordance with requirements of Ordinance No. 2024-22.

Plat Note 9: Parcels A, B, C, and D are hereby dedicated to Park City Municipal Corporation as public Right-of-Way.

5. Any minor modifications to the LOD, based on the final design of the SFD, require Planning Department review and approval prior to recording the plat; the square footage of the building footprints and hard surface paved areas may be adjusted within a threshold of no more than 1,000 square feet and the final total LOD of the SFD, Accessory Dwelling and driveway shall not exceed 18.2% or 13,800 square feet of the area of the 1.73-acre Lot and the general location of the buildings and driveway, sited on the Lot shall be maintained. Major modifications to the LOD require Planning Commission review and approval.
6. In accordance with Ordinance No. 2024-22, a condition precedent to Certificate of Occupancy for the SFD on the 1.73-acre lot is construction of a non-vehicular public pedestrian sidewalk, to be located within the ten-foot-wide public easement along the property's frontage on Iron Canyon Drive, constructed to City Standards and Specifications as required by the City Engineer. Any obligations or guarantees with respect to the construction of such sidewalk shall be governed by the terms and conditions of the Final Subdivision for the Property.
7. In Accordance with Ordinance No. 2024-22, a Housing Mitigation Plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Housing Authority and a deed restriction that complies with the City's Affordable Housing Resolution regarding tenants, rent charged, and rental terms shall be recorded with the Summit County Recorder prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for the Single-Family Dwelling.
8. A Landscape Plan shall be submitted with the SFD Building Permit that complies with standards outlined in the Municipal Code of Park City Chapter 11-21, *Utah Wildland-Urban Interface Code*, as amended, and Land Management Code § 15-5-5(N) *Landscaping*. All Significant Vegetation must be replaced with equivalency; all disturbed vegetation shall be replaced to existing or improved conditions; seeded areas must be at least 80% or more germinated prior to Site Completion; bark mulched areas must have 50% or more plants installed.
9. The Public Works Department requires the protection of existing snow storage easements adjacent to Iron Canyon Drive and shall review stormwater impacts of proposed development at the Building Permit stage.
10. Park City Fire District requires that an adequate water supply is available to meet fire flow requirements; emergency access roads are provided and installed throughout the project to meet the requirements of the Fire Code; and that impact fees are paid as each building is submitted for review and approval as part of the Building Permit process.

11. Per the City Engineer, all proposed improvements that tie into City rights-of-way shall be constructed per the Park City Municipal Code and the most current version of the Park City Supplemental Standards and Specifications.
12. An extension of the wastewater main line system is required, with the main lines being extended to the proposed Lot; a Line Extension Agreement and additional off-site easements will be required, per Snyderville Basin Water Reclamation District requirements.
13. Per the Park City Water Department, there is no existing water service in Iron Canyon Drive along the frontage of the proposed Lot. The Developer is responsible for installing water infrastructure to serve the Lot, as follows:
 - Design Drawings must conform to Park City Water Standard Plans and Specifications.
 - Design must show connection points to existing Park City water infrastructure.
 - Fire Hydrants may be needed to meet Park City Water and Park City Fire Department requirements.
 - All designs will be subject to the review and approval of the Public Utilities Department.

There are existing water-related easements in the project area, which include but are not limited to the following: Entry No. 125799 & 134110. Details as to the grantee, purpose and future use and/or abandonment need to be provided to the Public Utilities Team for review. A one-inch waterline is shown on the site plan of the annexation petition drawing package. Details as to the owner, purpose and future use of this water line need to be provided to the Public Utilities Team for review.

14. Prior to Final Plat recordation, the Applicant shall ensure adequate public utilities are provided to service new development at the site and dedicate utility easements on the Final Subdivision Plat per Public Utilities (for water) and Snyderville Basin Reclamation District (for sewer) specifications.

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

B. 405 Woodside Avenue – Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit – The Applicant Proposes to Construct a Rear Addition on a Significant Historic Structure on a Steep Slope in the Historic Residential - 1 Zoning District. PL-25-06511.

Planner III, Lillian Zollinger, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is the Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (“SSCUP”) for 405 Woodside Avenue. 405 Woodside Avenue is in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District and there is a Significant Historic Structure on the site that was built in 1901. The applicant is proposing an addition to the single-family dwelling behind the existing Significant Historic Structure. The slope of the lot towards the rear is 45% and requires a SSCUP. As conditioned, the proposed addition complies with the setbacks, footprint, height, and parking requirements of the LMC. As conditioned, the proposal also complies with the SSCUP requirements, which include:

- Location of Development;
- Visual Analysis;
- Access;
- Terracing;
- Building Location;
- Building Form and Scale;
- Setbacks;
- Dwelling Volume;
- Building Height.

The applicant has provided several renderings, including renderings that show the northeast view, northwest view, southeast view, and southwest view. Planner Zollinger explained that the renderings show the proposed addition behind the single-family dwelling. It is approximately 40 feet from the rear of the lot and approximately 55 feet from the front of the lot. She noted that it is approximately 7 feet behind the Significant Historic Structure. Several of the drafted Conditions of Approval were shared with the Commission. Planner Zollinger reported that there are conditions related to retaining walls, an Encroachment Agreement for the driveway, and Shoring Plans. There is also a condition that states the guest house and sheds on the northeastern side must be removed. New structures must be constructed entirely on the property and out of the right-of-way. The applicant will also be required to reduce the driveway width to 10 feet.

The Staff recommendation is that the Planning Commission review the SSCUP at 504 Woodside Avenue, conduct a public hearing, and consider approving the proposal based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter. Planner Zollinger reported that the applicant representative, Jonathan DeGray, has a point of discussion related to the terracing of the retaining walls.

Mr. DeGray stated that there is agreement with the Conditions of Approval, but there was one item that was added to the Staff Report that was not discussed previously. Under

the SSCUP criteria, there is a rendering image of the south wall of the driveway. It follows the slope of the grade adjacent to the driveway and then steps back three to four feet for a planting strip. The question was whether the lower wall should be angled or if there should be a step. The following language from the Staff Report was referenced:

- The Applicant proposes a series of concrete walls around the site. All proposed walls are four feet or less from Final Grade to break up the impact of the walls and to help create a Final Grade that is closer to Existing Grade. There is one wall on the southern end of the site that is proposed to slope instead of terrace. The Planning Commission may discuss whether the Applicant should break up this wall into smaller terraced walls to reduce the overall impact of the retaining wall. Such a plan amendment could be reflected as a condition of approval if determined necessary to comply with this section.

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

Director Ward reported that there are a few SSCUPs that are being processed right now. On June 5, 2025, there were updates made to the SSCUP criteria. She clarified that there was a complete application submitted by the applicant prior to the code updates.

Commissioner Frontero finds the application to be well put together. The item where he is struggling is Criteria 9, which relates to building height. He walked the site a few days ago and it is clear that the original mining house sits fairly high above the street. Page 13 of the Staff Report highlights his concern. The peak of the addition in the back dwarfs the neighboring homes. SSCUP Criteria 9 gives the Planning Commission a fair amount of discretion. Commissioner Frontero read the following language into the record:

- The Zone Height in HR-1 is 27 feet for Structures and is restricted as stated above in Section 15-2.2-5. The Planning Commission may require a reduction in Building Height for all or portions of a proposed Structure to minimize its visual mass and/or to mitigate differences in scale between a proposed Structure and the Historic character of the neighborhood's existing residential Structures.

Commissioner Frontero is concerned that what has been proposed will be out of scale. He did notice that a home to the right had the driveway dipping down. That home had less height and was less impactful since it started at a lower grade. He reiterated his concerns that the current design may not be compatible with the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. Commissioner Johnson echoed the concerns related to height. He believes Criteria 8 is applicable for the same reason, because the structure is overwhelming the Significant Historic Structure on the site. Commissioner Sigg noted that the Geotechnical Report points out that there was most likely fill brought to the site at some point. He agrees with the comments shared about the views. He shared

comments about the various streetscape images provided. It appears the new structure towers over the historic structure, so there are concerns about Criteria 8 and Criteria 9.

Mr. DeGray explained that there is sensitivity to the height. He reviewed Figure 15 in the Staff Report and stated that the dashed line in the image above the building represents the 27-foot height limit, so the building is only around 20 feet tall above grade. The building was stepped with the grade, as the code requests, and he feels the profile is reflective of that. The main floor of the historic home is the same elevation as the garage level of the building. If that were descended further, the upper floors would nestle down into the site even further, creating struggles for natural light. It seemed the natural and logical approach to the design was to stair-step the structure up the site. Commissioner Sigg asked if an additional tiered wall in the back would solve the issue of dropping the building down. Mr. DeGray reported that the stair-stepping effect behind the building maximizes the 4-foot steps in the grading. To drop the building further and still retain light in the back would involve larger walls. Additional discussions were had about the height.

