



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
JANUARY 28, 2026**

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair Christin Van Dine, John Frontero, Rick Shand, Grant Tilson, Seth Beal

EX OFFICIO: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Virgil Lund, Planner II; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney; Nan Larsen, Senior Planner; Alec Barton, Senior Planner

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Christin Van Dine called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. She noted that Commissioners Johnson and Sigg were excused.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from January 14, 2026.

MOTION: Commissioner Shand moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from January 14, 2026. 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, reported that there is a Joint Work Session scheduled with the Planning Commission and City Council on Tuesday, February 3, 2026. The Joint Work Session is scheduled to take place at 5:30 p.m. in Council Chambers. She added that the Planning Commission Meeting scheduled for February 11, 2026, was cancelled.

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

5. REGULAR SESSION

- A. 28 Payday Drive – Conditional Use Permit** – The Applicant Proposes to Construct a 480-Square-Foot Outdoor Pool in the Single-Family Zoning District and Sensitive Land Overlay. PL-25-06777.

Planner II, Virgil Lund, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) application for 28 Payday Drive. The application is for the construction of an outdoor pool. Planner Lund explained that 28 Payday Drive is a vacant lot in the Thaynes Creek Ranch Estates Subdivision. He shared a photograph of the existing conditions on the site and reported that the applicant is proposing a 480 square foot outdoor pool for private use. There is a Building Permit review currently underway for a new single-family dwelling on the property. The proposed outdoor pool complies with the Single-Family Zoning District requirements, the Subdivision Plat requirements for limits of disturbance, the Sensitive Land Overlay (“SLO”), and the CUP criteria in the Land Management Code (“LMC”). One of the Conditions of Approval is that the pool use must follow the Noise Ordinance. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review the proposal and consider approving the CUP based on the Draft Final Action Letter.

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

Commissioner John Frontero agreed with the Staff recommendations for the Conditions of Approval. He is in favor of those conditions and noted that the application is in compliance. Commissioner Seth Beal asked about the Staff Report reference to Plat Note #11. It states: “The maximum Limits of Disturbance (“LOD”) area (including house and barn footprints, paved driveways, patios, and other hardscape, and irrigated landscaping) for Lots a and B is restricted to a maximum of 75% of the Lot Area.” When he looked at the plat, it appeared that a lot of landscaping was excluded. He pointed out that the language changed between irrigated landscape and irrigated lawn and asked for clarification. Planner Lund explained that the plants surrounding the home are native plants that will be planted as part of the landscaping for the single-family dwelling. He believes it should be non-irrigated since those are native plants. Commissioner Beal next asked about the parking requirements and the capacity of the outdoor pool. Planner Lund stated that the applicant representative can speak to the capacity of the proposed pool.

The applicant representative, Logan Hall, reported that pool capacity is calculated based on the square footage and the depth of the pool. A pool contractor assisted with the calculations and determined that the maximum occupancy would be 24 people. After speaking to the applicant and potential homeowner for this site, the needed capacity is nowhere near 24 people. Planner Lund mentioned the Condition of Approval related to parking. Commissioner Beal noted that the code language does not provide a lot of discretion to decrease the amount of parking required. He is inclined to decrease the parking requirement and asked if that is something that can be done by the Commission.

Director Ward reported that there is a provision in the code, Section 15-3-7, that, as part of a CUP review, the Planning Commission has the discretion to reduce the parking.

Discussions were had about similar applications. Planner Lund explained that last month, there was a CUP that also had large parking requirements. Commissioner Rick Shand asked if there would be a reason for the Planning Commission to propose reduced parking. Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, explained that the Commission can find that impacts to the neighborhood need to be mitigated as far as the site design.

Mr. Hall addressed comments about landscaping and irrigation. He reported that the landscaped area surrounding this space will need to be irrigated until it is established. It will be water-wise and have low water use, but it should be considered by the Commission.

Commissioner Beal read the irrigated landscaping language. Planner Lund explained that it is possible to look at the irrigated and non-irrigated landscaping and compare it to other lots that have approved Building Permits. Staff will look into this during the Building Permit process for 28 Payday Drive. Director Ward pointed out that it is also possible to amend Condition of Approval #1. The following language was proposed to be added:

- Final Landscape Plan shall be reviewed for compliance with Plat Note 11.

Mr. Hall shared information about the existing conditions of the lot and asked if this would impact the approval of the irrigated landscape area. In this particular case, if 25% of the lot was left as natural plantings, it would remain as grass or field from a horse pasture as opposed to more native mountainscape. Chair Van Dine asked how to appropriately reflect that it is possible to have irrigation for a set amount of time since there are not native plants currently. There needs to be a way to establish native plants on the lot. Director Ward believed that is outside the scope of the current application. Staff can continue to work with the applicant to see if it is possible to revise the Landscape Plan to meet the requirements. If not, an amendment to the plat would need to be brought forward. The Planning Commission discussed appropriate language for a motion.

MOTION: Commissioner Shand moved to APPROVE the Conditional Use Permit for 28 Payday Drive for an Outdoor Pool, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval, as amended:

Findings of Fact:

1. 28 Payday Drive is a 0.42-acre vacant Single-Family Lot.
2. On January 31, 2013, the City Council approved Ordinance 13-06 annexing 28 Payday Drive into Park City, and on October 3, 2013, the City Council

approved Ordinance 13-38 approving the Thaynes Creek Ranch Estates Phase One Subdivision).

3. The Land Management Code definition for Private Recreation Facilities includes private swimming pools.
4. Private Recreation Facilities require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) in the SF Zoning District.
5. The SF Zoning District requires a 20-foot Front Setback, 15-foot Rear Setback, and a 12-foot Side Setback.
6. The proposed outdoor pool is 18 feet from the rear Lot line, 28 feet from the west side Lot line, 41 feet from the east side Lot line, and 137 feet from the front Lot line.
7. The Applicant's proposal does not impact any Significant Vegetation.
8. Plat Note 11 from the recorded plat states: "The maximum Limits of Disturbance area (including house and barn footprints, paved driveways, patios, and other hardscape, and irrigated landscaping) for Lots A and B is restricted to a maximum of 75% of the Lot Area."
9. The Applicant's landscape plan shows a total LOD of approximately 12,217 square feet and a landscaped area of approximately 6,061 square feet.
10. The Applicant's LOD for the SFD including the outdoor pool, driveways, patios, other hardscape, and irrigated lawns is approximately 67% of the Lot Area.
11. The Subdivision, Annexation approval, and platting of the Lots considered SLO principles, such as Steep Slopes, proximity to Open Space and wetlands, Ridge Lines, and visual analysis.
12. The proposed outdoor pool is not near wetlands or Ridge Lines and is not visible from any designated vantage points.
13. The proposed outdoor pool is on flat terrain and is not within 50 feet of Very Steep Slopes.
14. The proposal complies, as conditioned, with the Conditional Use Permit criteria outlined in Land Management Code Section 15-1-10(E).

- a. Size and location of the Site
 - i. 28 Payday Drive is Lot 4A of the Thaynes Creek Ranch Phase 1 Subdivision. The Lot is 0.42 acres, and the proposed pool is 480 square feet, located behind the SFD.
- b. Traffic considerations including capacity of the existing Streets in the Area
 - i. The proposed outdoor pool will not generate any additional traffic beyond the property's primary Use as a SFD. The outdoor pool will be used by the property owner and their guests.
- c. Utility capacity, including Storm Water run-off
 - i. The Development Review Committee (DRC) reviewed the proposal on December 16, 2025, and confirmed the proposal conforms with their requirements.
- d. Emergency vehicle Access
 - i. The DRC reviewed the proposal on December 16, 2025, and confirmed the proposal conforms with all emergency vehicle access requirements.
- e. Location and amount of off-Street parking
 - i. The Applicant can park two vehicles in the SFD's attached garage, which measures approximately 32 feet deep by 25 feet wide. An additional eight vehicles can be parked in the driveway, for a total of 10 Off-Street Parking Spaces. See Condition of Approval 7.
- f. Internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation system
 - i. The proposed outdoor pool does not change the Lot's vehicle or pedestrian circulation system.
- g. Fencing, Screening, and landscaping to separate the Use from adjoining Uses
 - i. The proposed outdoor pool will be screened from the south by the SFD, and the Applicant's Landscape Plan shows maple, aspen, and pine trees surrounding the pool on the north, east, and west side.
- h. Building mass, bulk, and orientation, and the location of Buildings on the Site; including orientation to Buildings on adjoining Lots
 - i. The proposed outdoor pool is in the Rear Yard of the SFD, in-ground, and is screened from neighboring properties with trees on the north, east, and west sides.
- i. Usable Open Space
 - i. The proposed outdoor pool does not decrease the amount of Open Space for the Subdivision.
- j. Signs and lighting
 - i. No Signs or exterior lighting are approved or proposed with this CUP.

- k. Physical design and Compatibility with surrounding Structures in mass, scale, style, design, and architectural detailing
 - i. The proposed outdoor pool is in the Rear Yard of the SFD, in-ground, and is screened from neighboring properties with trees on the north, east, and west sides.
- l. Noise, vibration, odors, steam, or other mechanical factors that might affect people and Property Off-Site
 - i. See Condition of Approval 3.
- m. Control of delivery and service vehicles, loading and unloading zones, and Screening of trash and recycling pickup Areas
 - i. Vehicles for service and maintenance of the outdoor pool will access the property from the private driveway on Payday Drive. All trash and recycling areas are inside the SFD. No additional trash or recycling areas are proposed.
- n. Expected Ownership
 - i. 28 Payday Drive is under private ownership and the proposed outdoor pool is for the use of the owner and guests.
- o. Within and adjoining the Site, Environmentally Sensitive Lands, Physical Mine Hazards, Historic Mine Waste and Park City Soils Ordinance, Steep Slopes, and appropriateness of the proposed Structure to the existing topography of the Site
 - i. See Finding of Fact 7 above.
- p. Reviewed for consistency with the goals and objectives of the Park City General Plan; however, such review for consistency shall not alone be binding
 - i. The recommended Conditions of Approval align with the recommendations listed in the Thaynes Neighborhood section of the General Plan, which encourages the protection of the primary resident neighborhood character.
- q. Radon mitigation
 - i. This criteria applies to residential Conditional Uses.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposed outdoor pool complies with the LMC requirements pursuant to Chapter 15-2.11 *Single Family Zoning District*, Chapter 15-2.21 *Sensitive Land Overlay*, and Section 15-1-10 *Conditional Use Review Process*.
2. The use will be compatible with surrounding Structures in use, scale, mass, and circulation.
3. The effects of any differences in use or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the final plans dated December 5, 2025, submitted to the Planning Department and reviewed January 28, 2026, by the Planning Commission. Final Landscape Plan shall be reviewed for compliance with Plat Note 11.
2. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning Department prior to making any changes to the approved plans. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director prior to construction.
3. The Applicant shall adhere to Municipal Code of Park City Chapter 6-3, *Noise*.
4. If Outdoor Lighting is proposed to be installed, it requires compliance with the dark sky code (LMC Section 15-5-5(J)) and Planning Department review and approval.
5. The Applicant shall coordinate pool drainage with Snyderville Basin Water Reclamation District at the Building Permit phase.
6. The pool cannot be rented out separately from the property's primary Use of a Single-Family Dwelling.
7. Driveway parking for guests using the pool is limited to a maximum of four vehicles

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

- B. 751 Rossie Hill Drive – Conditional Use Permit –** The Applicant Proposes a Nightly Rental at 751 Rossie Hill Drive, a Detached Single-Family Dwelling in the Historic Residential - Low Density Zone. PL-25-06767.

Senior Planner, Nan Larsen, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a CUP application for 751 Rossie Hill Drive. The CUP is to allow a nightly rental on the site. 751 Rossie Hill Drive is Lot 4 of the Lilac Hill East Subdivision and the site is located within the Historic Residential – Low Density Zoning District. It is also part of the Rossie Hill sub-zone of the Historic Residential – Low Density Zoning District. Nightly rentals in the Rossie Hill sub-zone require CUP approval. Planner Larsen shared information about the history of the Lilac Hill East Subdivision. It is a five lot subdivision and the subject site

is Lot 4. There are four previously approved nightly rental CUPs, which are located on Lot 1, Lot 2, Lot 3, and Lot 5. The proposed CUP will be the last in the subdivision.

The Staff analysis found that the proposed CUP for a nightly rental complies with off-street parking, property management contact information, emergency vehicle access, and the CUP criteria. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review the proposed nightly rental CUP and consider approval based on the Draft Final Action Letter.

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

Commissioner Shand asked if the Conditions of Approval for 751 Rossie Hill Drive are the same as the ones that were approved for the other nightly rental CUPs in the subdivision. Planner Larsen confirmed that there is no difference in the conditions.

Chair Van Dine wanted to know if there had been complaints received about the other nightly rentals in the subdivision. Planner Larsen stated that she did not receive public comment after the posted notice or mailing notices. She does not know if Code Enforcement has ever been involved, but she has not received complaints through the CUP process. The applicant representative, Kara Stewart, is unaware of any complaints.

Commissioner Frontero asked if there is a Homeowners Association (“HOA”) in this subdivision. It was confirmed that there is an HOA in place. The HOA manages the private drive and performs snow removal for the private drive. Director Ward stated that the Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions (“CC&Rs”) address the No Parking signs.

MOTION: Commissioner Frontero moved to APPROVE the Nightly Rental Conditional Use Permit for 751 Rossie Hill Drive, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. 751 Rossie Hill Drive is Lot 4 of the Lilac Hill East Subdivision and is approximately 0.17 acres or 7,437 square feet.
2. The Lilac Hill East Subdivision, a five-Lot Single-Family Subdivision, was approved on January 9, 2020, Ordinance No. 2020-02 and includes three Landmark Historic Sites – 729, 741, and 755 Rossie Hill Drive.
3. The Planning Commission previously approved Nightly Rental CUPs for four other Lots in the Lilac Hill East Subdivision.
 - a. 747 Rossie Hill Drive, Lot 5 of the Lilac Hill East Subdivision – approved on April 23, 2025,

- b. 729 Rossie Hill Drive, Lot 2 of the Lilac Hill East Subdivision – approved on July 12, 2023,
 - c. 741 Rossie Hill Drive, Lot 1 of the Lilac Hill East Subdivision – approved on August 14, 2024, and
 - d. 755 Rossie Hill Drive, Lot 3 of the Lilac Hill East Subdivision – approved on July 12, 2023.
4. This is the final CUP for a Nightly Rental in the HRL Zoning District Rossie Hill sub-zone.
 5. The requirements for Nightly Rentals in the Historic Residential – Low Density (HRL) Zoning District Rossie Hill sub-zone are outlined in the table below (LMC Chapter 15-2.1):

| Requirement | Analysis of Proposal |
|--|--|
| All rental agreements for Nightly Rentals shall include language that limits the vehicles allowed to the number of on-site parking spaces. | <i>Condition of Approval Recommended:</i> The Applicant Nightly Rental lease agreement limits the number of vehicles allowed to the number of on-site parking spaces. Staff recommends Condition of Approval 2, ensuring the Applicant complies with the criterion. |
| Property management contact information shall be displayed in a prominent location inside the Nightly Rental. | <i>Condition of Approval Recommended:</i> Condition of Approval 3 requires property management contact information is displayed in a prominent location inside the Nightly Rental. |

6. The requirements of LMC Chapter 15-3 Off-Street Parking are outlined in the Table below:

| Requirement | Analysis of Proposal |
|---|--|
| Nightly Rentals require at least one Off-Street Parking space per Unit. | <i>Complies:</i> The subject site contains two-Off-Street Parking spaces that meet the dimension requirement. Off-Street parking spaces must be at least 9 feet wide and 18 feet long. (1) |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Parking for the first six bedrooms is based on the parking requirement for the dwelling. An additional space is required for every additional two bedrooms utilized by the nightly Rental Use.</p> | <p><i>Complies:</i> 751 Rossie Hill is a five-bedroom SFD, two parking spaces are required. A two-car garage exists on the site and fulfills this criterion.</p> |
|---|--|

1 LMC § 15-3-3(F)

7. The criteria outlined in LMC Section 15-1-10(E) Conditional Use Permits are outlined in the Table below:

| CUP Review Criteria | Analysis of Proposal |
|--|---|
| <p>Size and location of the Site</p> | <p><i>No Negative Impact:</i> No exterior changes are proposed to the Structure or Site.</p> |
| <p>Traffic considerations including capacity of the existing Streets in the Area</p> | <p><i>Mitigating Condition of Approval Recommended:</i> A shared private driveway from Rossie Hill Drive provides access for the five Lots in the Lilac Hill East Subdivision. The Use of the Site as a Nightly Rental is not expected to generate additional traffic comparative to a SFD Use. Condition of Approval 2 requires the Applicant to limit the vehicles allowed at the Site to the number of on-site parking spaces as part of the Nightly Rental lease agreement.</p> |
| <p>Utility capacity, including Storm Water run-off</p> | <p><i>No Negative Impact:</i> Utility capacity for the SFD is available on-site.</p> |
| <p>Emergency vehicle Access</p> | <p><i>Mitigating Condition of Approval Recommended:</i> A private drive provides access for the five SFDs in the Lilac Hill East Subdivision. Plat Note 6 of the Lilac Hill East Subdivision Plat requires that driveways provide 20 feet of clear space to comply with Fire Code; it prohibits parking where it impacts the 20-foot clear access area. As part of the 2023 Nightly Rental CUP approval for 729 and 755 Rossie Hill Drive, Engineering and Park City Fire</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>District required the applicant to install “No Parking” signs along the shared private driveway for the Lilac Hill East Subdivision. The Applicant complied with this requirement and installed “No Parking” signs along the shared driveway in 2024. Recommended Condition of Approval 4 requires the Applicant to maintain the “No Parking” present along the shared driveway.</p> |
| <p>Location and amount of off-street parking</p> | <p><i>No Negative Impact:</i> Pursuant to LMC 15-3-6, two parking spaces are required for SFDs. The Applicant will provide a two-car garage for the proposed Nightly Rental use; the two-car garage meets the two-car dimension criteria.</p> |
| <p>Internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation system</p> | <p><i>No Negative Impact:</i> The proposed Nightly Rental function will be similar to a SFD, no changes are proposed to the internal vehicular or pedestrian circulation systems.</p> |
| <p>Fencing, Screening, and landscaping to separate the Use from adjoining Uses</p> | <p><i>No Negative Impact:</i> No changes to fencing, screening, or landscaping are proposed. Nightly Rentals are an allowed Use in the Historic Residential – Low Density (HRL) Zoning District. (2) The Site is located within the Lower Rossie Hill subzone, where Nightly Rentals require a Conditional Use Permit. The adjacent Uses comprise of SFD along Rossie Hill Drive. It is not expected the Nightly Rental Use will detrimentally impact adjoining properties.</p> |
| <p>Building mass, bulk, and orientation, and the location of Buildings on the Site; including orientation to Buildings on adjoining Lots</p> | <p><i>No Negative Impact:</i> No exterior changes are proposed.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Usable Open Space | <i>No Negative Impact:</i> There are no proposed changes to Open Space. |
| Signs and lighting | <i>Mitigating Condition of Approval Recommended:</i> Condition of Approval 5 requires all lighting on the Site to be dark sky compliant. There are no proposed changes to lighting in relation to the Nightly Rental CUP request. Condition of Approval 6 prohibits exterior signs on the Site advertising the Nightly Rental. |
| Physical design and Compatibility with surrounding Structures in mass, scale, style, design, and architectural detailing | <i>No Negative Impact:</i> No exterior alterations are proposed on the Structure or Site. |
| Noise, vibration, odors, steam, or other mechanical factors that might affect people and Property Off-Site. | <i>Mitigating Condition of Approval Recommended:</i> Condition of Approval 7 requires compliance with Municipal Code of Park City (MCPC) Chapter 6-3, Noise. |
| Control of delivery and service vehicles, loading and unloading zones, and Screening of trash and recycling pickup Areas | <i>Mitigating Condition of Approval Recommended:</i> Condition of Approval 8 requires the trash receptacles to be screened and stored on-Site, prohibits leaving trash receptacles at the curb for longer than 24 hours, and requires the Site be kept free of refuse. |
| Expected Ownership and management of the project as primary residences, Condominiums, time interval Ownership, Nightly Rental, or commercial tenancies, how the form of Ownership affects taxing entities | <i>Mitigating Condition of Approval Recommended:</i> The Site is privately owned and is part of the Lilac Hill East Homeowner's Association. The Homeowner's Association is governed by the Declaration of Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions for Lilac Hill East Subdivision, which establishes maintenance and repair of the shared driveway. Condition of Approval 10 requires snow removal of the shared driveway. Condition of Approval 1 requires the property owner to obtain a Business license for the Nightly Rental. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Condition of Approval 12 relates to operations and maintenance of the Nightly Rental, pursuant to the requirements outlined in MCPC Section 4-5-3, Regulation of Nightly Rentals. |
| Within and adjoining the Site, environmentally Sensitive Lands, Physical Mine Hazards, historic Mine waste and Park City Soils ordinance, Steep Slopes, and appropriateness of the proposed Structure to the existing topography of the Site | <i>No Negative Impact:</i> The Site is not located within the Sensitive Land Overlay, within the Soils Ordinance boundary, or on Steep Slopes. |
| Reviewed for consistency with the goals and objectives of the Park City General Plan; however, such review for consistency shall not alone be binding | <i>Mitigating Conditions of Approval Recommended:</i> The 2025 General Plan outlines recommendations for each neighborhood within Park City, including Old Town, where the Site is located. To protect resident quality of life, the Plan identifies improved nightly rental management as a priority. Key actions include management of occupancy limitation, parking, noise, outdoor lights, and trash management is listed as an action to obtain the goals of the neighborhood. The recommended Conditions of Approval outlined in this section address and sufficiently mitigate each concern outlined in the 2025 General Plan. |

(2) LMC 15-2.15-2

8. The Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal on December 2, 2025, and did not require Conditions of Approval.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposed Nightly Rental, as conditioned, complies with the requirements of LMC Section 15-1-10 *Conditional Use Review Process*, Chapter 15-2.1 *Historic Residential – Low Density District* and Chapter 15-3 *Off-Street Parking*.

2. The proposed Nightly Rental is compatible with surrounding structures in use, scale, mass, and circulation.
3. The effects of the difference in use or scale of the Nightly Rental have been mitigated through careful planning and Conditions of Approval.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Prior to operating a Nightly Rental, the property owner shall obtain and maintain a Nightly Rental Business License for 751 Rossie Hill Drive.
2. The Nightly Rental lease agreement shall include language that limits the vehicles to two parking spaces and prohibit parking on Rossie Hill Drive or within the surrounding neighborhood.
3. The property owner shall display property management contact information in a prominent location inside the Nightly Rental.
4. The Applicant shall maintain the "No Parking" signs that are currently installed along the shared private drive within the Lilac Hill East Subdivision in a form and location approved by the Engineering Department and Park City Fire District.
5. All outdoor lighting shall be down-directed, fully shielded, with bulbs 3,000 degrees Kelvin or less. A fully shielded light is installed in such a manner that all light emitted either directly from the bulb, or indirectly by reflection or refraction, is below the horizontal plane through the fixture's lowest light emitting part. The top and sides of a Fully Shielded fixture are made of completely opaque material such that light only escapes through the bottom of the fixture.
6. Outdoor sign installations advertising the Nightly Rental are prohibited.
7. The property owner shall be responsible for regulating the occupancy and noise created by occupants of the Nightly Rental. Violation of Municipal Code of Park City Chapter 6-3 *Noise*, illegal conduct, or any other abuse which violates Nightly Rental regulations or these Conditions of Approval may be grounds for Business License revocation.
8. Trash receptacles shall be stored on site, screened, and placed for trash pickup according to the Municipal Code of Park City Section 6-1-11, which prohibits trash receptacles from being set out for collection prior to 6:00 PM the day before collection. All trash receptacles must be removed from the

street as soon as practical after being emptied, and in every case must be removed from the street prior to 11:59 PM the day they are emptied.

9. Trash cans shall not be left at the curb for any period more than 24 hours, and the property must be kept free from accumulated garbage and refuse.
10. The Lilac Hill East Subdivision Homeowner Association shall keep the shared driveway clear of snow.
11. The licensee for Nightly Rentals shall be the property owner. The local representative shall be deemed the responsible party.
12. The Nightly Rental shall be properly managed through property management services with the minimum services and management required: snow removal during winter months to a level that allows safe access to the home over the normal pedestrian access; snow removal services for the two on-site parking spaces within the two one-car garages; summer yard maintenance including landscaping maintenance; structural maintenance to preserve substantial code compliance; routine upkeep, including painting and repair; and housekeeping service.
13. The applicant must designate a responsible party. The responsible party must be a property management company, realtor, lawyer, owner, or other individual, who resides within a 1-hour drive of the property, or, in the case of a company, has offices in Summit County. The responsible party is personally liable for the failure to properly manage the rental. The responsible party must be available by telephone, or otherwise, twenty-four (24) hours per day, and must be able to respond to telephone inquiries within twenty (20) minutes of receipt of such inquiries. The responsible party is also designated as the agent for receiving all official communications under this Title from Park City. If the licensee is a property management company or individual other than the owner, such company or individual must comply with applicable state law, including the Securities Division Real Estate Division in the Utah Code, as amended, which requires those who receive valuable consideration to lease property to have a State license.
14. The Nightly Rental shall not be used for commercial uses and may not be used for a corporate sponsor or to distribute retail products or personal services to invitees for marketing or similar purposes

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

C. 52 and 60 Prospect Avenue – Plat Amendment – The Applicant Proposes Creating Two Lots from Lots 5, 6, and 7 in Block 18 of the Park City Survey for Significant Historic Sites in the Historic Residential -1 Zoning District. PL-25-06778.

Planner Larsen presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Plat Amendment for 52 and 60 Prospect Avenue. 52 and 60 Prospect Avenue are located in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. She reported that 52 Prospect Avenue was built in 1885 and is considered a Significant Historic Site in the Historic District. 60 Prospect was built in 1895 and is also considered to be a Significant Historic Site. Both sites are located in the Park City Survey, Block 18, as Lots 5, 6, and 7. She explained that there is also a remnant parcel on which a portion of one of the structures is located on. Since these are both historic structures, the existing conditions in relation to the property lines are not typical.

For 52 Prospect Avenue, the single-family dwelling structure extends across Lot 5 and Lot 6 as well as the remnant parcel to the north. For 60 Prospect Avenue, the single-family dwelling structure extends across Lot 6 and Lot 7 of Block 18. The proposed Plat Amendment seeks to rectify some of the extensions across property lines. It would combine the three Old Town lots and one remnant parcel in order to create two lots.

Based on the Staff analysis, the proposed Plat Amendment complies with the Historic Residential Zoning District regulations and Off-Street Parking regulations. It was found that no public street, right-of-way, or easement is proposed to be amended or vacated. In addition, there is Good Cause for the Plat Amendment. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review the proposed Plat Amendment for 52 Prospect Avenue and 60 Prospect Avenue and consider approval based on the Draft Final Action Letter.

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

Commissioner Shand asked if there are two separate owners for the structures. It was clarified that there is one owner. The applicant representative, Megan Blosser, explained that she is with Alliance Engineering. There is one owner, but there are two LLCs.

Commissioner Beal requested additional information about the remnant lot location. It was noted that the remnant lot is the triangle portion shown on the materials. Commissioner Shand noted that, based on the County records, that is an existing property line. According to County records, the remnant parcel is in between Lot 5 and Lot 7. Director Ward stated that the County lines show the tax parcel boundaries and not necessarily the lot lines. There are instances where the tax ID or parcel number does not match the actual lots underneath. Additional discussions were had about the location.

MOTION: Commissioner Beal moved to APPROVE the Plat Amendment for 52 Prospect Avenue and 60 Prospect Avenue, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. 52 and 60 Prospect Avenue consists of two Single-Family Dwellings (SFD) that front Prospect Avenue.
2. Both 52 and 60 Prospect Avenue are listed as Significant Sites on Park City’s Historic Sites Inventory.
3. 52 Prospect, built in 1885, and 60 Prospect, built in 1895, straddle across Lots 5, 6, and 7 of Block 18 in Park City Survey.
4. The Applicant proposes combining the three Old Town Lots to create two Lots – one for each Significant Historic Site, resulting in two Lots measuring 2,918.03 square feet and 3,052.48 square feet.
5. The proposed Plat Amendment complies with the Historic Residential regulations outlined in Land Management Code Chapter 15-2.2.

| Requirement | Analysis of Proposal |
|---|--|
| Use: SFD are permitted | <i>Complies:</i> Both 52 and 60 Prospect are SFDs, which is an Allowed Use in the District. |
| Minimum Lot Area – 1,875 square feet | <i>Complies:</i> Both 52 and 60 Prospect have Lot Areas greater than the minimum, at 2,918.03 and 3,052.49 respectively. |
| Maximum Lot Area – 3,750 square feet | <i>Complies:</i> 52 and 60 Prospect are not proposed to exceed the Maximum Lot Area. 52 Prospect is 2,918 square feet; 60 Prospect is 3,052 square feet. |
| Minimum Lot Width – 25 feet, measured 15 feet back from the Front Lot Line. | <i>Complies:</i> 52 Prospect Lot Width measures 41 feet, measured 15 feet back from the Front Lot Line and is compliant. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>60 Prospect Lot Width measures 34 feet, measured 15 feet back from the Front Lot Line and is compliant.</p> |
| <p>Maximum Building Footprint -</p> <p>52 Prospect = $(2,918.03/2) \times 0.9$ 2,918/1,875</p> <p>60 Prospect = $(3,052.48/2) \times 0.9$ 3,052.48/1,875</p> | <p><i>Complies:</i></p> <p>The Maximum Building Footprint allowed on the proposed 52 Prospect Lot is 1,237.86 square feet. The existing Historic Structure on this Site has a Building Footprint of approximately 728 square feet.</p> <p>The Maximum Building Footprint allowed on the proposed 60 Prospect Lot is 1,279.99 square feet. The existing Structure in the Site includes a Building Footprint of approximately 718 square feet.</p> |
| <p>Front and Rear Setbacks for Lots 75 feet to 100 feet are 12 feet and 13 feet.</p> | <p><i>Complies, existing valid non-complying Structure:</i> 52 Prospect was built in 1885 and is a valid Non-Complying Structure in the HR-1 Zoning District. The Front Setback is approximately 6.5 feet; the Rear Setback is approximately 37 feet. Pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-4 Historic Buildings that do not comply with Building Setbacks are valid Non-Complying Structures.</p> <p><i>Complies:</i> 60 Prospect has a Front Setback of approximately 18 feet and a Rear Setback of approximately 28 feet. The proposed Plat Amendment will not alter the existing Front or Rear Setbacks.</p> |
| <p>Side Setbacks for Lots up to 50 feet in width 5 feet each side.</p> | <p><i>Complies, existing valid non-complying Structure:</i> Currently, the shared Property line of Lots 5 and 6 runs through the existing Structures at 52 Prospect and 60 Prospect. Additionally, a portion of the Structure located at 52 Prospect encroaches on a remanent Parcel along</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>the north Property Line. The reconfiguration of the Lots will result in Structures and Lots with an increased degree of compliance with the LMC, but will remain valid non-complying regarding the required Side Setbacks in the HR-1 District pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-4.</p> <p>52 Prospect proposed Side Setbacks are 0 feet to the south and less than 1 foot to the north. The proposed Plat Amendment will decrease the degree of non-compliance from the south and north Side Setbacks.</p> <p>60 Prospect proposed Side Setbacks are approximately 9 feet to the south and 1 foot to the north. The proposed Plat Amendment will decrease the degree of non-compliance from the north Side Setback, while the south Side Setback will remain the same.</p> |
|--|---|

6. The proposed Plat Amendment complies with LMC Chapter 15-3, Off-Street Parking requirements.

| Requirement | Analysis of Proposal |
|--|---|
| Single Family Dwelling: 2 spaces per Dwelling Unit | <i>Complies, existing valid non-conforming Use:</i> No Off-Street parking stalls exist on either site. Pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-4 Historic Buildings that do not comply with Off-Street park requirements are valid Non-Complying Structures. |

7. The proposed Plat Amendment complies with LMC § 15-7.1-3(B), Classification of Subdivision, Plat Amendment.

| Requirement | Analysis of Proposal |
|---|--|
| Plat Amendments require a finding of Good Cause. | <i>Complies:</i> LMC § 15-15-1 defines Good Cause as, “providing positive benefits and mitigating negative impacts, determined on a case by case basis to include such things as: providing public amenities and benefits, resolving existing issues and non-conformities, addressing issues related to density, promoting excellent and sustainable design, utilizing best planning and design practices, preserving the character of the neighborhood and of Park City, and furthering the health, safety, and welfare of the Park City Community.” There is Good Cause for the proposed Plat Amendment as the proposed Amendment decreases the degree of non-compliance to the LMC by reconfiguring the Lots to remove the Lot lines that run through existing Non-Complying Significant Historic Structures and creates two separate Lots for Significant Historic Sites designated on Park City’s Historic Sites Inventory. |
| Plat Amendments require a finding that no Public Street, Right-of-Way, or Easement has been vacated or amended. | <i>Complies:</i> The proposed 52/60 Prospect Avenue Plat Amendment will not alter or vacate a Public Street, Right-of-Way or easement. |

Conclusions of Law:

1. There is Good Cause for this Plat Amendment.
2. The Plat Amendment is consistent with Land Management Code Chapter 15-2.2 *Historic Residential 1 District*, Chapter 15-3 *Off-Street Parking*, and § 15-7.1-3(B) and § 15-7.1-6 *Subdivision Procedures*.
3. No Public Street, Right-of-Way, or Easement has been vacated or amended.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Prior to finalizing the plat for recordation with Summit County:
 - a. Include easements of record on the Amended Plat.
 - b. On the north side of Lot 2 include a light-weight line where the north line of the original Lot 5, add text “lot line reviewed via this plat amendment.”
 - c. Replace text “old lot line” with “lot lines removed via this plat amendment.”
2. Dedication of a non-exclusive 10-foot public snow storage easement along the Lot Frontages shall be shown on the plat.
3. The City Planner, City Attorney, and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the Conditions of Approval.
4. The Applicant shall record the plat at the County within one year from the date of Planning Commission approval. If recordation is not complete within one year, the 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.

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

- D. 7700 Marsac Avenue (Mine Bench Site) – Modification –** The Applicant Requests to Modify a Condition of Approval of the Planning Commission Conditional Use Permit for City Employee Temporary Housing on the Mine Bench Site in the Recreation and Open Space Zoning District. The Requested Modification Is to Grant the Housing Team One Additional Year to Acquire an Extended Agreement to October 31, 2029, with Jordanelle Special Service District. PL-26-06800.

Senior Planner, Alec Barton, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Modification request for 7700 Marsac Avenue. On December 10, 2025, the Planning Commission approved a modification to the CUP at 7700 Marsac Avenue for two 400 square foot temporary housing trailers for City employees through October 31, 2029. There was a Condition of Approval that required the Storage and Lease Agreement with Jordanelle Special Service District to be signed within 30 days, but that deadline was not met. The Modification is to extend the time for the Lease Agreement to be executed.

Planner Barton pointed out a recommended change to Condition of Approval #5 for this item. After the Meeting Materials Packet was published, there was notification was received from the Housing Team that the Storage and Lease Agreement had been completed. It was after the 30-day deadline, but the previously drafted 365 days is no longer necessary. Planner Barton reported that Condition of Approval #5 will now read as follows:

- The Housing Team shall acquire an extended agreement to October 31, 2029, with JSSD by January 30, 2026, or the approval is void

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

Commissioner Frontero asked to further review the amendment to Condition of Approval #5. There was support expressed for the language and for the Modification request.

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

Findings of Fact:

1. The property is located at 7700 Marsac Avenue in the Recreation and Open Space (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 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 that 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 by January 30, 2026, or the approval is void

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

- E. 610 Sunnyside Drive – Appeal** – The Applicant Proposes to Appeal the September 25, 2025, Planning Director Setback Determination. PL-25-06788 (A) Application Withdrawn.

It was noted that the application for 610 Sunnyside Drive has been withdrawn.

6. WORK SESSION

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

Planner Larsen and Planner Barton explained that this Work Session item is related to the 2025 General Plan Implementation. Planner Larsen reported that this is the fourth Work Session focused on the General Plan implementation. After Staff receives Planning Commission recommendations on priorities, those priorities, goals, strategies, and actions will be reviewed with the City Council. The last General Plan theme will be reviewed during this Work Session, which is Water and Open Space Preservation.

Water and Open Space Preservation was identified by the community as one of the main values. A few of the identified strategies and actions are already in progress and ongoing. Planner Larsen reported that the following items are currently in progress:

- Incentivize water efficiency improvements;

- Update LMC to reflect water-wise landscaping best practices;
- Partner with Localscapes and Utah Water Ways.

Planner Larsen shared information about the potential amendments that are addressed in the General Plan. The first is to update the LMC for greater compliance. This could be done with best practice water-wise landscaping as well as updating and clarifying water-wise landscaping regulations in the LMC. The Commission may also consider updating the Transfer of Development Rights (“TDR”) provisions to incentivize preservation of open space. It is also possible to identify and expand the TDR sending and receiving sites to optimize undeveloped open space. Planner Larsen explained that the General Plan recommends updating the LMC to create maximum impermeable surface standards in order to reduce stormwater runoff and preserve stormwater quality.

The Commission may consider a recommendation related to SLO regulation updates. The updates could reflect best practices for ridgeline protections, mitigation on steep slopes, wetland and stream setbacks, and preservation of wildlife corridors and habitat. The Commission can also consider whether SLO boundaries should be updated to preserve wildlife and open space and establish wildlife corridors and buffer zones. Another consideration is for an update to the Master Planned Development (“MPD”) process to limit habitat fragmentation. Prioritization information was shared next.

Planner Barton reiterated that this is the fourth Work Session discussion related to General Plan prioritization. He recapped the focuses of the previous Work Sessions:

- October 8, 2025:
 - Compatible infill in non-historic residential zones;
 - Regulations for telecommunications facilities.
- November 12, 2025:
 - Sustainability;
 - Moderate-Income Housing.
- December 10, 2025:
 - Transportation;
 - Economic Development.

Planner Barton shared a table that summarizes some of the policies there has been Planning Commission support to prioritize so far. The following items were highlighted:

- Sustainability:
 - Integration of Wildland Urban Interface (“WUI”) regulations;
 - Landfill diversion in construction mitigation plans;
 - Incentives for zero emissions stretch code;
 - Soil remediation criteria.
- Housing:
 - Updates to the Affordable Master Planned Development (“AMPD”) code;

- Incentives for workforce housing through dormitories or single-room occupancies.
- Community Character:
 - Updates to the regulations for telecommunications facilities;
 - Updates to the residential zoning district regulations outside of the Historic Districts for compatible infill.

The only policy the Commission has reviewed so far that did not seem to generate a lot of interest was code updates for accessory apartments. Planner Barton shared another table from the Staff Report, which summarized the remaining potential priorities.

Commissioner Frontero asked about the second item shown: “Eliminate excess surface parking in core areas.” He asked that core areas be defined. Planner Barton reported that the language was pulled from the General Plan. Director Ward explained that there are some neighborhoods where the developments are from the 1970s or 1980s. There were more parking requirements back then compared to what is required under the current code. There could be a comprehensive look at parking and potential reductions in targeted areas, such as mixed-use or commercial. There was discussion about the first item on the list: “Update the Off-Street Parking requirements to prohibit separate leasing of parking spaces; replacing parking minimums with parking maximums.”

Commissioner Frontero believed the first two items on the list are linked. He is in favor of reducing parking where appropriate. The transit system has since been built out, as have the bicycle paths. It is likely that there is not as much parking needed now.

Commissioner Frontero expressed support for combining the first two items on the list. He likes the idea of reducing parking and providing incentives to landowners who currently have large surface parking areas. The incentives could encourage conversion. Commissioner Shand thought the suggestion was to give landowners the opportunity to reduce the parking that already exists in order to use the land for something else. Commissioner Frontero confirmed this and explained that it would be an interesting incentive to offer landowners who previously had to have a certain amount of parking.

Commissioner Beal noted that there are a lot of references to open space, and it is defined in two ways under the LMC. This includes “open space, landscaped” and “open space, natural.” As a community, most of the time, it is “open space, natural” that is being discussed for preservation. He stated that there is not always clarity about what open space requirement needs to be applied, so he would like better definitions in place.

Commissioner Shand agrees with the comments made by Commissioner Beal. In addition to better defining what counts as open space, it is also important to understand the purpose of open space. He questioned whether or not something needs to be open to the public. It should not necessarily count against a developer if there is no desire for something to be open to the public, especially if the objective is not to have a space

completely filled by a building. Commissioner Beal agreed that it would be meaningful to have a common definition. Commissioner Shand shared comments about what counts as open space. Director Ward stated that if there is consensus among the Commission to prioritize this, the seventh and tenth items on the list could be combined. The broader discussion of open space, the definitions, and the requirements could be covered there.

Commissioner Beal stated that more transparency will benefit the community and simplify future Commission discussions. Commissioner Shand added that it will also create a clear expectation for the developer or applicant. Director Ward noted that item six can be merged into this as well. The sixth, seventh, and tenth items shown can be merged. Commissioner Beal thought it made sense to prioritize the parking and open space items.

Chair Van Dine noted that it would be simple to address item five: "Update the code to require greater compliance with water-wise landscaping best practices." Director Ward reported that the Commission previously provided clear feedback about the WUI. It could be helpful to bring those together. There could be a more streamlined process for applicants when designing their Landscape Plans. Chair Van Dine mentioned the previous discussion about native plants in areas that are not currently established.

Commissioner Grant Tilson mentioned the fourth item: "Consider a pilot parking permit program that provides residents access to transit stops in their neighborhood." He thought this was interesting and could be explored to expand resident access to transit. There are still some neighborhoods where transit is difficult to access, so he would be interested in looking into pilot parking permit programs that could increase transit use.

Commissioner Frontero asked what the goal of the fourth item is. Director Ward reported that in the open houses and community meetings with the neighborhoods, there was feedback from residents in certain areas to indicate that it can be difficult to access transit. One of the ideas was a pilot program to test out a permit that residents within certain neighborhoods could have in order to access transit. There would need to be some additional community engagement if this were pursued to ensure it was done thoughtfully. However, there might be opportunities with some of the existing parking areas. Commissioner Beal expressed support for micro-lots and parking permits. