



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
OCTOBER 22, 2025**

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

EX OFFICIO: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Virgil Lund, Planner II; Meredith Covey, Planner II; Nan Larsen, Senior Planner; Housing and Development Coordinator, Sara Wineman; John Robertson, City Engineer

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 Rick Shand. Commissioner Henry Sigg attending virtually.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from September 24, 2025.

MOTION: Commissioner Frontero moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from September 24, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tilson. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

B. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from October 8, 2025

MOTION: Commissioner Frontero moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from October 8, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sigg. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

There were no communications or disclosures. Commissioner Johnson took a moment to congratulate Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, and her team for winning the Small Area Plan award from the APA. He accepted the award on behalf of the team.

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

5. CONTINUATIONS

- A. 384 Woodside Avenue – Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit –** The Applicant Proposes to Construct a 2,465-Square-Foot Single-Family Dwelling on a Steep Slope in the Historic Residential - 1 Zoning District. PL-25-06608.

Director Ward reported that the 384 Woodside Avenue application was noticed for a public hearing, but the applicant is requesting additional time. As a result, the Staff recommendation is that a public hearing be opened and this item be continued to a date uncertain. The recommendation is the same for both 5A and 5B on the meeting agenda.

Chair Van Dine opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was continued to a date uncertain.

MOTION: Commissioner Frontero moved to CONTINUE the application for 384 Woodside Avenue – Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit and the public hearing to a date uncertain. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Johnson. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- B. 368 Woodside Avenue – Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit –** The Applicant Proposes to Construct a 3,915-Square-Foot Single-Family Dwelling on a Steep Slope in the Historic Residential - 1 Zoning District. PL-25-06609.

Chair Van Dine opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was continued to a date uncertain.

MOTION: Commissioner Sigg moved to CONTINUE the application for 368 Woodside Avenue – Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit and the public hearing to a date uncertain. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Johnson. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

6. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. Mid-Mountain Trailhead – Extension to a Conditional Use Permit –** The Applicant Requests an Extension of the Mid-Mountain Trailhead Conditional Use Permit in Order to Complete Construction by June 30, 2026. PL-25-06709.

Planner II, Virgil Lund, presented the Staff Report, and explained that the applicant made a request to extend the approval for the Mid-Mountain Trailhead until next summer. The applicant is working through additional approvals required through the Utah Department of

Transportation (“UDOT”) for the additional egress lane onto Marsac Avenue. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission open a public hearing and consider approving the extension request for the Mid-Mountain Trailhead based on the Draft Final Action Letter.

The applicant’s representative, Doug Ogilvy, explained that he is at the meeting to represent Sommet Blanc, LLC. Commissioner Johnson asked if it is acceptable to move from two to one ADA spots. Planner Lund explained that the Building Department verified that one ADA parking space is sufficient for the number of proposed parking spaces.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to APPROVE the Mid-Mountain Trailhead – Extension to a Conditional Use Permit request, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. The June 26, 2024, and September 10, 2025 Final Action Letters for the Mid-Mountain Trailhead CUP are incorporated herein.
2. Land Management Code (LMC) Section 15-1-10(G) establishes the following for extensions: the extension does not result in a finding of non-compliance with the review criteria in Section 15-1-10(E) or LMC, and there are no physical changes to the Property or surroundings.
 - a. The extension allows the Applicant to continue to work with UDOT to obtain the necessary approvals to construct the transit stop and bus-through lane at the Mid-Mountain Trailhead. The Applicant states that construction will continue, the Site retaining walls will be completed this fall, and the original pavement will remain in place so the public will have use of the Parking Area.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The extension complies with LMC Section 15-1-10(G).
2. The proposal complies with the LMC requirements pursuant to Chapter 15-2.13 *Residential Development Zoning District*, Chapter 15-3 *Off-Street Parking*, and Section 15-1-10 *Conditional Use Review Process*.
3. The Use will be compatible with surrounding Structures in use, scale, mass, and circulation.

4. The effects of any differences in use or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

Conditions of Approval:

1. All conditions of approval from June 24, 2024, and September 10, 2025, Planning Commission Final Action Letters except for the completion date shall apply.
2. The Mid-Mountain Trailhead parking lot shall be completed by June 30, 2026.
3. No Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued for a Sommet Blanc unit until the Mid-Mountain Trailhead parking area improvements are completed and inspected for compliance with the Planning Commission's CUP approval.
4. Sommet Blanc shall amend its Public Improvement Agreement to include the Mid-Mountain Trailhead parking lot improvements, and no Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued for a Sommet Blanc unit until the Mid-Mountain Trailhead parking lot improvements are completed and have passed all necessary inspections.
5. The Applicant shall ensure that the Mid Mountain Trailhead parking lot is safely open for public use from December 15, 2025, through April 15, 2026. The parking lot shall have its entrances and boundaries clearly marked for snowplowing and include temporary signage as approved by the Parking Department to support safe and enforceable public use during this interim period.

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

- B. 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.

Planner II, Meredith Covey, presented the Staff Report and explained that the first application related to Clark Ranch is for the proposed Zone Change. The Clark Ranch items have been noticed separately, so there will be a presentation for the Zone Change and a presentation for the Subdivision. The applicant team is present at the meeting.

The Land Management Code ("LMC") requires the applicant to submit a Sensitive Land Analysis identifying sensitive environmental and aesthetic areas such as steep slopes, ridge line areas, crest of hills, wetlands, stream corridors, wildland interface, and wildlife habitat

areas. The applicant has provided information regarding the requirements of the Sensitive Land Overlay (“SLO”). However, Staff has made recommendations and requests for additional information. Planner Covey shared the relevant Sensitive Lands Analysis and criteria with the Commission. For the Visual Assessment, the applicant has submitted a Visual Contextual Analysis of Phase I, which is the three multi-unit dwellings. It has renderings of the proposed development. The Commission may request additional renderings of the proposed development to assess the visual impact from other locations.

The second item is the Slope and Topographic Map. The project is proposed to be developed on steep slopes that are less than 40%, with most of the development on steep slopes between 15% and 30%. The applicant is working with the Engineering Department to determine the least impactful location for regrading and regrading for site access. The LMC requires that Master Planned Developments (“MPD”) be designed to take into consideration the characteristics that the site will be placed upon. It specifically states the project shall be designed to fit the site rather than the site modified to fit the project. Staff recommends the applicant provide an overview of the extent of the proposed grading and filling of slopes as well as opportunities to reduce and mitigate that extent.

As the graded and filled slopes are evaluated, Staff recommends that the retaining walls be terraced to not exceed four to six feet in height where possible and to be made of materials that blend in with the natural features of the site. The applicant must also commit to landscaping or revegetating the exposed slopes and use topsoil from any disturbed portion, which is to be preserved and utilized in re-vegetation of the site. Additionally, any development will be required to comply with the design standards set forth in the architectural regulations found in LMC Chapter 15-5 – Architectural Review. This will be reviewed by the Planning Commission as part of the Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) and MPD applications. As part of this, the applicant must prove that the development will have no significant adverse impact on adjacent properties. This will be determined by the Planning Commission if the applicant can prove that the density, architectural detail, height, building materials, and other design features of the development are compatible with the adjacent properties. In addition, there must be appropriate mitigation measures to buffer those adjacent properties. Planner Covey noted that the closest project to this property is the Park City Heights development.

The third item relates to the Geotechnical Report. The applicant has submitted a Geotechnical Report and a Soil Report. Staff is recommending that there be a requirement to incorporate the recommendations from the report into the proposed development. This includes mitigating construction on the expansive clay soils. The fourth item has to do with Ridge Line Areas. Planner Covey reported that there are no ridge-line areas within the proposed development. The fifth item has to do with Vegetative Cover. Staff recommends that, as part of the CUP and MPD review, the applicant identify significant vegetation and proposed replacement that is native, waterwise, and firewise for the impacted areas. The sixth item has to do with Wetlands. Planner Covey noted that there are no proposed wetlands in the area, but the applicant will be required to submit updated verification that there are none within the development.

The seventh item is for Stream Corridors, Canals, and Irrigation Ditches. Planner Covey reported that there are no streams, canals, or irrigation ditches near the proposed development. Regarding the Wildlife Habitat Areas, there are areas within the proposed development. Staff recommends that the applicant complete a Wildlife Assessment and Report outlining the plan and practices that will be implemented to protect these species during development. The ninth item is the Fire Protection Report. The Park City Fire District has reviewed the proposed plans as part of the Development Review Committee process and is working with the applicant on final conditions. Staff recommends that the applicant also consider fire-resistant materials for cladding and rooftops.

Senior Planner, Nan Larsen, shared information about the Traffic Impact Study (“TIS”). Park City adopted TIS guidelines outlining the requirements for a TIS submittal in 2023. In 2023, as part of the Feasibility Study, the applicant provided a trip generation evaluation where three density scenarios were analyzed, with a focus on the densest scenario of 290 dwelling units. The applicant updated their study with a 2025 TIS, which was submitted in October and was conducted by Hales Engineering. That study is currently being reviewed by a third-party consultant. The applicant provided an addendum to the TIS to correct the unit count. Planner Larsen noted that it is Exhibit N in the Staff Report.

The report found an increase of 977 daily trips, with 74 peak AM trips and 91 peak PM trips at the point of project completion in 2030. As part of the Traffic Operations Analysis, the level of service (“LOS”) of five major intersections was included in the TIS. Table 1 shows the LOS Description. Table ES-1 – Peak Hour LOS Results was reviewed. Planner Larsen reported that the TIS found at the future opening date of 2030, with or without the proposed Clark Ranch project, the LOS decreases at the Comstock Drive and Kearns Boulevard intersection. To mitigate this impact, Hales Engineering provided four recommendations that are outlined on Page 23 of the Staff Report.

The General Plan recommends building on the Short-Range Transit Plan and Transportation Master Plan to build the transit network and improve regional connections. Planner Larsen reviewed a few of the options to mitigate the traffic impacts:

- For those areas not proximate to a transit stop, one consideration is to establish a parking permit program that allows residents in areas not proximate to a transit stop to park near a transit stop in their neighborhood;
- Other considerations are to have the applicant demonstrate the proposed pedestrian and bicyclist connections to the Rail Trail and other multi-use pathways, evaluate the potential for an e-bike station or e-bike share, and other possibilities to provide many travel options for future residents;
- Additionally, the Applicant could explore a residential car share or incentives or discounts for residents who agree to reduce the number of vehicles associated with their unit.

Planner Covey reported that the site is currently zoned Recreation and Open Space (“ROS”) and SLO. The applicant is proposing a rezone to the Residential Development – Medium Density (“RDM”) Zoning District. Staff has recommended a possible Affordable Housing Overlay to restrict future uses on the site to residential and those accessory to residential. This would also establish a minimum requirement for the affordable units.

At the Planning Commission Meeting held on September 24, 2025, the Planning Commission requested additional information about an Affordable Housing Overlay that was specific to the Clark Ranch affordable project and would apply over the RDM Zoning District. Planner Covey shared a table that highlights the current zoning requirements for the RDM Zoning District. Staff has outlined possible requirements for an Affordable Housing Overlay specific to the Clark Ranch project in the right column of the table. Staff is looking for input from the Planning Commission about whether this language captures the requirements for the zone overlay or if there are modifications that should be made. Additionally, a sunset clause would be included to outline that a Building Permit would need to be obtained within two years or the proposed rezone and overlay would be void.

The applicant team introduced themselves to the Planning Commission. Chris Day explained that he is the Development Project Manager with The Alexander Company, Inc. His colleague, Colin Cassady, is attending the meeting virtually. Jaret Moe stated that he is the Principal Architect on the project, and he is attending the meeting in person.

Mr. Day reported that during the Planning Commission Meetings on September 24, 2025, and October 8, 2025, there was feedback provided. Comments related to the following:

- Planning application status;
- Property boundary;
- Preliminary TIS;
- Geotechnical Report findings;
- Occupancy projections;
- Project density;
- Project affordability mix;
- Building and site design;
- Stormwater retention basin;
- Proposed road access.

The third-party Geotechnical Report and Preliminary TIS were submitted. The second item on the list relates to the proposed property boundary. Mr. Day explained that he would like to outline their understanding of the proposed 10-acre development boundary. The current design and boundary follows the City Council-approved request for proposal (“RFP”) recommendation that the development be within 10 to 12 acres in the northernmost corner of Clark Ranch. He noted that the proposed project is within that. He understands that the City Council will be meeting soon to discuss the details of the conservation easement. The applicant team is prepared to react to those conversations.

The TIS is currently under review. At the Planning Commission Meeting on November 12, 2025, the applicant team will be prepared to discuss that in further detail. As for the Geotechnical Report, the site is deemed suitable for the planned development. The bedrock and soil strength are adequate to support foundations and parking areas. The groundwater and seismic risk are low. The only concern relates to the clay soils, which will be managed with excavation and proper fill. During the meeting on September 24, 2025, the occupancy projection was over-simplified. The analysis has since been expanded to more accurately estimate the number of driving-age individuals per unit type. For 201 units, the projection is that there will be a total of 393 individuals living at the property, and 253 of them (approximately 64%) of those individuals will be of driving age.

Another important discussion topic has to do with the proposed project density. Per the direction provided by the City Council in the RFP, the target range was 150 to 200 total residential units on 10 to 12 acres. Based on the current proposal, the project reflects a density of approximately 10 units per acre across the 10 acres. That results in a 201 total residential units. Mr. Day next discussed the project affordability mix. The current unit affordability mix was established based on direction from the City Council. There were multiple scenarios presented, as well as a financial feasibility analysis. Council provided direction on the current mix, which is 34 market-rate ownership units and 167 workforce/affordable rental units. He asked Mr. Moe to share additional information.

The building and site design information was reviewed. Mr. Moe reported that at the last meeting, there were comments about how the current design has been adapted to the site. He shared some information to clarify the lens through which the applicant team is thinking about the design. The Feasibility Study explored multiple unit types and densities. The medium-density option was selected by the City Council as the best balance between cost, visual implications, and overall site integration. He noted that the Utah Low-Income Housing Tax Credit ("LIHTC") score is based on effectiveness. There are a lot of factors that need to be balanced, including the overall cost of the design. Some diagrams were shared with the Planning Commission. Mr. Moe explained that these are intended to show how the applicant team is thinking about the site. An image of a vertical stack was reviewed. If that design was pursued, the units would fit on less than one acre, but would require multiple surface parking lots with retaining. The building would be approximately 180 feet tall, so this was deemed an incompatible design. In the second image, it splits the vertical stack. This results in a building that is approximately 90 feet tall and is more spread out on the site. The assumption is that this is probably incompatible as well.

The other images were discussed. Mr. Moe explained that the team looked at how parking can best be accommodated on the site. He pointed out the fourth, fifth, and sixth images on the presentation slide. Essentially, the development is spread out over the site. There is an intention to match the topography and use the buildings as retaining to reduce the impact. The topography is not linear, but has a bit of a curve to it, which reflects the layout of the buildings. To reflect the architectural design guidelines, there are massing breaks provided within the façade. This results in a design that is spread out on 10 acres with 10 residential

unit equivalents per acre. The current design accommodates the parking needs with only one surface parking lot provided.

The early buildings in Park City were utilitarian, simple structures based on pragmatic approaches. The aesthetic fits the programming constraints as well as the cost and need for a firewise design. The Park City architectural history is not dominated by a single style or era, but a layering of different time periods. Mr. Moe explained that a choice has been made to reflect more of the utilitarian, simple structure style, where the detailing is minimal. He noted that it has been interesting to learn that snow actually works better on flat or low slope roofs because it increases insulation values in the winter, helps to control snow and ice dams, and limits unnecessary exposure to residents by falling snow and ice. Firewise design would echo this approach, which is the reason for the proposed massing.

Mr. Moe discussed the stormwater retention basin, which was mentioned during previous Planning Commission Meetings. The stormwater retention basin is a minor depression that is revegetated to encourage the rapid reabsorption of any stormwater that would sheet flow from developed areas on the project. It works best when it is built within the landscape and is spread out over an area to allow for more plants and surface area, which increases the moisture absorption rate. The proposal is to replant the area with native vegetation, helping to avoid further erosion and promote greater absorption. There has been coordination with the Landscape Architect about the stormwater retention basin.

Commissioner Johnson asked if there will need to be regrading, which was confirmed. He also wanted to know what the acreage of the retention basin will be. Mr. Moe reported that the actual retention pond area is approximately one acre. Commissioner Johnson asked why it could not be located in between the buildings. Mr. Moe explained that it is possible, but this is based on volume. It is possible to look at that as an option, but from a design perspective, a smaller and deeper approach does not reflect the native landscape. He stated that it becomes foreign to the existing landscape.

Commissioner Johnson mentioned the HOPA development, which built the retention ponds into the open space, so it became usable open space between the buildings. He believes it is an efficient way to fit the accessory use within the project area. Mr. Moe explained that this option could be explored, but it would not provide enough area to most effectively mitigate the volume of stormwater runoff there that needs to be mitigated.

Mr. Day reported that the applicant team was asked to discuss the status of the proposed road access. The design is progressing and is 30% complete. The City-led design team is working with the regional partner, UDOT. There have been recurring coordination calls between the applicant team, City team, and the UODT team. As for the next steps in this process, there is a Planning Commission Meeting scheduled on November 12, 2025.

Chair Van Dine reported that this item will be continued to the November 12, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting. She wanted to make sure the applicant and Staff receive necessary feedback from the Commission ahead of the next meeting. Commissioner Grant Tilson

asked if there is a requirement for the occupants of the units to be working in Park City. Mr. Day stated that there have been discussions with Staff about a tenant selection plan within the laws of fair housing. Rules could be established to determine who would receive priority preference to live in the development. As an example, municipal employees and people within a certain area of Park City. There have been discussions about the framework for that, but nothing has been finalized at this point.

Additional discussions were had about the fair housing laws. Housing and Development Coordinator, Sara Wineman, reported that there are ways to prioritize the workforce. There cannot be a requirement for people who live in Park City due to the Fair Housing Act, but prioritization can occur. This is typically done through mass marketing, which has been successful in other areas. Efforts will be made to focus on the workforce.

Chair Van Dine opened the public hearing. She clarified that there will be two public hearings related to Clark Ranch. The first public hearing relates to the Zone Change.

Meg Ryan gave her zip code as 84060 and explained that she lives in a 1975 ranch-style home that was purchased approximately 30 years ago. There have been five teardowns on her street in the last two years, where the homes were replaced by much larger designs. Housing pressure is everywhere. She is at the Planning Commission Meeting to support an Affordable Housing Overlay. Ms. Ryan does not live adjacent to the applicant site, but she lives in the community. She understands the viewpoints that have been expressed by some of the residents, but does not see the situation the same way.

Ms. Ryan has spent her years in Park City supporting and opposing all types of ideas and projects. She pointed out that land use is a balance of competing interests. Ms. Ryan reminded those present that this public hearing is related to the rezone. The Planning Commission weighs the pros, cons, and opinions, and then sends a recommendation to the City Council. This is not an approval for the specific project. She expressed support for the rezone and acknowledged that details will need to be worked out during the Subdivision process. There are also other steps related to the MPD and CUP.

Ms. Ryan suggested that the Subdivision, MPD, and CUP be reviewed together so that it is possible to see all of the pieces of the proposal. This will ensure that the best project for the site moves forward, assuming the Zone Change occurs. It seems there are many details that still need to be addressed. She reiterated her support for the Zone Change and added that there is a serious need for workforce housing in Park City. With City owned land, there is a unique opportunity to control the outcome of the development. Lack of housing is a national issue, and it makes sense to be part of the solution. The City's plans and goals for housing call for the creation of housing opportunities. It makes sense to create opportunities for new residents. Park City Heights was given an opportunity with City owned land to create 79 units. It makes sense to do the same for new residents.

Jeff Iannacone gave his zip code as 84060 and explained that he is speaking in support of Keep Clark Ranch Wild. There is an understanding that Utah is a landholder-friendly State,

and when CUP applications are considered, there is a mandate to approve as long as mitigations are in place. However, a Zone Change is different because it is discretionary. There is no Good Cause for this rezone, but there is information that indicates this is not the correct decision. Mr. Iannacone stated that the details of the acquisition matter. The parcel was sold with the intent that there would be conservation.

The parcels were acquired using open space funds and bond money. A conservation easement was always intended for the parcel. While others may have hoped for different uses, it was the Open Space Advisory Committee that was tasked with guiding parameters. There was no housing intended on open space. As for locating more of the workforce in town, this is a meaningful goal, but the direction is questionable when it comes to Clark Ranch. The 10 acres proposed for development are steep, isolated, and challenging. Before ground is broken on a single dwelling, there will need to be \$6 million spent on road infrastructure. Since this project intends to use Federal funds, it cannot legally prioritize anyone, including workers and locals. Mr. Iannacone next discussed the application and the fact that there have been continued discussions about acreage. He asked the Commission to consider the history and future of Park City and deny this item.

Jason Glidden gave his zip code as 84098 and explained that he works with the Mountainlands Community Housing Trust. He emphasized the need for affordable housing in the community. He is not sure about the necessity of an overlay and asked for additional clarification about that. The questions related to occupancy are fair. Mountainlands owns several properties, including two larger properties in Park City, where the majority of the residents work in Park City. He reiterated his support for this project.

Sophia Lucey gave her zip code as 84060. She was present in support of Keep Clark Ranch Wild. In regards to Good Cause and the Zone Change application, she would like to address the wildlife analysis required by the LMC. The following language was read into the record: "Wildlife Habitat Areas: A map depicting all wildlife habitat areas, as defined by a Wildlife Habitat Report shall be provided by the Applicant. The wildlife habitat report shall be prepared by a professional, qualified in the areas of ecology, wildlife biology, or other relevant disciplines." She does not believe The Alexander Company solicited and compiled a true report. The applicant requested a data pull from the Utah Division of Wildlife Resources. Completed on October 10, 2025, and included in the Meeting Materials Packet, this data pull relies on existing habitat information rather than information gleaned from current or even recent surveys and assessments of wildlife activity in the area. Most of the data is from 2020 and some is from 2001 and before.

The intent of the Wildlife Habitat Code is to provide a current assessment using information collected by an independent wildlife professional after the award of a project, which in this case would be November 2024. Ms. Lucey pointed out that some of the data in the report is more than two decades old, but this particular Division of Wildlife Resources report shows, "Not for consultation." This means the historical data pull is not a substitute for an on-the-ground biological survey. The applicant was required by municipal code to develop a map

depicting all wildlife habitat areas related to the proposed activity after November 2024, but that map has not been included in the Meeting Materials Packet.

If the map is created, it will show four adult and maturing moose that use a portion of the proposed 10-acre development site as their permanent habitat. Park City prides itself on allowing resident wildlife to roam free without disturbance. These moose, along with elk, mule deer, coyotes, eagles, and bobcats have been observed by many residents in the Park City Heights development and users of the trail network. Housing developed on the Clark Ranch parcel will increase the risk of vehicle and moose conflicts and will also increase the likelihood that the moose will be forcibly relocated. Moose are a unique and valuable part of the Utah wildlife heritage. Keep Clark Ranch Wild requires a third-party independent wildlife biologist to evaluate all aspects of wildlife living on the 10-acre parcel, as well as the terrain in close proximity. Ms. Lucey asked that the report include current data and the required maps, address the wildlife regularly observed in the area, and provide protection and/or relocation specific to each of the impacted species living in the area.

John Greenfield gave his zip code as 84060. He stated that this project cannot be fixed with conditions, as the flaws are structural rather than stylistic. The applicant claims the project fits the hillside, but the Geotechnical Report admits that up to six feet will need to be cut and up to 12 feet will need to be filled to build flat pads. One garage slab is raised 11 feet above natural grade. On top of that sits a 200-foot-long three-story building. That is not site-sensitive design, but is forcing density onto a slope by reshaping the terrain, complete with tiered retaining walls. Under LMC 15-6-5(G), that is what is not supposed to be done. In this proposal, every building sits on terrain between 15% and 30% grade. This is what the LMC defines as steep slopes. The over 40% zones were avoided and the narrative claims that the hillside is being respected, but the plan shows it is being reengineered. When it comes to height, the buildings reach 45 feet above existing grade, which is 60% taller than the 28-foot cap at the neighboring Park City Heights. With flat roofs and 200-foot facades, this is not infill, but institutional-scale housing on a highly visible hillside. COSAC did not envision what has been proposed.

Mr. Greenfield discussed open space and noted that the applicant states 83% of the land is preserved. When it comes to the stormwater retention pond, it appears to be the only outdoor amenity. There is no park, no play structure, and nothing proposed for families, despite the Planning Commission specifically requesting gathering space for over 200 proposed units. That is not a planning oversight, but a choice that has been made. As for access, the traffic plan hinges on a future frontage road and UDOT interchange. However, none of that is built, bonded, or guaranteed. What is planned is a new access road through an artificial berm that requires cuts and embankments up to 24 feet high, which is a massive disturbance. Mr. Greenfield stated that the proposal, as written, asks the Planning Commission to trust claims that do not hold up under scrutiny.

Sam Brothwell gave his zip code as 84060 and explained that he heads the Nordic Village Homeowners Association ("HOA"). His neighborhood does not adjoin Clark Ranch, but he wanted to share a traffic observation, specifically what happens when an unimproved dirt

road is paved to allow access to a new residential development. Even when there are restrictions on the use, those restrictions are often ignored, and the road becomes a general-use public thoroughfare. He knows this firsthand because his house and neighborhood border what was once known as Keetley Road. This connected Queen Esther Drive to the old mining town of Keetley before it was buried under the Jordanelle in 1995. Also, back in 1995, an agreement was reached to vacate Keetley Road to provide access to what is now known as Deer Crest. That agreement spelled out conditions for the improvement and private use of Keetley Road, specifically gated and controlled access limited to Deer Crest residents and guests. It also allowed limited commercial access to the Snow Park Hotel site, as well as construction vehicles dedicated to improving the road. However, that is not how the road has been used, because access from Lower Deer Valley is not controlled, which violates the original agreement.

Mr. Brothwell shared a comment with those surrounding the proposed Clark Ranch development. He suggested that there be skepticism about studies and restrictions aimed at traffic concerns. Studies are theoretical, restrictions are not enforced, and there could be issues after the developer leaves. The only way to prevent what is experienced along Queen Esther Drive in this area is to stop the access now.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was continued to the Planning Commission Meeting on November 12, 2025.

Commissioner Johnson stated that the policy direction was for an affordable housing development on 10 acres. The remaining acres of Clark Ranch should be under a conservation easement. That public land should be preserved as open space with no accessory uses located on it. When looking at the Grading Plan, the retention pond is disturbing the earth, so he would like to see the retention pond fit within the 10-acre site. He would like to understand why the applicant team believes the retention pond needs to go outside of the 10 acres and why there is a belief that it cannot fit within that area.

Within the 10 developable acres, Commissioner Johnson wants to make sure there is compliance with the proposed setbacks. He mentioned the Fire Protection Report and stated that it needs to be expanded to clarify the zone of defensible space. When he looks at the applicant drawings, there is 25 feet shown on the west side, but he believes that should be 30 feet for defensible space. On the north side, it looks to be between 10 and 15 feet. Commissioner Johnson reiterated a desire for additional information. He reported that a wildlife habitat assessment needs to be conducted by a wildlife consultant.

Commissioner Sigg agreed with Commissioner Johnson that the policy was outlined for 10 acres, but somehow, this development has expanded to assume that open space lands can be construed as open space for a development project. That is something that he is concerned about. In addition, he is concerned about the retention basin in the proposed location. Commissioner Sigg is most concerned about the compatibility issues. The directive was 150 to 200 units, but there are 201 units proposed. The RDM is specific about eight units per acre. He noted that the Planning Commission is being asked to do a Zone

Change to RDM and then consider an overlay, which will amend the RDM Zone for the current development. Concerns about compatibility and traffic were shared.

Commissioner Sigg noted that when it comes to the SLO, there is specificity on benching and terracing. There are concerns about sheet flow and stormwater detention. He pointed out that there is a section in the Geotechnical Report that calls the walls out as 1.5:1. He is not sure how that will be accomplished without engineered walls, which is not ideal from a visual perspective. Commissioner Sigg is not opposed to affordable housing on the site, but believes the City can do better. He does not feel the project fits the site as currently proposed and reiterated that there are compatibility issues. It was noted that there is no real commerce in this location, so this development will generate traffic that comes into town. When looking at the Clark Ranch site in its entirety, it might be possible to find 10 better acres that would also be more cost-effective. Until he sees a project that is more compatible and more in line with 15-7-2 and 15-2.21-4, he is not ready to move forward with this application. Commissioner Sigg clarified that he is in favor of workforce housing. He explained this could be an attractive site for workforce housing, but he is not sure that the number of units proposed is appropriate.

Mr. Day asked about the statements from Commissioner Johnson and Commissioner Sigg that indicate there was a policy direction dictating 10 acres. Commissioner Johnson explained that it is based on the presentations that have been made previously. Figure 1 of the Staff Report was reviewed. Commissioner Johnson noted that the retention pond is highlighted in orange. In addition, on the west side, there is an open space carved out, which means it is not contiguous. He has listened to the City Council Meetings remotely, and based on the information presented, he was expecting development to be 10 acres.

Commissioner Seth Beal expressed concerns about the approach. He feels that the Planning Commission is being asked to take steps without understanding the full set of facts. In general, he is supportive of approving a Zone Change on 10 acres, as that is the direction that has been provided by the City Council. However, he has a hard time seeing how he would approve the proposed project on those 10 acres. It seems like the envelope is consistently pushed towards the high end of things. For example, there was direction for 150 to 200 units, but the proposal is 201. Commissioner Beal mentioned one of the points made in the Staff Report related to compatibility with the area. This particular 10 acres is in a fairly prominent location at an entry point into the community. It is an appropriate location for the right project, but what is developed needs to be suitable for the location. The design and density that are proposed make him uneasy. There are still some concerns about the project as it has been proposed so far. He asked the applicant team to think about how to address some of the community concerns.

Commissioner John Frontero agreed with the previous Commissioner's comments. He will not consider a rezone unless it is for 10 acres. He finds compatibility is the biggest issue associated with this application, because this needs to be compatible with the adjacent properties. The closest adjacent property is Park City Heights, and this is not compatible with that development for a variety of reasons. The proposal that is currently before the

Planning Commission is trying to maximize development. There are a lot of hurdles that this proposal needs to overcome. He finds it difficult to imagine a positive vote based on what has been presented at this time. Commissioner Frontero believes the density and height need to be reduced. In addition, the infill cannot take place the way it has been described. He stated that there needs to be a drastic reduction in height, mass, and density. He also stated that the retention pond will need to be within the 10 acres.

Chair Van Dine agreed with the points raised in the Staff Report as far as what is needed to move forward. She asked for additional feedback about the Affordable Housing Overlay. Commissioner Tilson would like to see the road design because the access road crosses a very steep slope. Though the design is 30% complete, the Commission has not seen the design and cannot determine compatibility with the Code. City Engineer, John Robertson, asked if the request has to do with the entire frontage road or the connection from the frontage road to the site. Commissioner Tilson clarified that he is interested in information about the connection where it crosses the very steep slope.

Commissioner Johnson asked Engineer Robertson about a retention pond that is located on a slightly sloped hillside. He believed berming would be required around it. Engineer Robertson reported that if it were kept higher on the hillside, berming would be needed.

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to CONTINUE Parcel PC-SS-121-X (Clark Ranch) – Zone Change and the public hearing to the Planning Commission Meeting on November 12, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Frontero. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

- C. 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.

Planner Covey presented the Staff Report and explained that the applicant is proposing the Clark Ranch Subdivision, which will create three lots located on the northwest portion of the larger 57-acre site. Within those three lots, there is a proposal for three development pods. The development pods are proposed to be limited to no more than 10 acres. Additional areas within these lots and outside of the development pods are proposed to remain open space. The designated open space parcels, Open Space Parcel A and Open Space Parcel B, will be protected as open space through a conservation easement. There are three new local roads that are proposed as part of the Clark Ranch Subdivision. Road 1 terminates as a cul-de-sac. Road 2 connects to Park City Heights, which will have limited access. It will be for fire access only, and that will be enforced by a gate. Road 3 will create a second access to the frontage road. The frontage is proposed to run parallel to Highway 40 to the east and is proposed to provide access to the Clark Ranch Subdivision. Planner Covey noted that the frontage road is currently under review by the Engineering Department for compliance with the LMC.

Planner Larsen explained that as part of the Clark Ranch Subdivision review, the Planning Commission must make a finding of Good Cause. The applicant submitted a Statement of Good Cause, which is attached to the Staff Report as Exhibit B. The purpose of the Subdivision regulations was outlined in LMC 15-7-2. Some examples were shared:

- To guide the future growth and development of Park City, in accordance with the General Plan;
- To provide the most beneficial relationship between the uses of land and buildings and the circulation of traffic, throughout the municipality, having particular regard to the avoidance of congestion in the Streets and highways, and the pedestrian traffic movements appropriate to the various uses of land and buildings, and to provide for the proper location and width of Streets and Building lines;
- To preserve the natural beauty and topography of Park City and to ensure appropriate development with regard to these natural features;
- To provide for open spaces through the most efficient design and layout of the land, including the use of flexible density or cluster-type zoning in providing for minimum width and Area of Lots, while preserving the density of land as established in the Land Management Code of Park City.

As part of the Subdivision review, the Planning Commission makes findings on drainage and stormwater, and whether the stormwater runoff channels and catch basins are sufficient for the project. At the September 10, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting, the Commission was in support of combining the Preliminary and Final Plats. Planner Larsen reported that the Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal on August 19, 2025. The applicant is continuing to work with various City departments specified in the Staff Report to address those comments and ensure compliance with all regulations.

To comply with the required completion and maintenance of improvements, the applicant is responsible for all site improvements. To comply with the required improvements, reservations, and design, the applicant must address and comply with the SLO regulations, general Subdivision requirements, road design requirements, drainage and storm sewers, sidewalks, and trails. Each of these items are reviewed in more detail in the Staff Report. The applicant continues to work with City departments to finalize these details and ensure LMC compliance. Planner Larsen asked for Commissioner input.

Chair Van Dine opened the public hearing.

Mary Louise Care gave her zip code as 84060 and stated that she is in support of Keep Clark Ranch Wild. The Alexander Company hired Gordon Geotechnical Engineering to study the Clark Ranch site, but the report fails to include the required assessment, an analysis of potential landslides, mine shafts, or avalanche paths. The Clark Ranch parcel lies on steep, rugged, mountain terrain with slopes of 30%, 40%, and higher. She discussed the expansive clay, which has high shrink-swell potential. Adding or removing water can result in a shift, which is a textbook condition for landslides and snowslides.

The neighboring Park City Heights development already struggles with significant runoff. However, when Lynn Sheldon, a Civil and Environmental Engineer, contacted Gordon Geotechnical Engineering directly, the Project Engineer confirmed that they were not asked to study landslides or snowslides at all. Ms. Care believed that before any rezone or recommendation moves forward, The Alexander Company should complete a full hazard analysis. She understands that the applicant is seeking a decision on November 12, 2025, but the public and the Commission should not be forced to review an application that is missing critical studies. There is no legal or factual foundation for a Good Cause finding. She asked the Planning Commission to hold this project to the same standards as every other application and to require a complete and compliant submission.

John Greenfield gave his zip code as 84060 and stated that there is no Good Cause for the Subdivision. The Commission is being asked to approve a Subdivision that locks in a specific footprint and intensity of development. This is a commitment that cannot be undone. The applicant claims there is Good Cause for the application under the LMC, but their own numbers challenge that claim. Lot 1 is 4.36 acres, Lot 2 is 4.59 acres, and Lot 3 is 5.13 acres, which is over 14 acres designed for development pods. Even if the code allows for future refinement, this layout signals the City's intent to accept the footprint. The open space used to justify the footprint includes a stormwater retention basin, road berms, and fragmented buffers. That does not reflect a strategy of conservation. In addition, the Planning Commission requested a community-scale gathering space, but that is absent from the materials submitted. He pointed out that a Subdivision is not a right, as it must demonstrate a clear and compelling public benefit. Until the applicant returns with a plan that meets the standards, he does not feel it should be supported.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was continued to the Planning Commission Meeting on November 12, 2025.

Commissioner Frontero mentioned Figure 2. What is being proposed needs to be a contiguous 10 acres. As a result, the cutout shown is unacceptable. When this comes back, the boundary the applicant is using needs to be a complete contiguous 10 acres.

MOTION: Commissioner Johnson moved to CONTINUE Parcel PC-SS-121-X (Clark Ranch) – Subdivision and the public hearing to the Planning Commission Meeting on November 12, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Frontero. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

Chair Van Dine informed those present that additional comments can be submitted to planning@parkcity.gov. Those comments will be included in the public record.

The Planning Commission took a short break before hearing the remaining agenda items.

- D. 7600 Royal Street – Conditional Use Permit** – The Applicant Proposes to Install a Temporary Tent Annually at the Silver Lake Lodge to be Used for the Duration of the Deer Valley Resort Winter Season. PL-25-06689.

Planner Lund presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a CUP application for 7600 Royal Street. He reported that the CUP is for an annual tent to be installed at the Silver Lake Lodge. The proposal is for a 1,500 square foot tent that will be installed annually, each time not to exceed 180 days, as required by the International Building Code for temporary structures. An aerial image was shared. Planner Lund pointed out the location of the Silver Lake Lodge and the proposed tent location. Some additional photographs of the site were shared for context. The proposal complies with the Residential Development (“RD”) Zoning District requirements, temporary structure criteria, and CUP criteria. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission open a public hearing and consider approving the CUP based on the Draft Final Action Letter.

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

Commissioner Johnson thanked Planner Lund for the quality of the Staff Report and the Conditions of Approval that were drafted. Commissioner Frontero noted that the application appears to be straightforward, and he is in favor of the proposal. However, he asked the Commission to consider a three-year term. It seems like there should be some mechanism for the Commission to revisit this approval in the future. This would ensure that the reasonable conditions being proposed are actually mitigating the anticipated detrimental effects of the proposed use. He does not anticipate an issue, but thought it might be best for there to be some sort of administrative review every few years. Planner Lund shared some additional information about the process. Every year, the applicant is required to submit a Fire Permit for the installation of the tent, which is reviewed by the Building Department and the Planning Department. This means that each year, the Planning Department sees a proposal and a permit, so the conditions are reviewed.

MOTION: Commissioner Tilson moved to APPROVE the 7600 Royal Street Conditional Use Permit for an Annual Temporary Tent, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. The Applicant proposes to install a 1,500-square-foot tent for the Deer Valley ski season (not to exceed 180 days) on an annual basis at the Silver Lake Lodge.
2. Silver Lake Lodge (the “Lodge”) is part of the Deer Valley Resort 12th Amended and Restated Large Scale Master Planned Development (MPD). On February 26, 2025, the Planning Commission approved a modification to the 12th Amended and Restated Large Scale MPD to increase the restaurant/commercial square footage for Silver Lake Lodge by 15,000 square feet for public or skier service. The existing as-built square footage for the Silver Lake Lodge is approximately 32,000 square feet. The tent is proposed

for the ski season on an annual basis to provide temporary, covered seating in a location where the Lodge has traditionally placed beach chairs. Any displaced beach chairs will be relocated south of the tent. No changes to the existing Lodge are proposed.

3. The installation of the tent will require an annual fire permit to be submitted to the Building Department.
4. The proposed tent complies with the Residential Development (RD) Zoning District Requirements.
 - a. LMC § 15-2.13-3 outlines Lot and Site requirements for Structures in the RD Zoning District.
 - i. Front Setback: 20 feet.
 1. Complies: The proposed tent is 134 feet from the front Lot line.
 - ii. Side Setback: 12 feet.
 1. Complies: The proposed tent is 50 feet from the west side Lot line and greater than 100 feet from the east side Lot line.
 - iii. Rear Setback: 15 feet.
 1. Complies: The proposed tent is greater than 100 feet from the rear Lot line.
5. LMC § 15-2.13-4 outlines Building height requirements in the RD Zoning District: No Structure may be erected to a height greater than 28 feet from Existing Grade.
 - a. Complies: The proposed tent is 13 feet 5 inches in height from Final Grade.
6. The proposal complies with the tent criteria in LMC § 15-4-16.
 - a. The Applicant proposes to install the tent annually for the Deer Valley ski season, not to exceed 180 days. The occupancy of the tent is approximately 108 people.
 - b. The proposal complies with the requirements for temporary tents.
 - i. The Applicant shall provide written notice of the Property Owner's permission.
 1. Complies: The CUP application form is signed by the Vice President of Resort Planning for Deer Valley.
 - ii. The proposed Use should not diminish existing parking.
 1. Complies: The proposed tent will not diminish existing parking; it is on the existing hardscape area outside the Silver Lake Lodge.

- iii. The proposed Use shall not impede pedestrian circulation, emergency Access, or any other public safety measure.
 - 1. Complies: The proposed tent will not impede the existing pedestrian circulation system. Guests using the tent will be able to access the tent from Silver Lake Lodge, Silver Lake Village, or the ski run. The Park City Fire District reviewed the proposal on September 16, 2025. The Fire District will review the tent for compliance with their required standards at the Building Permit phase.
 - iv. The Use shall not violate the Noise Ordinance, Municipal Code Chapter 6-3.
 - v. The Use shall comply with the LMC, the signage shall comply with the Sign Code, Title 12, and the lighting shall comply with Illumination Section 12-4-9.
 - vi. The Use shall not violate the Summit County Health Code, the Fire Code, or State Regulations on mass gathering.
 - vii. The Use shall not violate the International Building Code.
 - viii. The Applicant shall adhere to all applicable City and State licensing ordinances.
7. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with the Conditional Use Permit criteria outlined in Land Management Code Section 15-1-10(E).
- a. Size and location of the Site
 - i. The proposed tent will be installed throughout the Deer Valley ski season each year, not to exceed 180 days. The tent is on the resort area adjacent to the Silver Lake Lodge with convenient access to the ski runs and ski lifts.
 - b. Traffic considerations, including the capacity of the existing Streets in the Area
 - i. The Engineering Department's Traffic Impact Study (TIS) Guidelines require a TIS if a development will generate 25 or more net new vehicle trips during the weekday AM or PM peak hour or other analysis hour at the discretion of Park City Staff.
 - ii. Silver Lake Lodge does not allow public parking on-site. The tent is intended for skiers and guests already staying or recreating on the resort and will not generate 25 or more new vehicle trips. The hours of operation for the tent will be consistent with those of the Silver Lake Lodge operations.
 - c. Utility capacity, including Storm Water run-off
 - i. The Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal on September 16, 2025, and confirmed the proposal conforms with all utility and stormwater run-off requirements.
 - d. Emergency vehicle Access

- i. The Park City Fire District reviewed the proposal on September 16, 2025. The Fire District will review for compliance with their required standards at the Building Permit phase.
- e. Location and amount of off-street parking
 - i. The proposed tent is intended for skiers and guests already staying or recreating on the resort.
- f. Internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation system
 - i. The proposed tent is on the resort area adjacent to Silver Lake Lodge and existing chairlifts and ski runs and will not encroach into or affect the existing pedestrian walkway or internal vehicular system.
- g. Fencing, Screening, and landscaping to separate the Use from adjoining Uses
 - i. No additional fencing, screening, or landscaping are proposed with this CUP.
- h. Building mass, bulk, and orientation, and the location of Buildings on the Site; including orientation to Buildings on adjoining Lots
 - i. The proposed tent is 1,500 square feet and 13.5 feet tall. The tent is proposed to be located adjacent to the Silver Lake Lodge and near the existing chair lifts and ski runs.
- i. Usable Open Space
 - i. The temporary 1,500-square-foot tent will not substantially decrease the required Open Space within the MPD and is proposed to be installed in an area already disturbed and used for guest seating, adjacent to the existing lodge deck.
- j. Signs and lighting
 - i. No Signs or Lighting are proposed or approved with this Application.
- k. Physical design and Compatibility with surrounding Structures in mass, scale, style, design, and architectural detailing.
 - i. The proposed tent is constructed of a metal structure and a white vinyl covering and is appropriate in size, scale, and design for the intended use.
- l. Noise, vibration, odors, steam, or other mechanical factors that might affect people and Property Off-Site
 - i. No speakers or outdoor lighting are proposed or approved with this Application.
- m. Control of delivery and service vehicles, loading and unloading zones, and Screening of trash and recycling pickup Areas.
 - i. The proposed tent will not affect any loading or unloading zones. All trash and recycling must be located inside Silver Lake Lodge.
- n. Expected Ownership and management
 - i. The proposed tent will be operated, managed, and maintained by Deer Valley Resort.

- ii. The submitted application form is signed by the Vice President of Deer Valley Resort Planning.
 - 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 location of the proposed tent is not on or near Steep Slopes, Physical Mine Hazards, or Mine Waste, and is outside of the Park City Soils Ordinance.
 - 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. The proposed Use of the Site is consistent with the objectives of the Upper Deer Valley Neighborhood in the General Plan, as it provides a comfortable visitor experience and supports the resort economy.
 - q. Radon mitigation
 - i. There is no residential component to this CUP.
- 8. The Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal on September 16, 2025.

Conclusions of Law:

- 1. The proposal complies with the LMC requirements pursuant to Chapter 15-2.13 Residential Development Zoning District, Section 15-4-16 Temporary Structures, Tents, and Vendors, and Section 15-1-10 Conditional Use Review Process.
- 2. The use will be compatible with surrounding Structures in use, scale, mass, and circulation.
- 3. The effects of any differences 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 dated September 22, 2025, submitted to the Planning Department and reviewed October 22, 2025, by the Planning Commission.
- 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 the applicable standards by the Planning Director prior to construction.

3. The Applicant shall adhere to Municipal Code of Park City Chapter 6-3, Noise.
4. If Outdoor Lighting is proposed to be installed, it requires compliance with the dark sky code (LMC Section 15-5-5(J)) and Planning Department review and approval.
5. The Use shall not violate the Summit County Health Code, the Fire Code, or State Regulations on mass gathering.
6. The Applicant shall submit an annual fire permit for review and approval by the Fire Marshal before installation each year.
7. The Applicant shall adhere to all applicable City and State licensing ordinances.
8. The temporary tent shall not be used for non-permitted special events, private events, or for use not associated with Deer Valley resort guests.
9. All trash and recycling receptacles must be screened and not visible to guests.
10. The annual installation shall not exceed 180 days

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

- E. 1060 Woodside Avenue – Plat Amendment –** The Applicant Proposes to Combine Lots 17, 18, And 19 of Block 4 of Snyders Addition to Park City to Create a 5,662.8 Square Foot Lot in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. PL-25-06695.

Planner Covey presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Plat Amendment for 1060 Woodside Avenue. She reported that 1060 Woodside Avenue is in the HR-1 Zoning District and there is a Landmark Historic Structure on the site that is built over three existing lots. The applicant is proposing to combine the three lots to create one 5,662.8 square foot lot. The maximum building footprint for this lot would be 2,059, which is included as a Condition of Approval to include as a Plat Note on the recorded plat. As conditioned, the proposal is compliant with LMC Chapter 15-2.2 and LMC Section 15-7.1-3(B). Any future work the applicant would do on the historic structure would need to be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Board. Any additions would be reviewed by the Planning Department through the Historic District Design Review application process.

Planner Covey shared the proposed plat and noted that there is a 10-foot snow storage easement around the outside of the lot. Some of the Conditions of Approval were reviewed with the Commission. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission consider approving the proposal based on the items in the Draft Final Action Letter.

Chair Van Dine opened the public hearing.

Heidi Goedhart stated that she is one of the owners of 1059 Park Avenue. The rear of her property abuts the applicant's residence. After reviewing the Staff Report, she has no issues and is pleased to see that there is a condition to limit the building envelope size.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Sigg moved to APPROVE the 1060 Woodside Avenue – Plat Amendment, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. 1060 Woodside Avenue (Parcel No. SA-38) is a Landmark Historic Site in the Historic Residential – 1 (HR-1) Zoning District as designated by Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-11-10.
2. The Landmark Historic Structure on the site was constructed circa 1928 during the Mature Mining Era.
3. The existing Landmark Historic Structure straddles Lots 17, 18, and 19 of Block 4 of Snyders Addition to Park City. The property has one Summit County Tax Identification Number.
4. LMC § 15-2.2-3(A) establishes a minimum Lot size of 1,875 square feet and a maximum Lot size of 3,750 square feet in the HR-1 Zoning District.
5. Because the 5,662.8-square-foot Lot at 1060 Woodside Avenue is a Landmark Historic Site, it is a valid Non-Complying Lot pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-4.
6. LMC § 15-2.2-3(B) establishes a minimum Lot width requirement of 25 feet in the HR-1 Zoning District. The Lot at 1060 Woodside Avenue is 75 feet wide and compliant.
7. The Planning Commission finds Good Cause for this Plat Amendment because it creates a Lot for the Landmark Historic Site and allows the Applicant to make improvements to the Historic Structure and Site. The proposed Plat Amendment does not create any non-conformities. No Public Street, Right of Way, or easement is vacated or amended.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The Plat Amendment is consistent with the LMC, including Chapter 15-2.2 *Historic Residential - 1 (HR-1) Zoning District* and § 15-7.1-3(B) *Classification Of Subdivision– Plat Amendment*.
2. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed Plat Amendment.
3. Approval of the Plat Amendment, 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 shall review and approve the final form and content of the Plat Amendment for compliance with State law, the LMC, and these Conditions of Approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The Applicant shall record this Plat Amendment at the county within one year from the date of Planning Commission approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year, this approval 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 include a Plat Note limiting the Building Footprint to 2,059 square feet.

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

7. ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting adjourned at approximately 7:24 p.m.