Chair Van Dine appreciates the effort that has been made and noted that the appearance of the massing depends on the point of view. She mentioned Streetscape 2 and pointed out that when comparing it to the house to the north, it is not that much out of scale. Based on the streetscape shown, she believes the new structure is somewhat subordinate to the historic structure. The historic structure still stands out and the look has been mirrored to maintain the roof lines. An effort has been made to keep the height down while avoiding going deeper into a very steep lot. Commissioner Grant Tilson agreed. The application follows the code for the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District and gives the Significant Historic Structure enough of a presence against the new construction to differentiate it. This stepped design mitigates some other impacts as well.

Commissioner Johnson disagrees with Chair Van Dine and Commissioner Tilson. He referenced Figure 5, which shows the interior height based on the old Code calculation. He referenced the steep slope and reiterated that he does not believe the current proposal is in compliance with Criteria 8 and Criteria 9. Commissioner Frontero mentioned the driveway in Streetscape 1. He asked if the driveway rises up from the street to the first level of the mining house, which was confirmed. Commissioner Frontero wondered if there is a reason it is not possible to come straight in rather than rising 7 or 8 feet. He would like to see an alteration made to this design so that there is a driveway that comes in flat from the street. That would set the back of the house down 7 or 8 feet, which would alleviate a lot of his concerns related to the overall neighborhood compatibility.

Commissioner Sigg expressed support for the comments shared by Commissioner Johnson and Commissioner Frontero. He would like to see a driveway that is closer to the grade of Woodside Avenue rather than rising from Woodside Avenue. There could be some mitigation with additional tiered walls to the rear of the house. Chair Van Dine stated that it is possible for the applicant to continue the item, so additional work can be done. Mr. DeGray thought that was the best course of action based on the comments.

Director Ward summarized the input from the Planning Commission. Criteria 6, which is related to building form and scale, is a concern for some Commissioners, especially how the addition fits in with the district. There were also concerns related to Criteria 8, which relates to the building volume, and Criteria 9, which relates to the building height. Chair Van Dine asked about a date to continue the item in the motion language. Director Ward recommended that the Planning Commission continue this item to a date uncertain.

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to CONTINUE the SSCUP for 405 Woodside Avenue to a date uncertain. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sigg. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- C. Ordinance – Complete Application, Noticing Requirements, Annexation References, and Public Meeting Clarification to Comply with Utah Code – Land Management Code Amendments –** The Planning Commission Will Consider Forwarding a Recommendation to the City Council Regarding Amendments to Land Management Code Sections 15-1-8 Review Procedure Under the Code, 15-1-12 Notice, 15-1-21 Notice Matrix, 15-15-1 Definitions to Comply With Changes to State Code, and Chapters 15-8 Board of Adjustment, and 15-10 Annexation. PL-25-06686.

Senior Planner, Nan Larsen, presented the Staff Report and explained that the purpose of this presentation is to review needed amendments to the LMC after recent updates were made to the State Code. The updates are part of House Bill (“H.B.”) 368, which was signed into law last spring. Earlier this year, the Planning Commission heard the first phase of amendments, which were immediately necessary. This is the second phase. It is in large part to clarify those needed amendments. The third phase will be heard by the Planning Commission in the future and will address bonds associated with public improvements. The proposed amendments currently under review will better align the LMC with State Code. It will make the necessary changes that add clarity. She reported that H.B. 368 modified the state-mandated notice requirements for certain Land Use applications, reorganized and renumbered the Annexation sections of State Code, and prohibited public hearings for Variance Requests and Land Use Appeals.

To comply with the changes, Staff is recommending amendments to the LMC. Planner Larsen reported that there will be clarification that Variances and Land Use Appeals cannot require a public meeting. Section 15-1-12 is recommended to be updated to address all application types rather than only public hearings. The notice matrix in Section 15-1-21 has been amended to comply with State Code and it includes Ministerial Notice Requirements. It is recommended that the matrix reorganize applications by the noticing class, which is categorized by State Code. The notice matrix has also been simplified. The footnotes in the notice matrix were removed, as they are addressed elsewhere.

During the last Legislative Session, the Annexation sections of State Code were reorganized and numbered. As a result, Chapter 15-8, where there are State Code Annexation citations, will need to be updated to reflect those State Code changes.

Planner Larsen discussed Section 15-15-1. The current definition for application includes both Land Use and Building Permit applications. Staff recommends separating and distinguishing between these two types of applications, as State Code has different screening and review times for Land Use applications and Building Permit submittals. A new definition of a Complete Building Permit Submittal is also provided. This new definition is defined by State Code. Staff recommends the Planning Commission consider forwarding a recommendation of approval to the City Council for their consideration.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Frontero moved to forward a POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION to the City Council for Land Management Code Amendments for Review on December 11, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tilson. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

6. WORK SESSION

A. 2025 General Plan Implementation - The Planning Commission Will Review the 2025 General Plan Vision, Goals, and Strategies and Discuss Potential Actions to Recommend to the City Council for Implementation in 2026. *The Staff Report Was Published on Tuesday, October 7.*

Director Ward reported that the 2025 General Plan Implementation item was added to the Planning Commission Meeting agenda when the Clark Ranch item was continued. This Work Session was originally intended to be brought to the Commission in November, but since there was some time available, it was determined that an overview would be provided. This includes information about the codes that were adopted this year, what is in progress, and some early considerations. In addition, some of the work that is being done to prepare for the Work Sessions in November and December will be shared. She noted that there will be coordination with Transportation Planning on some of the projects that are in progress. The Economic Development Team is working on a Feasibility Study for one component of the Main Street Area Plan, which is related to pedestrian and circulation improvements. The Sustainability Team and Housing Team will also share information.

Senior Planner, Alec Barton, recapped the LMC amendments the Commission has already reviewed and recommended this year. This includes the following:

- Child Care Facilities;

- Steep Slope Conditional Use Permits in Historic Districts;
- Radon Mitigation;
- Historic District Materials;
- Maximum Driveway Widths in Non-Historic Districts;
- Changes to Reflect Updates to State Code.

Planner Larsen reviewed the LMC amendments that are currently in progress:

- Bonanza Park Mixed-Use District;
- Transportation Demand Management;
- Continuations;
- House Bill 368.

The Bonanza Park Small Area Plan was adopted by the City Council in 2024 and it establishes a vision for more walkable mixed-use with livability in mind. The Planning Commission heard the proposed rezone to the Bonanza Park Mixed-Use District in June 2025 and forwarded a recommendation for approval. Staff is also working to codify Transportation Demand Management strategies in the LMC to incentivize multi-modal transportation. The Work Session for this item was conducted in August 2025 and draft amendments are scheduled for Planning Commission review in early 2026. The Planning Commission also forwarded a recommendation to approve some Continuation amendments on September 24, 2025. The Continuation amendments, along with H.B. 368, are scheduled to be heard by the City Council on December 11, 2025.

Planner Larsen shared information about updating the LMC to shape compatible infill. Many subdivisions in Park City were approved in the 1970s through the 1990s and have lots that remain vacant. While the Planning Commission today regulates building envelopes, maximum square footage, and LOD through Subdivision reviews and Plat Notes, some Subdivisions approved during this time did not include Plat Notes and instead were regulated through Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions ("CC&R"). CC&Rs may be modified or removed by the Homeowners Association ("HOA") without returning for Planning Commission review. Removal of CC&Rs that regulate building envelopes, maximum square footage, and LOD may result in new infill construction or redevelopment that is larger than the other structures in the neighborhood and might not be compatible. The General Plan includes strategies and potential actions to address compatible infill development. Potential amendments could include the following:

- Codify previously approved maximum footprint or limitations;
- Additional zoning amendments based on lot size;
- Maximum footprint for combined lots.

Planner Barton reported that the LMC includes regulations for Telecommunication Facilities. The last time these were substantially updated was over 20 years ago, in 2002. Since that time, there have been emerging technologies that have shifted the way cell

infrastructure is constructed and permitted. A major theme in the review of cell infrastructure is the co-location of infrastructure to limit the construction of macro towers and protect sensitive views. Another potential update to the LMC could include requiring conduit for future installations, ensuring that new developments are adequately prepared to provide infrastructure in the future for these facilities. Commissioner feedback was requested.

Commissioner Johnson stated that he is interested in the Telecommunication Facilities item, as it has not been updated since 2002. Commissioner Frontero asked to further review the presentation slide related to infill. Director Ward reported that there are some Subdivisions that have lots that are quite large. At the time those were approved, there were also CC&Rs that established a LOD or maximum house size, but those were separated from the Subdivision. The State is shifting to a more administrative review for plats in general. With regulations that can apply to properties, they need to be codified in zoning. Right now, there are setbacks and height restrictions in the residential zoning that is outside of Old Town. There could be some opportunities to update the zoning regulations in order to address some of the gaps that exist and help shape infill so that it is compatible.

Commissioner Frontero asked about the process moving forward. Director Ward explained that research would need to be conducted to determine where there are opportunities to fill in some of the gaps. This would involve a lot of community engagement and outreach. It would be done at a Subdivision level, but would be addressed comprehensively through zoning. She anticipates that this would be a long process with a lot of community engagement throughout the review process itself. Commissioner Tilson asked how many structures would become non-compliant. Director Ward reported that the number of homes would need to be evaluated.

Commissioner Sigg believes implementing the zoning criteria for certain neighborhoods would supersede any HOA authority or jurisdiction. He knows that there are some Subdivisions in Park City where the Land Use Code specifically references the approval by the HOA. He wondered who would have the greater jurisdiction and also asked about the future of those CC&Rs. Director Ward reported that the LMC would address massing, but would not preempt something like architectural review or materials. Commissioner Sigg asked when the chart of vacant lots was created. Director Ward reported that as part of the General Plan update, all of the platted residential properties were reviewed and an analysis was conducted on those that remained vacant. Chair Van Dine stated that she would like to see the Planning Department move forward with this work.

Director Ward explained that the recommendations were a result of the neighborhood open houses. Commissioner Frontero asked what problem there is a desire to solve. Director Ward clarified that when looking at some older plats, there is a lot and that is it. The only regulations for what can be built on that lot are setbacks and height. For large

lots, that could result in a large home. There is an opportunity to do some research and analysis to find out where the gaps are, so there is ultimately compatible development.

Commissioners expressed support for the Planning Department to move in this direction. Director Ward reported that on November 12, 2025, and December 10, 2025, there will be additional discussion. She asked for input on what should be evaluated. There was consensus to keep the following items on the list: Update LMC to Shape Compatible Infill and Telecommunication Facilities. Director Ward reiterated that input can be shared at future Planning Commission Meetings. Suggestions can also be submitted via email.

7. ADJOURNMENT

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

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:12 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Approved 10.22.2025

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Elissa Martin](#)
Subject: [External] FW: SS-104-B Iron Canyon Drive Proposed Final Plat
Date: Sunday, October 5, 2025 8:21:02 PM

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

[CAUTION] This is an external email.

From: [REDACTED] >
Sent: Sunday, October 5, 2025 7:59 PM
To: elissa.martin@parkcity.gov.
Cc: Jim Helfand [REDACTED]
Subject: SS-104-B Iron Canyon Drive Proposed Final Plat

Dear Planning Commissioners,

I have two comments that I hope the Planning Commission will consider. As you know the "S Curve" on Iron Canyon Drive between Delta Drive and Payday Drive is a dangerous street especially in the winter but also in the summer for walkers and bicycles. It is steep and has the two curves, one of which is a blind corner. This is why we had always hoped that access to the proposed dwelling would not be off of Iron Canyon Drive. The decision, however, was to permit access on to Iron Canyon Drive. Working together everyone has tried to come up with ways to mitigate the safety concerns.

The construction of the sidewalk from Delta Drive to Payday is meant to address safety concerns for walkers on this segment of Iron Canyon Drive. (Note: Our School bus stop is at Payday Drive.) I would like the Commission to consider making this a "bike" path for both bicycles and pedestrians. It could be adjacent to the road similar to what has been done on Thaynes Canyon Drive by the entrance to the golf course. This might mean a width of eight or ten feet. A sidewalk will get people off the road, but a bike path would also get bicycles off the road. This is a steep section of road with curves and I think this would greatly enhance safety for bicycles. A lot of the new ebikes the kids are riding are just really moving down this stretch of road.

Secondly, should the driveway from the new lot line up with the existing driveway from the lot across the street? Would this be a safer arrangement? It's not that far away from lining up. I would defer to the City Engineer and the Commission.

Thank you for everything all of you do for our community.

Richard D. Pick
[REDACTED]

Approved 10.22.2025

August 25, 2025
Planning Commission:

**Subject: Working Session August 27, 2025
SS-104-B Iron Canyon Drive Proposed Final Plat**

Dear Commission Members,

My home is situated north of and overlooks the 1.73 acre property which is the subject of your review. Naturally, we have an interest in what is being developed.

In looking at the proposed plat documents we are at first reminded of the lyrics in that Joni Mitchell song, "They paved paradise and put up a parking lot." We are grateful that the Planning Department and its staff have addressed this aspect of the proposed plat head-on. Even with the revised driveway suggested in the Staff Report the almost 250-foot long driveway could accommodate over a dozen parked cars and still leave room for a fire truck to gain access to the residence.

Secondly, virtually all of the homes in the Aspen Springs and Iron Canyon neighborhood are situated in the center of their lots. A center-of-the-lot location has been depicted for the residence location in previous drawings prepared by the Planning Department, however, the applicant proposes to place the residence further to the north, apparently to add an extra 2-3 feet of elevation on a lot which is already elevated above the road. Is it really necessary to squeeze out a couple more feet of elevation?

Third, even with the elimination of the proposed parking lot on the property, the extended driveway and sprawling layout of the proposed residence exceed the customary LOD area for homes in the neighborhood. And, apart from the actual areas of development, shouldn't there be LOD boundaries shown on the plat more restrictive than merely the outer boundaries of the parcel as are currently shown?

Fourth, the proposed driveway entry onto Iron Canyon Drive would probably be more safely located further east of the proposed location rather than in the proximity of the sharp curve on Iron Canyon Drive.

Fifth, the visual renderings of the residence as shown on Exhibit B look like a self-storage facility or industrial structure rather than a residence. This is apparently due to both the sprawling layout and flat- or shed-roof design. This is not consistent with the design features of other homes in the neighborhood.

In summary, as adjoining property owners we've long known that this parcel was destined for development and that the view from our windows would include the results of that development. We hope the applicant will be a good steward of the land while also giving some consideration to neighbors' perspectives.

Planning Commission
August 25, 2025

We realize you've got much bigger projects than this to deal with in Park City. That makes us particularly grateful for the consideration you are giving, and particularly the Planning Department and its staff for the diligence involved in picking up on the shortcomings of this proposed plat, including its failure to address the remnant parcels relating to the property, failure to mention the sidewalk obligation, and the overreach regarding the actual area proposed to be disturbed.

Thank you,

James Helfand
[REDACTED]

Approved 10.22.2025

October 4, 2025
Park City Planning Commission:

**Subject: Public Meeting October 8, 2025
SS-104-B Iron Canyon Drive Final Plat**

Dear Commission Members,

For the record, my letter to you dated August 25 concerning the above property was written in advance of your working session on August 27th. I wish to thank you and Ivory Homes or the Boyer Company for resolving most of the issues raised in that letter.

One remaining issue that deserves mention, even though it may not fall within the scope of your duties, is the visual assessment (Exhibit C of the Meeting Files) of the proposed residence. Note on the next page of this letter that the residence is obscured by various trees whose images were “pasted” onto the two renderings. In the working session on August 27th those trees were mistakenly represented as already existing on the property (Video recording of meeting at 2:04:55). In fact, there are currently no trees on the property that would shield the view of the residence as seen from either direction on Iron Canyon Drive.

Secondly, the rendering depicts a flat-roof or shed-roof structure which appears to be similar to the residential design format in Ivory Homes’ Park City Heights development. For example, the picture below is a portrayal of one of the models in that development. Not meaning to impugn that design for that neighborhood, almost all of the homes in the surrounding neighborhoods of the Iron Canyon lot have pitched roofs and ridges, including recently built homes on Country Lane and Aspen Springs Drive. The residence depicted in the renderings shown on the next page does not blend in with home styles in the surrounding neighborhood, thus I would implore Ivory Homes or the Boyer Company to reconsider its design plans.

Sincerely,
James Helfand



Park City Heights Model

