



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
DECEMBER 10, 2025**

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair Pro Tem Bill Johnson, Seth Beal (left at 6:30 p.m.), Henry Sigg, John Frontero, Rick Shand, Grant Tilson

EX OFFICIO: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Meredith Covey, Planner II; Jaron Ehlers, Planner I; Alec Barton, Senior Planner; Rhoda Stauffer, Affordable Housing Project Manager; Elissa Martin, Planning Project Manager; Steven Dennis, Capital Projects Manager; Virgil Lund, Planner II; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney; Conor Campobasso, Senior Transportation Planner; Julia Collins, Transportation Planning Manager; Chris Eggleton, Economic Development and Housing Director; Matthew Lee, Project Manager for Economic Development

1. ROLL CALL

In the absence of Chair Christin Van Dine, Chair Pro Tem Bill Johnson called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. All Commissioners are present with the exception of Chair Van Dine. Commissioner Henry Sigg joined shortly after roll call.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from November 12, 2025.

MOTION: Commissioner Shand moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from November 12, 2025. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Frontero. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, shared information about the code amendments the Planning Commission recommended as a result of changes to State Code requirements. These are related to public noticing, public meetings, and continuations, and are scheduled for City Council consideration tomorrow evening. On December 18, 2025, the City Council will be reviewing updates to the Main Street Area Plan as well as updates to the Memorandum of Agreement required by the amendments to the Empire Pass

Development Agreement. In addition, the Clark Ranch Conservation Easement will be before the Council during the City Council Meeting scheduled for December 18, 2025.

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

5. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. 37 Hillside Avenue – Plat Amendment** – The Applicant Proposes to Combine Lot 12 and a Portion of Lot 11 of Block 19 of the Park City Survey to Create One 2,617.23 Square Foot Lot for a Significant Historic Site in the Historic Residential - 1 Zoning District. PL-25-06763.

Planner II, Meredith Covey, presented the Staff Report and explained that the application is a Plat Amendment for 37 Hillside Avenue. She reported that 37 Hillside Avenue is a Significant Historic Site in the Historic Residential – 1 (“HR-1”) Zoning District. The applicant is proposing to combine Lot 12 and a portion of Lot 11 of Block 19 of the Park City Survey to create one 2,617.23 square foot lot. The existing Significant Historic Structure straddles the two lots. The maximum building footprint of the proposed lot will be 1,129.64 square feet. As conditioned, the proposal is compliant with the HR-1 Zoning District regulations and the subdivision regulations, as it will amend the plat to reflect existing conditions and allow the applicant to make improvements to the structure.

All future work on the Significant Historic Structure will be required to be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Board and will also be reviewed under the Historic District Design regulations. Any work related to steep slopes will return to the Planning Commission to be reviewed through a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (“SSCUP”). Staff recommends that Condition of Approval #5 be added to the Draft Final Action Letter:

- The Applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Agreement with the adjacent property owner for the portion of the Historic Structure that encroaches onto the adjacent property, unless in the future, the Historic Preservation Board approves material deconstruction resulting in the removal of the encroachment.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission consider approving the proposal based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval, as amended.

Commissioner Grant Tilson asked about the encroachment of the existing structure into the neighboring lot. He wanted to know how significant that encroachment is. Planner Covey shared an image with the Commission to illustrate the encroachment and explained that it is approximately 2 feet. Commissioner John Frontero asked whether the driveway encroaches. Planner Covey shared the Existing Conditions Survey and noted that the property lines are shown with a heavy dashed line. It was noted that there is a

sign from Park City stating that parking is reserved for 37 Hillside Avenue, but there has never been a formal agreement. That is the reason for the Encroachment Agreement that has been proposed. Commissioner Frontero stated the Staff Report and the proposed Conditions of Approval make him comfortable with the application.

Commissioner Sigg finds the Conditions of Approval recommended by Staff are sufficient. Commissioner Seth Beal agreed. Chair Pro Tem Johnson asked to review the Draft Final Action Letter. Planner Covey clarified that Condition of Approval #5 is proposed to be added. The amendment will need to be mentioned in the motion language.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Commissioner Frontero moved to APPROVE the Plat Amendment for 37 Hillside Avenue, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval, as amended:

Findings of Fact:

1. 37 Hillside Avenue (Parcel No. PC-243) is a Significant Historic Site in the Historic Residential – 1 (HR-1) Zoning District pursuant to Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-11-10. The property contains all of Lot 12 and a portion of Lot 11 of Block 19 of the Park City Survey.
2. The Significant Historic Structure on the site was constructed circa 1885 during the Mature Mining Era and straddles Lot 12 and Lot 11 of Block 19 of the Park City Survey.
3. The proposed Plat Amendment creates a 2,617.23-square-foot Lot. The Lot is compliant with the 3,750-square-foot maximum Lot size outlined in LMC § 15-2.2-3.
4. Pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-4, any additions to the Significant Historic Structure must comply with Building Setbacks and Footprint regulations of the HR-1 Zoning District.
5. The proposed Lot at 37 Hillside Avenue is 40.7 feet wide and is compliant with the minimum Lot width requirement of 25 feet in the HR-1 Zoning District.
6. The Planning Commission finds Good Cause for this Plat Amendment because it reflects existing conditions 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 has been 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 Land Management Code, 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's time, this approval for the 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 include a Plat Note limiting the Building Footprint of the Lot to 1,129.64 square feet.
4. The Applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Agreement from the City Engineer for the existing stairs, retaining walls, and landscaping in the City Right of Way prior to plat recordation.
5. The Applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Agreement with the adjacent property owner for the portion of the Historic Structure that encroaches onto the adjacent property, unless in the future, the Historic Preservation Board approves material deconstruction resulting in the removal of the encroachment.

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

- B. 7800 Royal Street Unit 6 – Condominium Plat Amendment –** The Applicant Proposes to Amend the Sterlingwood Condominiums Unit 6 to Convert 338 Square Feet of Common Area to Private Ownership and 30 Square Feet of Limited Common Area to Private Ownership to Reflect As-Built Conditions in the Recreation Development Zoning District, Sensitive Land Overlay, and Deer Valley Master Planned Development. PL-25-06707.

Planner I, Jaron Ehlers, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Condominium Plat Amendment application for 7800 Royal Street Unit 6. The applicant proposes to amend Unit 6 of the Sterlingwood Condominiums Plat to convert 338 square feet of common area to private ownership and 30 square feet of limited common area to private ownership. It is located in the Recreation Development (“RD”) Zoning District, Sensitive Land Overlay (“SLO”), and Deer Valley Master Planned Development (“MPD”).

There are three elements to the proposed Plat Amendment, which includes the lower level, main level and upper level. The applicant proposes to convert the following:

- 119 square feet of common area crawl space to private area on the lower level;
- 30 square feet of limited common area (platted as part of the garage) to private area on the main level;
- 219 square feet of common area (located above the garage) on the upper level.

Planner Ehlers shared some background information. On December 27, 1984, the Sterlingwood Condominiums Plat was recorded, creating an 18-unit condominium. On June 6, 2001, the City issued a Building Permit for Unit 6 that allowed for an expansion into the garage and the creation of a new bedroom above the garage. Despite the scope of work requiring the removal and shifting of walls under common ownership, no Plat Amendment was completed. On October 25, 2022, the City passed Ordinance No. 02-34. There were two other Plat Amendments in the Sterlingwood Condominiums, but neither affected Unit 6. On September 25, 2025, the applicant applied for the Condominium Plat Amendment to reflect the work completed in 2001 and propose new modifications to the platted crawl space. The application included a letter affirming that two-thirds of the members of the Homeowners Association (“HOA”) approved the proposed Plat Amendment, which is seen as Exhibit F in the Meeting Materials Packet.

The proposed Plat Amendment complies with the RD and SLO requirements because there are no changes proposed to the exterior, and the building footprint would not be expanded. Staff finds there is Good Cause for the main and upper levels, because that corrects the issue with the conditions approved as part of the 2001 Building Permit. In

addition, Staff finds there is Good Cause for the lower level, because that will not lead to a reduction of open space or an expansion of the existing building footprint.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission review the proposed Plat Amendment, conduct a public hearing, and consider approval of the application based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval in the Draft Final Action Letter.

Commissioner Beal asked about the lower level. He wanted to know if the plan is to make that part of the room. Megan Blosser from Alliance Engineering explained that it is currently a storage area. It is already dug out and concreted, so it is a matter of cutting a door. That space already exists, so there will not be any excavation that occurs.

Commissioner Sigg noted that it appears the Planning Commission is cleaning up existing conditions. Commissioner Frontero wanted to know who is responsible for filing a Plat Amendment. In 2001, building took place with a Building Permit, but the Plat Amendment was never filed. Director Ward clarified that the City does not have all of the details about the process at that time. In the current process, if a Building Permit is submitted that changes the way something is platted in a condominium, the Planning Department reviews the Building Permit. Those are not processed until a Plat Amendment is completed. There is some uncertainty about what happened back in 2001. Director Ward explained that if the Commission approves this Plat Amendment, it will go through the finalization to prepare the plat for recordation. That must occur before a Building Permit is issued for the additional work. Commissioner Frontero appreciated the clarification.

Commissioner Rick Shand understands the concerns from Commissioner Frontero, because there are situations where certain cleanup items come back to the Planning Commission. Chair Pro Tem Johnson agreed that the Commission is constantly rectifying these types of situations, and it can be frustrating. He echoed the comments shared.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Commissioner Sigg moved to APPROVE the Condominium Plat Amendment at 7800 Royal Street, Unit 6, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

Procedural History:

1. On December 27, 1984, the Sterlingwood Condominium Plat was recorded, creating an 18-unit Condominium.
2. While the Sterlingwood Condominium Plat has been amended twice, Unit 6 has never been affected.

3. On June 6, 2001, the City issued a Building Permit for Unit 6 that allowed for an expansion into the garage and the creation of a new bedroom above the garage. Despite the scope of work requiring the removal and shifting of walls under Common Ownership, no Plat Amendment was completed.
4. On August 22, 2002, the City Council adopted Ordinance No. 02-34 (Exhibit G) which amended Units 1-6 and 16-18. The approved change to Unit 6 was similar to the proposed change to the Upper Level in the pending application except there would have been an alteration to the Roof. The Plat Amendment was never recorded.
5. On September 25, 2025, the Applicant applied for the Condominium Plat Amendment to reflect the work completed in 2001 and to propose new modifications to platted crawl space. That included a letter affirming that 2/3rds of the members of the Homeowner's Association had approved the proposed Plat Amendment. On November 6, 2025, staff deemed the application complete.

Findings of Fact:

1. The proposed Plat Amendment is located at 7800 Royal Street Unit 6.
2. The property is located in the Recreation Development Zoning District, Sensitive Land Overlay, and Deer Valley Master Planned Development.
3. Multi-Unit Dwellings are a Conditional Use in the RD Zoning District when part of the MPD. Unit 6 is part of the Sterlingwood Condominium Plat, approved by the City Council and recorded with Summit County on December 27, 1984, and is part of the Deer Valley Master Planned Development.
4. There are no proposed changes to the exterior of the existing Structure, or expansion of the Building Footprint, as part of this Plat Amendment.
5. There are no proposed changes to the exterior of the Structure and no expansion of the Building Footprint as part of this Plat Amendment. Therefore, no SLO analysis is required.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposal to convert Common and Limited Common Area to Private Ownership complies with the requirements of the RD Zoning District pursuant to Land Management Code (LMC) Chapter 15-2.18.

2. The proposal to convert Common and Limited Common Area to Private Ownership complies with the requirements of the Sensitive Land Overlay pursuant to LMC Chapter 15-2.21.
3. The proposal to convert Common and Limited Common Area to Private Ownership complies with the requirements of Classification of Subdivision pursuant to LMC Section 15-7.1-3.
4. There is Good Cause for the proposed conversions of the main and upper levels because they will correct the existing conditions approved through the 2001 Building Permit.
5. There is Good Cause for the proposed conversion of the lower level because it is within the existing Building Footprint, so the amount of Open Space will not be affected, and it complies with the requirements of the LMC.

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 record with Summit County an Amendment to the CC&Rs concurrent with the Plat Amendment recordation to reflect the changes in Ownership.

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

- C. 7700 Marsac Avenue (Mine Bench Site) – Modification** – The Applicant Requests to Modify the Planning Commission Conditional Use Permit for City Employee Temporary Housing on the Mine Bench Site Located in the Recreation and Open Space Zoning District to Extend the Approval to October 31, 2029. PL-25-06748.

Senior Planner, Alec Barton, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a

Modification request at 7700 Marsac Avenue. He reported that this is a 29-acre parcel owned by Park City Municipal Corporation and is also known as the Mine Bench Site.

Parcel PCA-S-98-L-X is a 1.99-acre parcel owned by Jordanelle Special Service District (“JSSD”) within the City-owned parcel. It is currently being used to house two 400-square-foot temporary housing trailers. A Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) was approved for this use in 2022 for the Park City Fire District. The trailers were no longer required for use by the Park City Fire District, and in 2023, the City Council authorized the Housing Team to acquire the trailers and use them as housing for City employees.

On September 27, 2023, the Planning Commission approved a modification to the 2022 CUP to continue the use of the housing trailers to provide housing for City employees. The proposed modification is to extend the use of the trailers for housing for City employees to October 31, 2029. Through the CUP, the project is conditioned to comply with the setback and height requirements of the Recreation and Open Space (“ROS”) Zoning District as well as the parking requirements for that district. Planner Barton highlighted several of the Conditions of Approval included in the Draft Final Action Letter.

Staff recommends the Planning Commission review the Modification request, 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.

Commissioner Tilson asked what would happen if a different use for the site is identified. He mentioned the temporary nature of the housing and asked if the housing would need to remain in place until the expiration of this extension. Affordable Housing Project Manager, Rhoda Stauffer, explained that this will remain as housing until October 31, 2029. The Public Works Department would like some time to negotiate with JSSD, because the hope is for that particular piece to be permanently owned by the City. It is filled with City maintenance facilities as well as the temporary housing trailers. There is uncertainty about whether the trailers will remain there, as there might be a better location, but Public Works would like some time to figure out the details.

Director Ward explained that the current location impacts existing water infrastructure. The reason this is recommended through 2029 is that if the use is proposed to continue, it would need to come back to the Planning Commission. There would either need to be relocation within the site or relocation to another site. Based on plans to update some of the infrastructure, closer to 2029 or after that date, a change will be required.

Commissioner Shand asked how many employees the two trailers house. Manager Stauffer reported that these house one employee per trailer, so two total employees. Commissioner Shand believes if this is needed, it makes sense to extend the use to 2029.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson noted that when this was first proposed, there was a bit of a concern about the insulation paneling that was used on the lower portion of the buildings.

He asked if there has been any deterioration seen with that. Manager Stauffer clarified that it has been replaced twice. It is a very cold and high wind area, so the panels below the trailers are constantly being inspected. There were no additional questions.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Commissioner Shand moved to APPROVE the Modification of the CUP for 7700 Marsac Avenue (Mine Bench Site), according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. The property is located at 7700 Marsac Avenue in the Recreation and OpenSpace (ROS) Zoning District.
2. On March 23, 2022, the Planning Commission reviewed a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for Park City Fire District's (PCFD) proposal to temporarily install two Temporary Housing Trailers for personnel living quarters and storage of two fire trucks on the Mine Bench property during the construction of Fire Station 34 in Upper Deer Valley.
3. Condition of Approval 7 from the 2022 approval required PCFC to request an extension of the approval from the Planning Commission if the use of the site extends beyond January 1, 2023.
4. PCFD did not request an extension prior to the expiration of the CUP, and the approval expired.
5. PCFD offered the City the opportunity to purchase the two Temporary Housing Trailers.
6. On July 27, 2023, the City council authorized the Housing Team to acquire the two Temporary Housing Trailers in the amount of \$180,000.
7. The Housing Team requests to modify the March 23, 2022, approval to continue to use the Mine Bench site until October 31, 2029, for temporary employee housing while the City searches for a permanent location for the two Temporary Housing Trailers.
8. Park City's Public Works Department currently uses portions of the Mine Bench site for storage and maintenance of equipment.

9. The City leases portions of the Mine Bench property for other uses and the City provided notice to their existing tenants that City Employees will possibly occupy the two Temporary Housing Trailers.
10. The ROS Zoning District establishes a 25-foot front, side, and rear setback from the boundary line of the lot, district, or public right-of-way. The two Temporary Housing Trailers were installed in such a way they meet the required 25-foot setback.
11. LMC § 15-2.7-4 establishes a 28-foot Building Height limit. The tallest trailer is 16 feet, two inches.
12. Essential Municipal Public Utility Uses, Facilities, Services, and Structures greater than 600 square feet in the ROS Zoning District are a Conditional Use.
13. The two Temporary Housing Trailers are 400 square feet each.
14. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with the criteria outlined in LMC section 15-1-10(E).
 - a. Size and Location of the Site - Since 2022, the two 400-square-foot Housing Trailers have been located within the JSSD parcel of the Mine Bench site. They will remain in the same location.
 - b. Traffic Capacity - The Mine Bench is accessed from Marsac Avenue. Traffic Impact Studies are required for developments that generate 25 new vehicle trips. The Housing Trailers are limited to one person or a couple per unit and do not generate more than 25 new vehicle trips.
 - c. Utility Capacity - PCFD worked with the Snyderville Basin Water Reclamation District and the Engineering and Public Works Departments to coordinate connections to existing sanitary sewer and water lines. The Housing Trailers are connected to existing onsite power sources.
 - d. Emergency Vehicle Access - On May 25, 2023 and November 18, 2025, PCFD confirmed the proposal meets their requirements.
 - e. Off-Street Parking - Public Utility Uses require:
 - i. One space per five seats; or,
 - ii. Two spaces per three employees; or,
 - iii. One space per 1,000 square feet or floor Area, whichever is greater.

The Site does not have dedicated parking, but there is ample unused space adjacent to the two Temporary Housing Trailers to provide up to eight

parking spaces. Public Works will limit occupancy of the two Temporary Housing Trailers to one person or couple per unit.

- f. Internal Vehicular and Pedestrian Circulation - The continued use of the two Temporary Housing Trailers will not detrimentally impact internal vehicle or pedestrian circulation.
- g. Fencing, Screening, and Landscaping - The existing site is well-screened from Marsac Avenue by the existing topography of the site; there is no new fencing or landscaping proposed.
- h. Building Mass, Bulk, and Orientation - The two Temporary Housing Trailers are 38 feet long by 10.55 feet wide (400 square feet) each. They are set back more than 25 feet from the property line and are not visible from Marsac Avenue or the entrance of the Mine Bench.
- i. Useable Open Space - The proposed use does not change or disturb the site's Open Space because the tiny homes will remain in the same approved location.
- j. Signs and Lighting - No signs or lighting are proposed.
- k. Physical Design and Compatibility with Surrounding Structures – The Housing Trailers are modern and compatible in style, scale, and mass with the industrial-type structures on the site.
- l. Noise, Vibration, Odors, Steam, or Other Mechanical Factors – See Condition of Approval 1 - The current Use as two Temporary Housing Trailers for PCFD has not produced any known noise complaints. The surrounding buildings are industrial in nature and are more than 400 feet away. However, staff recommends including a Condition of Approval that requires compliance with Municipal Code Chapter 6-3, Noise.
- m. Control of Delivery and Service Vehicles, Loading and Unloading Zones, and screening of Trash and Recycling Pickup Areas - See Condition of Approval 2 - Delivery and service vehicles do not need to access the site and do not require mitigation for loading and unloading zones. However, the occupants of the two Temporary Housing Trailers shall ensure trash and recycling is disposed of properly on site and removed weekly.
- n. Expected Ownership and Management of the Project - See Condition of Approval 3 and 5 - Park City Municipal owns 29.07 acres of the Mine Bench property. In 2002, approximately two acres within the Mine Bench property was conveyed to JSSD (Parcel PCA-S-98-L-X). The City is currently looking to acquire the parcel from JSSD. Prior to the March 23, 2022, CUP approval, JSSD and PCFD entered into an agreement to use JSSD's parcel for the Housing Trailers. In 2023, PCMC purchased the Housing Trailers and the Housing team manages their occupancy and maintenance. Condition of Approval

- 5 requires the Housing team to acquire an extended agreement with JSSD.
- o. Within and Adjoining Environmentally Sensitive Lands, Physical Mine Hazards, Historic Mine Waste, Park City Soils Ordinance, Steep Slopes -The Housing Trailers are located on a level concrete pad and will not disturb mine hazards or mine waste. No physical changes are proposed to the site.
 - p. General Plan Consistency - Item H2 of the General Plan outlines that Park City will prioritize housing for 15% of the total workforce within the City boundary. The proposal assists with reaching that goal.
 - q. Radon Mitigation - Not required for temporary structures. Any permanent structure will need to be equipped with radon mitigation.
15. Staff published notice on the City's website, the Utah Public Notice website, and posted notice on the property on November 25, 2025.
16. *The Park Record* published notice on November 25, 2025.

Conclusions of Law:

- 1. The application is consistent with the Land Management Code, including LMC Chapter 15-2.7 *Recreation and Open Space (ROS) District*, LMC § 15-1-10 *Conditional Use Review*, and LMC Chapter 15-2.21 *Sensitive Land Overlay Zone (SLO) Regulations*.
- 2. The Use is 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. The Use of the two Temporary Housing Trailers shall comply with Municipal Code Chapter 6-3 *Noise*.
- 2. The occupants of the two Temporary Housing Trailers shall ensure trash and recycling is disposed of properly on site and removed weekly.
- 3. This Approval expires on October 31, 2029, and the two Temporary Housing Trailers shall either be removed, relocated, or the Applicant shall obtain Planning Commission approval for permanent use.

4. Use of the two Temporary Housing Trailers is limited to City Public Works employees, or those employees associated with the Essential Municipal Services provided in association with the Mine Bench Site. Public Works shall limit occupancy of the two Temporary Housing Trailers to one person or couple per unit.
5. The Housing Team shall acquire an extended agreement to October 31, 2029, with JSSD within 30 days of this approval, or the approval is void.

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

- D. 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.

Planning Project Manager, Elissa Martin, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is an SSCUP application for 368 Woodside Avenue. She reviewed the updated plans for the proposed single-family dwelling. 368 Woodside Avenue is a 2,812 square foot lot in the HR-1 Zoning District. The Commission reviewed the project during the November 12, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting and continued the item to the current meeting, requesting that the applicant explore design alternatives to reduce the building height.

The applicant plans reviewed during the November 12, 2025, Planning Commission Meeting included a building height exception of 4 feet 4 inches for the downhill side of the garage shed roof and an internal building height that exceeded the maximum of 35 feet by 1 foot 8 inches. The applicant submitted modified plans that show a reduced external building height, which exceeds the HR-1 Zone height by 2 feet 6 inches. The updated plans also show that the proposed single-family dwelling meets the internal building height of 35 feet. An image was shared to highlight the previous and current proposals.

The majority of the proposed structure is well under the 27-foot zone height, except for the rear portion of the garage shed roof. Manager Martin reported that the area highlighted in yellow shows the roof that is under the 27-foot zone height. The small portion highlighted in orange represents the portion of the roof that is over that height.

The applicant requests a building height exception to accommodate a two-car garage in a tandem parking configuration. This is to comply with the required off-street parking in Chapter 15-3. For a single-family dwelling, the requirement is for two parking spaces. The portion of the driveway not in the public right-of-way is limited to 12 feet 9 inches, which is not sufficient to accommodate one of the two required 18-foot deep spaces. The Staff Report contemplates one design alternative, which would result in one compliant parking space in the driveway and a one-car garage. This could be done by pushing the

garage further back into the lot. However, this change would have an impact on the entry level roof form, as the garage and living area are connected by one contributory roof form, which is required to have at least a 7:12 pitch. Even by pushing the garage back into the lot further, the roof may still necessitate a height exception. Additionally, the design could result in other non-compliances with the HR-1 requirements.

To achieve the reduced building height, the applicant increased the slope of the driveway to the maximum 14% allowed and adjusted the floor-to-ceiling height of each level to reduce the overall external and internal building height. The proposed plans now show that the internal building height meets the 35-foot maximum as measured from the lowest floor plane to the highest wall top plate. In terms of the SSCUP criteria, the location of development is on a previously disturbed site built to the required setbacks and is designed to minimize the visual impact as viewed from the street. The proposed retaining walls step with the natural grade of the site, and the change in grade does not exceed 4 vertical feet. The building is broken into a series of smaller modules that are compatible with the Historic District. In addition, the structure steps with the grade. The front of the building, as viewed from the street, is similar in scale to existing surrounding structures.

Staff finds there are no unmitigated impacts of the dwelling volume on the steep slope. The majority of the structure meets the HR-1 Zone height and is compatible in scale with the surrounding existing structures. Staff finds there are no unmitigated impacts related to building height, but the proposed height does require Planning Commission approval of a building height exception, pursuant to Land Management Code ("LMC") 15-2.2-5 – Building Height Exceptions, Garage on Downhill Lot, which states:

- **GARAGE ON DOWNHILL LOT.** The Planning Commission may allow additional Building Height (see entire Section 15-2.2-5) on a downhill Lot to accommodate a single-car wide garage in a Tandem Parking configuration; to accommodate circulation, such as stairs and/or an ADA elevator; and to accommodate a reasonably sized front entry area and front porch that provides a Compatible streetscape design. The depth of the garage may not exceed the minimum depth for internal Parking Space(s) as dimensioned within this Code, Chapter 15-3. The additional Building Height may not exceed thirty-five feet (35') from Existing Grade.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission review the SSCUP for 368 Woodside Avenue, conduct a public hearing, and consider approval based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter.

Commissioner Beal appreciates the work that was done to alleviate the building height, particularly the interior building height. He recognizes that in order to achieve the two-car garage that is required by code, the shed roof is slightly higher, but the height exception is quite small. This will be consistent with the neighboring structures.

Commissioner Sigg noted that there were discussions about the shed roof encroaching beyond the 27 feet, but it is part of the massing of the building as well and not just the roof form. This was confirmed. Commissioner Frontero echoed the comments made by other Commissioners. He appreciates that the applicant listened to the previous Planning Commission comments and reworked the plan to create what has now been proposed. Though the shed roof is slightly higher than the maximum, it was proposed to be over 4 feet higher and now it is down to 2 feet 6 inches. He expressed support for the height exception on the shed roof based on the additional effort made to reduce other areas.

Commissioner Shand asked that Figure 7 from the Staff Report be shared. He prefers the tandem garage that has been proposed by the applicant and echoed the comments made by Commissioner Frontero. Commissioner Tilson finds the revised plan meets the requirements for a height exception for a garage on a downhill lot. Chair Pro Tem Johnson stated that the revisions and updates made to the proposal are reasonable.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Commissioner Sigg moved to APPROVE the Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit for 368 Woodside Avenue, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

Background Facts:

1. 368 Woodside Avenue is Lot A of the Wardell Replat First Amended Subdivision within the Historic Residential-1 (HR-1) Zoning District.
2. The Planning Commission approved the Wardell Replat First Amended Subdivision on April 2, 2025, which created the 2,812.5-square-foot Lot A (368 Woodside Avenue) and the 1,875-square-foot Lot B (368 Woodside Avenue); the plat has not been recorded and this SSCUP approval is conditioned upon the recordation of the Plat with Summit County.
3. The existing Single-Family Dwelling (SFD) that straddles the common Lot line is proposed to be demolished and two new SFDs are proposed to be constructed on Lots A and B.
4. A Historic District Design Review application is being processed concurrently.

Findings of Fact:

1. The property owner submitted a SSCUP application for 368 Woodside Avenue to construct a SFD on slopes over 30% in accordance with Land

Management Code (LMC) § 15-2.2-6, which requires a SSCUP for construction of any Structure with a Building Footprint in excess of two hundred square feet if said Building Footprint is located on or projecting over an existing Slope of thirty percent (30%) or greater.

2. As conditioned, the proposed SFD meets the HR-1 Zoning District Lot and Site Requirements, pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-3, according to the following findings:

Zoning Requirement	Analysis
LMC § 15-2.2-3(A) Minimum Lot Size for an SFD – 1,875 square feet	COMPLIES: The SFD is proposed on a 2,812-square-foot Lot.
Maximum Lot Size – 3,750 square feet	COMPLIES: The area of the Lot is under 3,750 square feet, at 2,812 square feet.
LMC § 15-2.2-3(B) Minimum Lot Width is 25 feet, measured 15 feet back from the Front Lot Line	COMPLIES: The Lot measures 37.5 feet in width.
LMC § 15-2.2-3(E) Maximum Building Footprint – 1200.5 square feet (1)	COMPLIES: The proposed Structure has a Building Footprint of 1,200 square feet.
LMC § 15-2.2-3(F) Lots that are 75 feet in depth require 10-foot Front and Rear Setbacks (2)	COMPLIES: The Lot is 75 feet in depth. The proposed Structure and decks are set back 10 feet from the Front and Rear Lot lines.
LMC § 15-2.2-3(G), the Front Setback must be open and free of any Structure except: “Fences, walls, and retaining walls not more than four feet (4') in height, or as permitted in Section 15-4-2 Fences and Retaining Walls.” “Roof overhangs, eaves or cornices projecting not more than three feet (3') into the Front Setback” “Hard-surfaced driveways leading to a Garage”	COMPLIES: There are two retaining walls that encroach into the Front Setback that do not exceed four feet in height. COMPLIES: The roof overhang extends two feet into the Front Setback. COMPLIES: The proposed driveway is within the Front Setback and leads to an approved garage (see Analysis Section II Off-Street Parking below for additional requirements related to the driveway).

<p>LMC § 15-2.2-3(H), the Rear Setback must be open and free of any Structure except:</p> <p>“Patios, decks, pathways, steps, or similar Structures not more than thirty inches (30") above Final Grade, not including any required handrail, and located at least one foot (1') from the Rear Lot Line”</p>	<p>COMPLIES AS CONDITIONED: Applicant’s plans show a patio and steps that encroach 2 feet 3 inches into the Rear Setback. The patio and stairs are located over seven feet from the Rear Lot Line. The patio and stairs must not exceed 30” in height above Final Grade in the Rear Setback.</p> <p>Condition of Approval 8(a) requires the plans be updated to clearly show Final Grade that is no more than 30 inches below the top of the patio and stairs in the Rear Setback prior to HDDR Final Action.</p>
<p>“Fences, walls, and retaining walls as permitted in Section 15-4-2, Fences and Retaining Walls are permitted within the Rear Setback. Pursuant to LMC § 15-4-2, Fences and retaining walls shall not exceed six feet (6’) in height measured from Final Grade within any required Rear Setback.”</p> <p>“Mechanical equipment (which must be screened), hot tubs, or similar Structures located at least three feet (3’) from the Rear Lot Line are allowed in the Rear Setback.”</p>	<p>COMPLIES: The retaining wall proposed in the Rear Setback is 4 feet, 10 inches in height from Final Grade.</p> <p>COMPLIES: The plans show a 12-foot by 8-foot swim spa on the rear patio. The 96-square-foot swim spa is considered a hot tub or similar Structure, which may encroach into the Rear Setback and must be no more than three feet from the Rear Lot Line. The swim spa is located approximately 1 foot, 10 inches from the Rear Lot Line and is recessed into the patio.</p>
<p>LMC § 15-13-2.2-3(I) Side Setbacks for Lots up to 25 feet in width require three-foot Setbacks on each side (3)</p> <p>LMC § 15-2.2-3(J), the Side Setback must be open and free of any Structure except:</p> <p>“A one foot (1’) roof or eave overhang is permitted on Lots with a Side Setback of less than five feet (5’)”</p>	<p>COMPLIES: The Structure is set back three feet from the side Lot Lines.</p> <p>COMPLIES: The roof overhang extends one foot into the Side Setbacks on each side.</p>
<p>LMC § 15-4-2(A), “Fences and retaining walls shall not exceed six feet (6’) in height measured from Final Grade within any required Rear Setback or Side</p>	<p>COMPLIES: The Applicant proposes retaining walls that encroach into the Side Setback that do not exceed six feet in height.</p>

<p>Setback.”</p> <p>“Patios, decks, pathways, steps, or similar Structures not more than thirty inches (30”) in height above Final Grade, not including any required handrails.”</p>	<p>COMPLIES: two small stairways are proposed within each Side Setback. The steps do not exceed 30” in height above Final Grade.</p>
--	--

1 MAXIMUM FP = (A/2) x 0.9A/1875 where FP = maximum Building Footprint and A = Lot Area.

2 LMC § 15-2.2-3(F)

3 LMC § 15-2.2-3(I)

3. The SFD complies with the Off-Street Parking Requirements pursuant to LMC Chapter 15-3, with an approved Building Height Exception in accordance with LMC § 15-2.2-5(D)(4) *Building Height Exceptions, Garage on Downhill Lot*, according to the following findings:
 - a. To meet the minimum Off-Street Parking requirement of two Parking Spaces, pursuant to Off-Street Parking standards outlined in LMC § 15-3-6(A), the Applicant requests Planning Commission approval of a Building Height exception pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-5 (D)(4) *Building Height Exceptions, Garage on Downhill Lot*.
 - b. The site is limited in depth and contains Very Steep Slopes; additionally, the required Off-Street Parking is limited to the portion of the driveway that is outside the public ROW and the garage.
 - c. The Building Height exception for Garages on a Downhill Lot requires that the garage does not exceed the minimum depth for an internal Parking Space, pursuant to LMC § 15-3-3(F), *Parking Space Dimensions*, which is 18 feet.
 - d. The depth of the driveway outside the public ROW is 12 feet 9¾ inches, which is not deep enough to accommodate Parking Spaces with the required dimension of 18 feet in depth, pursuant to LMC § 15-3-3(F), *Parking Space Dimensions*.
 - e. The Applicant proposes to accommodate the two required Parking Spaces in tandem within a single-car wide garage that is 36 feet in depth and 11 feet in width. The proposed garage would exceed the 27-foot Zone Height, by 2 feet 6 inches.
 - f. The proposed driveway and garage meet the standards outlined in Chapter 15-13 Historic District Regulations, as required by Chapter 15-3, Off-Street Parking in the following ways:
 - i. The proposed driveway is 10 feet in width.
 - ii. The proposed attached garage does not require excavation and is designed to be offset behind the pedestrian entrance.
4. The proposed SFD meets the HR-1 Zoning District Building Height requirements outlined in LMC § 15-2.2-5, with a Building Height Exception,

pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-5(D)(4) *Building Height Exception, Garage on a Downhill Lot*, in the following ways:

- a. While most of the Building, as measured from Existing Grade, meets the HR-1 Zone height of 27 feet, the Applicant requests a Building Height exception to allow a height of 29 feet 6 inches from Existing Grade, for the downhill side of the garage, pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-5(D)(4), which grants heights up to 35' to accommodate a single-car-wide garage in a Tandem Parking configuration, with Planning Commission approval.
 - b. The interior height, as measured from the Lowest Floor Plane to the point of the highest wall top plate that supports the ceiling joists is 35 feet.
 - c. The proposed SFD meets the requirement for a 10-foot horizontal step in the downhill façade.
 - d. The proposed Contributing Roof Form has a 7:12 pitch and has a horizontal distance that is over 20 feet, measured from the primary façade to the rear of the building, as viewed from the primary public ROW, which meets the HR-1 Building Height requirement according to LMC § 15-2.2-5(C).
 - e. The proposed Final Grade is within four feet of Existing Grade, consistent with LMC § 15-2.2-5.
5. The Applicant submitted a Geotechnical Analysis and a Topographic Map, in accordance with the requirements outlined in LMC § 15-2.2-6(B) *Development on Steep Slopes, Steep Slopes Review*.
 6. As conditioned, the proposed SFD meets the SSCUP criteria outlined in LMC § 15-2.2-6 *Development on Steep Slopes*, which requires Development on Steep Slopes to be environmentally sensitive to hillside Areas, carefully planned to mitigate adverse effects on neighboring land and Improvements, and is consistent with the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites Chapter 15-13.
- 1. LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT – *Development is located and designed to reduce visual and environmental impacts of the Structure.***

NO UNMITIGATED IMPACTS: The proposed Structure maximizes the full extent of the allowed Building Footprint of 1,200 square feet and is built to the required Setbacks. The SFD is designed to step up the hillside in a similar pattern to adjacent properties on the street and is consistent with the horizontal step-back requirement of the HR-1 Zoning District.

- 2. VISUAL ANALYSIS** – *The Applicant must provide the Planning Department with a visual analysis of the project from key Vantage Points: To determine potential impacts of the proposed Access, Building mass and design; and to identify the potential for Screening, Slope stabilization, erosion mitigation, vegetation protection, and other design opportunities.*

COMPLIES: The Applicant provided a visual analysis of the proposed development that includes four panoramic views of the existing site as viewed looking away from the site as well as four panoramic views looking towards the site, a streetscape elevation view, a 3D massing model and a rendering that superimposes the proposed project on the site, according to the SSCUP visual analysis requirements. The Visual Analysis shows the proposed SFD is highly visible from cross canyon views.

Screening

The proposed retaining walls surrounding the SFD are visible from cross-canyon Vantage Points.

Soil Stabilization

The City Engineer has reviewed the Applicant's submitted Geotechnical and Soils Investigation Report to ensure soil stabilization and drainage impacts are mitigated and may require additional modifications to the plans of the SFD prior to Building Permit.

Vegetation Protection

The site is disturbed by the existing SFD, though there is some natural vegetation that surrounds the existing SFD.

- 3. ACCESS** – *Access points and driveways must be designed to minimize Grading of the natural topography and to reduce overall Building scale. Shared Driveways and Parking Areas, and side Access to garages are strongly encouraged, where feasible.*

NO UNMITIGATED IMPACTS: Driveway access is from Woodside Avenue, at the highest elevation of the Lot, which allows the SFD to appear relatively small in scale, as viewed from the Street. The driveway will require minimal grading due to the existing SFD and driveway. The proposed driveway is 10 feet in width and approximately 29 feet in depth, with 12 feet 2 ½ inches of driveway outside the public ROW. The Applicant proposes a single-car-wide garage with two Parking Spaces in Tandem. The garage would require a Building Height exception pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-5(D)(4).

- 4. TERRACING** – *The Applicant shall terrace retaining walls to return to Natural Grade. The proposed Plans shall include detailed information, including height from Existing Grade, width, and length of all proposed retaining walls. A Building Permit, including drawings stamped by a licensed engineer, is required for any*

retaining wall or combination retaining wall with a total or combined height greater than four feet (4') in height.

NO UNMITIGATED IMPACTS: The Applicant submitted plans that include detailed information on the Structure's height from Existing Grade, width, and length of the proposed retaining walls. The Natural Grade of the site was disturbed with the construction of the original SFD. The proposed development on the site is designed to integrate with the existing grading on the site to step with Natural Grade; the proposed retaining walls do not exceed four feet in height.

Condition of Approval 8 requires a modification application be filed with the Planning Department and return to Planning Commission for review and Final Action if the height of any retaining walls is proposed to be modified by more than twelve inches in height, width, length, or location, or if there are modifications of pervious material to impervious material or changes to excavation depths, pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-6(4) Terracing.

- 5. BUILDING LOCATION** – *Buildings, Access, and infrastructure must be located to minimize cut and fill that would alter the perceived natural topography of the Site. The Site design and Building Footprint must coordinate with adjacent properties to maximize opportunities for open Areas and preservation of natural vegetation, to minimize driveway and Parking Areas, and to provide variation of the Front Yard.*

NO UNMITIGATED IMPACTS: The proposed SFD will be built within the existing site disturbance and will utilize the existing Parking Areas for the new driveway, minimizing cut and fill that would alter the perceived natural topography of the Site.

- 6. BUILDING FORM AND SCALE** – *Where Building masses orient against the Lot's existing contours, the Structures must be stepped with the Grade and broken into a series of individual smaller components that are Compatible with the District. Low profile Buildings that orient with existing contours are strongly encouraged. The garage must be subordinate in design to the main Building. In order to decrease the perceived bulk of the Main Building, the Planning Director and/or Planning Commission may require a garage separate from the main Structure or no garage.*

NO UNMITIGATED IMPACTS: The building mass of the proposed Structure steps with the Grade and is broken into a series of smaller volumes that are compatible with the Historic District.

- 7. SETBACKS** – *The Planning Commission may require an increase in one or more Setbacks to minimize the creation of a "wall effect" along the Street front and/or the Rear Lot Line. The Setback variation will be a function of the Site constraints, proposed Building scale, and Setbacks on adjacent Structures.*

NO UNMITIGATED IMPACTS: The proposed structure is compliant with the required Setbacks of the HR-1 Zoning District and is sited in a distance like adjacent properties.

8. **DWELLING VOLUME** – *The maximum volume of any Structure is a function of the Lot size, Building Height, Setbacks, and provisions set forth in this Chapter. The Planning Commission may further limit the volume of a proposed Structure to minimize its visual mass and/or to mitigate differences in scale between a proposed Structure and existing Structures.*

The rear of the proposed SFD is approximately 32 feet in width as viewed from cross canyon views and is four stories. There are three decks on the rear façade that are visible from cross canyon views.

Pursuant to LMC § 15-13-8(B)(7), decks shall be constructed in inconspicuous areas where visually minimized from the primary public right-of-way, usually on the tertiary façade.

COMPLIES: The decks are proposed on the tertiary façade and are not visible from the primary public ROW.

NO UNMITIGATED IMPACTS: The original iteration of the plans included decks on the tertiary façade that were 17 feet in width and 14 feet in depth. While the decks are not visible from the primary public ROW, they are visible from cross canyon views, contributing to the overall dwelling volume on the Steep Slope. The Applicant provided updated plans that show decks on the tertiary façade that are reduced in size. The deck on the main level, north elevation is 14 feet 9 inches in width and 11 feet 5 inches in depth. The deck on the main level is 13 ½ feet in width and 10 feet 3 inches in depth.

9. **BUILDING HEIGHT | STEEP SLOPE** – 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.

NO UNMITIGATED IMPACTS WITH APPROVED BUILDING HEIGHT EXCEPTION: The Applicant's proposed Building Height for the majority of the Structure meets the 27-foot Zone height and is consistent with the scale of Structures and Historic character of existing residential Structures.

A portion of the downhill side of the garage shed roof, which is only visible from the side and rear of the Structure, is 29 feet 6 inches; the Applicant requests a height exception pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-5(D)(4) Building Height Exceptions, Garage on Downhill Lot, for the additional 2 feet 6 inches of height. The LMC grants heights up to 35 feet for a

single-car-wide garage in a Tandem Parking configuration on a downhill Lot, with Planning Commission approval.

The minimum Off-Street parking requirement of two parking spaces and site constraints of the downhill Lot, including the limited depth of the driveway, necessitate a building height exception for the attached garage.

7. The Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal on August 5, 2025, and requires Condition of Approval 13.

Conclusions of Law:

1. As conditioned, the proposal complies with the LMC requirements in Chapter 15-2.2 *Historic Residential - 1 (HR-1) Zoning District*.
2. As conditioned, the proposal complies with the Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit criteria outlined in LMC § 15-2.2-6 *Development on Steep Slopes*.
3. As conditioned, the proposal complies with the LMC requirements in Chapter 15-3 *Off-Street Parking*.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the plans reviewed December 10, 2025, by the Planning Commission, with Staff redlines and required modifications in the Conditions of Approval of this Final Action Letter and pending additional design modifications required as part of the Historic District Design Review.
2. The proposed SFD shall meet all applicable standards outlined in LMC § 15-13-8. Prior to application for a Building Permit the Applicant shall obtain approval of the Historic District Design Review application, which may require additional modifications to the design of the SFD to comply with LMC Chapter 15-13, *Regulations For New Residential Infill Construction (and Non-Historic Residential Sites) In Historic Districts*.
3. If the Applicant does not obtain a Building Permit within one year of the date of this approval, this SSCUP approval will expire unless the Applicant submits a written extension request to the Planning Department prior to the expiration date and the Planning Director approves an extension.
4. Residential fire sprinklers are required for all new construction on this Lot, per requirements of the Chief Building Official.

5. The Wardell Replat First Amended Subdivision shall be recorded with the Summit County Recorder prior to submitting a Building Permit application.
6. Impacts to existing vegetation shall be minimized. Prior to HDDR approval, a landscape plan shall be submitted that shows all Significant Vegetation within twenty feet (20') of proposed Development, pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-10 *Vegetation Protection*; any areas disturbed during construction surrounding the proposed work shall be brought back to their original state.
7. The landscape plan, submitted prior to HDDR Final Action, shall include vegetative screening to reduce visibility of the retaining walls.
8. Prior to HDDR Final Action, the plans shall be modified to address the following items:
 - a. Clarify on the plans to show that Final Grade is no more than 30 inches below the rear patio and stairs.
 - b. Plans shall be updated to address any non-compliance with the HDDR standards, including glazing and external siding.
9. If the height of any retaining walls is proposed to be modified by more than twelve inches in height, width, length, or location, the Applicant shall file a modification application with the Planning Department and return to the Planning Commission for review and Final Action. Additionally, modifications of pervious material to impervious material or changes to excavation depths require a modification application and Planning Commission review and Final Action.
10. Additional modifications to the proposed structural components may be required based on Engineering review and approval of the Geotechnical and Soils Investigation Report, prior to applying for a Building Permit.
11. The Applicant will be required to provide intermediary shoring plans at the Building Permit phase.
12. If a heated driveway is installed in the portion of the driveway that encroaches into the City ROW, an encroachment agreement with the City is required.
13. For the sides of the SFD that are adjacent to another property, a Snow Shed Agreement and Access Agreement are required to be submitted to the Building Department, along with the Applicant's Building Permit.

14. 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 or designee prior to construction.
15. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved in advance by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

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

- E. Land Management Code Amendments –** The Planning Commission Will Review Amendments to Add Public Transit Amenity Areas as an Allowed Use and Front Setback Exception in the Historic Residential - Medium Density (Chapter 15-2.4), Historic Recreation Commercial (Chapter 15-2.5), Estate (Chapter 15-2.10), Residential Development (Chapter 15-2.13), and Recreation Commercial (Chapter 15-2.16) Zoning Districts, and Update Requirements for Public Transit Amenity Areas (Section 15-4-24). PL-25-06762.

Planner Barton presented the Staff Report and explained that this relates to LMC amendments. He is joined by Planner Ehlers and Capital Projects Manager, Steven Dennis. Planner Barton reported that there are proposed amendments to the LMC to allow Public Transit Amenity Areas as an allowed use in front setbacks in five zoning districts. The City is currently undergoing the Bus Stop Improvement Project over a four-year timeline to improve bus stops and shelters at many locations throughout the City.

Over the last two years, the Phase I improvements have addressed shelters, stops, and other amenities at a range of locations throughout the City. There has also been planning for Phase II and Phase III. During the next two phases, bus shelters in 10 locations would be located partially or fully outside the public right-of-way and on private property. Most of the proposed locations are in zoning districts that currently do not allow bus shelters as an allowed use or a front setback exception. Planner Barton shared a map with the Planning Commission with the location of the shelters impacted by the code amendments.

Planner Ehlers reported that on April 10, 2024, the Planning Commission unanimously forwarded a positive recommendation to the City Council to amend the LMC. The City Council adopted Ordinance No. 2024-09, limiting Public Transit Amenity Areas to General Commercial (“GC”), Frontage Protection Zone (“FPZ”), and Entry Corridor Protection Overlay (“ECPO”). On October 17, 2025, the Engineering Department submitted an analysis request form concerning proposed work on bus shelters outside the right-of-way.

The Planning Department determined that these code amendments would be necessary to facilitate the proposed bus stop improvements. The General Plan mentions creative, multi-modal solutions to address traffic and mobility. Strategy 2B calls to improve regional connections. An action tied to Strategy 2B is to complete the proposed bus stops.

Planner Barton reported that in four of the five zoning districts implicated in these amendments, the language would limit Public Transit Amenity Areas to streets currently served by Park City Transit that are identified in the Short-Range Transit Plan for future service or as approved by the Transportation Director. There is an outlier parcel owned by the City off Bonanza Drive near the Rail Trail that is zoned Estate. This is a singular parcel that requires a bus shelter, so the proposed language is to limit the Public Transit Amenity Area to that specific parcel. Planner Ehlers explained that there are also proposed updates to LMC Section 15-4-24. That language would be updated to call out the zones where it is expanded to be an allowed use. In addition, it would state that it is an Administrative Permit. The Transportation Department has recommended that the trash and recycling requirement be removed from the section of code. The requirement that trash and recycling be screened would be clarified to state, "if it is provided."

Planner Ehlers explained that to address some of the concerns from the City Council, there is a proposal to bring down the allowed height for Public Transit Amenity Areas from 20 feet to 12 feet, which is the size of the proposed bus shelters. There would be two proposed height exceptions. One would allow for up to 20 feet for electric bus charging infrastructure, but only in the GC and outside of the FPZ. Another proposed recommendation is to allow up to 4 additional feet for public art on top of the bus shelters if it has been approved by the Public Art Advisory Board. The final proposed change is to add a new criterion that requires all non-impervious surface to be restored, in compliance with the Landscaping Code. Staff recommends the Planning Commission review the proposed amendments to the LMC, conduct a public hearing, and consider forwarding a recommendation to the City Council for their meeting on February 3, 2026.

Commissioner Shand noted that in most of the narrative, it talks about bus stops, but there was also a mention of bus shelters during the Staff presentation. He believed there are no physical bus shelters being proposed, but shelters for people waiting to board a bus. This was confirmed. Commissioner Shand is familiar with a few of the existing bus stops and asked if those were approved with a CUP. Planner Ehlers was not certain.

Commissioner Beal mentioned the City Council's concerns from 2024. He wanted to know if those were specifically related to height, which was confirmed. Director Ward reported that in the previous round, there were proposed amendments that addressed some of the electric charging infrastructure that was proposed to be installed. The City Council expressed concerns about the overall height and the location within the entry corridor and FPZ. The Council wanted to ensure that the charging infrastructure would not be installed within the key corridors. That was addressed through the previous code amendment. She noted that there were also concerns about accessory uses.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson believed in the GC Zoning District, it is possible to exceed 12 feet for electric bus charging infrastructure. Director Ward confirmed this and explained that the infrastructure has already been installed. Commissioner Sigg asked about turnout lanes for the buses. He asked if this is included in the analysis. Manager Dennis explained that the current direction from the Transit Department is to remove pullouts. He knows that it is an allowed use under the Public Transit Amenity Area definition, but the intention is to remove a number of those. Where those are intended to be left or installed is primarily on Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) rights-of-way where the bus might be waiting for a longer period of time or there are sight distance issues. Through the bus stop project, there will be improvements made to 83 of approximately 120 stops throughout the City and there are no planned pullouts onto City roads.

Commissioner Frontero finds the 12 feet to be appropriate for the height, but is uncertain about the public art display language. He noted that the suggestion is to allow art to be 4 feet above the 12 feet when approved and asked if that is needed. Manager Dennis explained that this was based on feedback from himself and his team after coordination with the Public Art Advisory Board. There is a desire for larger art installations in the community beyond what has been seen in the most recent shelters with the paintings on the back. There can be a platform created on the new shelters for art installation.

Commissioner Frontero pointed out that the City Council proposed reducing the height, so it is now at 12 feet. Adding another 4 feet for art seems to be contrary to the City Council direction received. Manager Dennis clarified that the Public Art Advisory Board would need to make a recommendation to the City Council. Ultimately, the City Council would need to approve the artist contract. The language would allow the Public Art Advisory Board and City Council to review and consider the installation of an art piece.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson reported that Commissioner Beal left the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

Commissioner Shand summarized the earlier comments from Commissioner Frontero about City Council direction. Chair Pro Tem Johnson explained that the City Council will ultimately make the decision. Commissioner Frontero asked if it would be possible to forward a recommendation for 12 feet with the wording that the Planning Commission would consider a 4-foot height exception for art installation. There could be language that distinguishes the art from the structure, because the structure itself would be 12 feet.

Planner Barton shared the language included in the Draft Ordinance, which is included in the Meeting Materials Packet. In the Review Criteria section, there are 6(A) and 6(B). Chair Pro Tem Johnson noted that the Planning Commission recommendation could highlight those two items for the City Council to thoroughly review. This will ensure the

City Council is comfortable with the potential exceptions included in the language. Commissioner Frontero finds 6(B) to be a reasonable statement to present to the City Council. The City Council can determine whether there is a desire to make an adjustment. Chair Pro Tem Johnson asked that this language be highlighted for the City Council.

MOTION: Commissioner Shand moved to forward a POSITIVE RECOMMENDATION to the City Council for the Land Management Code Amendments to allow Public Transit Amenity Area improvements, for City Council consideration on February 3, 2026, as outlined in the Draft Ordinance. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sigg. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

The Planning Commission took a short break before hearing the Work Session items.

6. WORK SESSION

- A. 1500 Kearns Boulevard – Master Planned Development** – The Applicant Proposes to Redevelop 1500 Kearns Boulevard with a Mixed-Use Development including 97 Market Rate Units and 20 Affordable Units in the General Commercial Zoning District. PL-25-06599.

Planner II, Virgil Lund, presented the Staff Report and explained that this relates to the proposed MPD at 1500 Kearns Boulevard. This was reviewed by the Planning Commission in August 2025 as a Work Session item. Planner Lund shared an image of the existing site. The applicant is proposing 117 units totaling approximately 106,231 square feet. 97 of the units will be market rate and 20 of the units will be affordable. In addition, there will be approximately 10,000 square feet of commercial space. The applicant's rendering was shared with the Commission. The focus of the current Work Session will be on the requested building height exception and the setback request.

Planner Lund reported that the GC Zoning District requires a 35-foot height from the existing grade, but the applicant's proposal is up to 49 feet 6 inches above the current grade of the site. The requested building height exceptions are outside of the FPZ. An image was shared to show where the building height will exceed 35 feet. He noted that the first criterion for a building height exception is related to volume. The proposed volume is less than what is allowed by the zoning district. As part of the building volume and height exception criteria, the Planning Commission must find that there is desired architectural interest and variation for a reduction of setbacks. This may include additional adjustments to the massing and façade variation beyond the minimum requirements of the LMC.

The second criteria is related to solar access and potential problems that may be caused by the increased height. During the previous Planning Commission discussion about this proposal, the Planning Commission requested a Solar Access Study. This study is included in the Staff Report for Commissioner review. It shows the impacts on

neighboring properties during different times of the year. The next criteria for the building height exception has to do with landscaping and buffering from adjacent properties and uses. Planner Lund explained that a setback for an MPD greater than two acres is 25 feet around the perimeter of the site. The applicant proposes reduced side setbacks of 10 feet. The project abuts fire access lanes on the adjacent properties, HOPA and Wells Fargo. The front and rear yards include landscaping, sidewalks, and a multi-use pathway.

The next criterion relates to setbacks and separations from adjacent projects. The Commission may decrease the required perimeter setback to the zone required setback if it is necessary to provide desired architectural interest and variation. A building footprint encroachment of 15 feet into what would otherwise serve as a buffer between developments conflicts with the building height criteria that require landscaping and increased setbacks from adjacent properties. Planner Lund reported that the next criterion has to do with open space. The minimum required is 30%, and there is 32% proposed.

The next criterion states that the additional building height is designed in a manner that provides a transition in roof elements in compliance with the architectural design guidelines in the LMC. The three buildings are proposed to be connected by pedestrian bridges. Portions of each building are proposed to exceed the zone height, and the applicant is proposing flat roofs throughout. Planner Lund posed the following questions:

- Is more information needed to evaluate the six criteria to determine whether the Commission may consider granting the applicant a building height exception?
- Is the Planning Commission willing to consider a building height and/or setback exception for this project?

The applicant representative clarified that the design has changed, and the open space is now 37%. Commissioner Frontero asked if the calculation is based on fully public open space. It was stated that there will be some restrictions after dark. There are two areas that will lock off at sunset for the security of the tenants. Commissioner Frontero asked the City Attorney if that space would qualify as publicly available open space. Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, noted that the Staff Report identifies that issue. This is an interpretive question, because it may or may not qualify depending on the Commission perspective. The Staff Report analyzes this both ways, but the requirement is met either way. The degree to which this proposal exceeds the requirement is a factor for the height exception. Director Ward explained that as part of the MPD review, the Planning Commission has discretion about the type and amount of open space available.

Commissioner Frontero asked where the HOA is in relation to the applicant project. The location of Boothill Condominiums was pointed out on a map of the area. Chair Pro Tem Johnson asked if the setbacks have been changed based on previous Planning Commission feedback, which was denied. He asked about the rationale for focusing on the height and setback at this time. He wanted to know if there will be another Work

Session that focuses on the traffic impact, parking, and various other components. The applicant representative explained that there has been work done with Staff and there will be a meeting related to the traffic study. In terms of parking, the requirements are met. Chair Pro Tem Johnson stated that he would like to look at the whole application.

Commissioners reviewed the Solar Access Study included in the Meeting Materials Packet. Chair Pro Tem Johnson noted that the winter solstice is the most impactful time of year for the adjacent residential homes. There was discussion about setbacks.

Commissioner Tilson mentioned the breezeway that was added. He asked if that would be a publicly accessible pathway into the plaza. Jared Wright from Method Studio explained that the breezeway on the ground floor was in response to a request to allow people to cross the site. Commissioner Tilson stated that it is difficult to evaluate the impacts without knowing the full details of the application. He saw that there was an increase in affordable units, which is one way to provide a community benefit. He prefers the open concept to the alternative site plan, but without the full details, it is difficult to know for certain that the open design would benefit the community more than the closed design. Out of all the criteria, the one that is most concerning relates to setbacks and separation from adjacent projects. He believes this proposal is close to meeting the standard for architectural interest and variation, as it is the strongest component of this application.

Commissioner Shand noted that the Planning Commission is currently considering height and setbacks. What is shown in some of the renderings is a design that is thoughtful and opens up the entry corridor, but there are some design shortcomings. He likes how the impact on Kearns Boulevard has been minimized. Commissioner Shand mentioned the image that is currently being shared with the Commission and asked if the footprint of the underground parking is the footprint of the building, which was confirmed. He pointed out that the areas that are taller are shown in the darker gray color. Commissioner Shand noted that the south setback by Wells Fargo is fronted by a road, so he is not as concerned with that, but he is concerned about the setback that fronts the HOPA property.

Commissioner Shand would be willing to approve a conditional use for the height, but he would like to hear from other Commissioners about the setback on the north boundary. The positioning of the future HOPA buildings benefits this project as far as having the buildings closer, but he is not sure that is enough to approve 10-foot setbacks.

Commissioner Sigg explained that he does not like to look at a project in the context of what the alternative could be. He would like to focus on the project that has been proposed and not a potential alternative. Commissioner Sigg agrees with Commissioner Shand that the setback reduction along the Wells Fargo portion is acceptable. However, he is concerned about the setback in the HOPA area. He stated that this project needs to be looked at holistically. Commissioner Sigg would like to see the height put into context. The main issues with the proposal have to do with traffic, circulation, conflicting

turns, and pedestrian functionality, but he understands this is not currently being considered. There was discussion about drawings that would provide additional context.

Commissioner Frontero reported that the code is clear and the height in the GC Zone is limited to 35 feet. Despite this, some of the buildings are 50 feet. The code is also clear that the applicant must provide increased setbacks to qualify for a building height exception. This does not qualify and he is not in favor of what has been presented.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson suggested that the Planning Commission think about items to request in order to alleviate concerns about the project. He has a concern with the setback along the northern boundary of the project and the Solar Access Study solidified that. 10 feet is too close to that property boundary, as it could adversely impact the adjacent property. There are also concerns about the height. Chair Pro Tem Johnson stated that the full information needs to be provided to better understand the proposal. He likes some of the architectural variation, but believes more information is needed.

Commissioner Tilson mentioned traffic patterns. He wanted to know what will be done to alleviate traffic at this critical intersection. The architectural variation is strong in this proposal, but that needs to be seen in context with the traffic and circulation information, which includes pedestrian circulation. He asked for additional information about the permeability of the building and the different entrances to the courtyard. There was additional discussion about pedestrian access and circulation at the project site. Commissioner Sigg stressed the importance of considering the context of the height.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson reiterated the desire to review a complete application. Commissioner Frontero finds that the proposal before the Commission does not meet the code. He is willing to consider a height exception, as there are procedures for that, but he expressed concerns about the setbacks. He does not see how this design can move forward, as currently presented. Chair Pro Tem Johnson believed that some of the requested materials will provide a better understanding. Commissioner Frontero reiterated that if he is following the code, it is not possible for him to make a positive recommendation. He does not find the code allows the Commission to do so at this time, because the applicant must provide increased setbacks. That means the setbacks would need to be 30 feet or 35 feet in order to justify the height exception proposed.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson reported that this Work Session item was not noticed for public input. However, comments can be submitted to planning@parkcity.gov ahead of the next discussion. There will be future opportunities for public input related to this project.

- B. 2025 General Plan Implementation** – The Planning Commission will Review the 2025 General Plan Vision, Goals, Strategies, and Discuss Potential Actions to Recommend to the City Council for Implementation in 2026.

Planner Barton presented the Staff Report and explained that this Work Session item has to do with the 2025 General Plan implementation. During the previous Work Session, the Planning Commission considered possible LMC updates related to the housing and sustainability portions of the General Plan. During this discussion, the focus will be on transportation. He reported that Senior Transportation Planner, Conor Campobasso, Transportation Planning Manager, Julia Collins, and Economic Development and Housing Director, Chris Eggleton, are all present at the Planning Commission Meeting.

Planner Barton reviewed code amendments that are currently in process, including the planned upgrades to the local bus stops. The City Council will consider the positive recommendation from the Planning Commission during the February 3, 2026, City Council Meeting. Also underway are updates to the Transportation Impact Study (“TIS”) guidelines and the establishment of a Transportation Demand Management (“TDM”) program for new developments of a certain size. City Engineer, John Robertson, is leading that effort and there will be another Work Session on this held in January.

Some potential code amendments the Commission can consider include:

- Update the off-street parking requirements;
- Evaluating bicycle parking and storage requirements;
- Recommend a pilot parking permit program for transit access.

For off-street parking, the General Plan recommends considering prohibiting leasing parking spaces for uses other than those intended for the development. If the Commission considers this recommendation, it should be narrowly tailored to continue to allow shared parking agreements for new developments. Additional amendments could involve replacing minimum parking requirements with maximum parking allowances.

It is also possible to consider incentives to eliminate excess surface parking. The last time the bicycle parking and storage requirements in code were reviewed was approximately three years ago. The General Plan recommends regularly evaluating the code to ensure that it reflects best practices. The Planning Commission could also consider incentives to bring existing developments into compliance with the code.

Something that was mentioned at several neighborhood meetings associated with the General Plan was that there is interest in a pilot parking permit program. This program would permit residents that are not proximate to transit stops to have greater access to transit amenities in the City. The Commission could consider recommending a pilot program that would allow residents in certain neighborhoods greater access.

Planner Campobasso shared information about the Re-Create 248 project. Right now, the study phase is underway, and the focus is on a transit-forward solution to bring people from out east into town as quickly as possible, preferably not with personal vehicles. There are three alternatives at this point and there is a goal of implementation by 2034. He shared a map of the study area. It starts off in the Quinn's Junction area. At one point, a potential Rail Trail alignment was considered, but that has since been removed from the study due to public feedback and other environmental and physical constraints.

The timeline information was reviewed. Planner Campobasso explained that transit projects take time. Right now, the transit study phase of the project is ending and it will then move into the National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA"). There are 24 months listed in the timeline for NEPA, but if it ends up being a bus project, it might be 12 months. After that, there will be two years for design and another two seasons for construction.

Commissioner Shand asked if the bus alternative will be explored first before light rail. Planner Campobasso reported that this initially started with 12 modes and those were narrowed down. The alternatives will continue to be narrowed until there is a locally preferred alternative, which is what will move forward. The next steps include conducting Level 2 Screening using the defined criteria, identifying the best performing transit project that meet the agreed upon corridor goals, and having the City Council adopt the locally preferred alternative. There was discussion about traffic issues that currently exist.

Information about the 9 Purple route was shared. It was a successful pilot project done over the summer. This pilot project showed that if parking is priced appropriately and the funds generated from parking are used, it is possible to alleviate some traffic congestion and provide alternative access. In the fall, there will no longer be a run all the way to Bloods Lake, but there will be a shuttle that will meet the Purple route at the Montage.

The 20 Tan route was discussed. This is something that was implemented in order to respond to community needs. It connects Park Meadows all the way to Royal Street. An extension is offered where it will run up Aerie Drive as well. Commissioners discussed ridership numbers. The most popular stops are Fresh Market, Old Town Transit Center, and Park Avenue. Manager Collins reported that Park City has a wide variety of travel users but a seasonal travel pattern. There is a willingness to try pilot programs, monitor data, and receive feedback to see what might be beneficial to the community. For the bus stop project, there was an initial evaluation of the bus stops and those were scored. Approximately 80% of the \$18 million project has been covered by either Federal investment, State investment, or County investment. This makes it possible to upgrade approximately 65% of the City bus stops in order to provide that amenity to residents.

Manager Collins explained that this involves a comprehensive look at access to bus stops. It also involves improvements to sidewalks, pathways, crosswalks, bulb-outs, and the way users travel to the bus stop. In addition, there will be updates to bus stops

themselves and transit amenities. There is a comprehensive package associated with the \$18 million project. She explained that Phase I of the project is currently underway.

Commissioner Frontero asked if there is a saturation point where more bus stops do not result in more ridership. He wanted to know if the City is close to that point. Manager Collins explained that the ridership numbers are considered as well as where bus stops are placed relative to one another. She clarified that this process will not update every bus stop, but the ones that are currently most utilized. The criteria includes ridership, ADA, the number of buses that will pass the stop, and the current status of the bus stop.

Commissioner Frontero wanted to understand if most riders use the app to check bus times or if that information is presented at the actual bus stop. Planner Campobasso reported that the information is accessed in a widespread manner. The intention is to make the information available for all riders. It was reported that there is a matrix to determine what amenities will be at a bus stop. The more popular a bus stop is, the more amenities it will have. Information about ways to access the bus information was shared. Planner Campobasso reported that a lot of the technology on the buses was upgraded. There was discussion about the current bus schedule and communication efforts.

Manager Collins shared information about the Ride On Winter Rewards Program. This is a four-month initiative that encourages residents, visitors, and employees in the Park City community to choose sustainable travel options like walking, bicycling, transit, carpooling, vanpooling, and utilizing park and ride lots rather than driving alone. This is a commuter-based app platform, and there are partnerships with major employers. She explained that the program is incentive-based. Deer Valley increased its participation by over 18% last year and saw a reduction in the amount of vehicle miles traveled overall by its employees. She is impressed with their level of participation and partnership.

Information about the Utah Transit Authority (“UTA”) vanpool program was shared. There is a monthly rate for the vanpool. The employer can choose to have employees pay into the vanpool or pay for it themselves. Park City and Summit County will subsidize a portion of the vanpool if the vanpool originates or has a destination in Park City. This will remove single-occupancy vehicles from the road and enable people to travel in a more sustainable manner. It reduces traffic congestion, reduces emissions, and supports City goals. Park City has already seen six vanpool proposals in the last three weeks of this program.

Commissioner Frontero asked who would apply for this program outside of the ski resorts. Manager Collins reported that it currently includes the resorts and there are also some for City employees. There is work being done to see if there could be matches with smaller businesses that have similar travel patterns. \$80,000 has been put aside for this pilot project. There are certain benchmarks and requirements that each of the subsidy receivers will need to hit. Commissioner Frontero expressed support for the implementation of the vanpool program and the Ride On Winter Rewards Program.

Commissioner Sigg applauded the efforts made by the Transportation Department to address transportation needs and traffic management. He mentioned Uber Ski, which is a partnership between two large corporations. He asked whether this is being addressed or considered in some manner. Planner Campobasso explained that from a transportation perspective, Uber is seen as both a blessing and a curse. It reduces the number of vehicles that are being parked in Park City. It also moves people from the airport to town. The hope is that visitors will use the transit system from there. There was discussion about Uber and some of the issues related to airport transportation.

Director Eggleton explained that he is present to share information about the Main Street Area Plan. He introduced Project Manager for Economic Development, Matthew Lee. Manager Lee reported that he will share a status update on the projects that have come out of the Main Street Area Plan. He shared a summary of the Council direction received:

- Study pedestrian-friendly street and sidewalk improvements to improve traffic and circulation within the Historic Commercial Business District (“HCBD”);
- Explore potential for thermal energy network within the HCBD and the possibility of using it for street/sidewalk snowmelt;
- Study the feasibility of an aerial transit connection between Deer Valley’s Snow Park to China Bridge parking garage and Richardson Flats parking lot.

Manager Lee shared the project timeline with the Planning Commission. The Main Street Area Plan was presented to the City Council in December 2024. The plan as a whole was not adopted, but there was an additional presentation at the Council Retreat in February 2025. In June 2025, there was a City Council Work Session related to aerial transit. In July 2025, there was a Roadway and Circulation contract approved by the City Council. That contract was executed in August 2025. One of the first items was a LiDAR Survey Scan of Main Street, which was completed in September 2025. In October 2025, the Aerial Transit Feasibility contracted was executed. Manager Lee reviewed the scope for the Roadway and Circulation Feasibility and Concept Design. He informed the Commission that the survey of existing conditions has been completed. The concept design phase is currently underway. Some of the next steps include the following:

- Analyze potential impacts to public and private adjacent landowners;
- Cost estimates;
- Preliminary schedule estimate - design, utility relocation, and construction; and
- Feasibility analysis report highlighting challenges and opportunities.

Manager Lee shared the scope for the Aerial Transit Feasibility and Concept Design. He reported that the initial stages are underway and there is a preliminary alignment evaluation taking place. The next steps after the alignment evaluation include:

- Concept design plan for aerial transit corridors;

- Concept design plan for terminal stations; and
- Cost estimates for construction, ongoing operations and maintenance, and right-of-way acquisitions.

Chair Pro Tem Johnson asked if there will be a risk assessment conducted on the land acquisitions, which was confirmed. Manager Lee shared the estimated future timeline for the Main Street Area Plan projects. He highlighted the following estimates:

- January 2026: Snowmelt/Geothermal Feasibility Phase II Procurement;
- March 2026: Roadway/Circulation Concept Presentation to City Council (Work Session);
- March 2026: Aerial Transit Concept Presentation to City Council (Work Session);
- October 2026: Snowmelt/Geothermal Feasibility Phase II Study Complete.

Commissioner Shand asked what would happen if the aerial transit ran from Snow Park to somewhere on Main Street. For instance, if there would be a public-private partnership. Director Eggleton reported that there is coordination with Deer Valley, but there is uncertainty about the type of participation that could occur in the future. Chair Pro Tem thanked Staff for providing updates to the Planning Commission. It was noted that there is a public-facing website that will continue to be updated throughout this process.

7. ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:23 p.m.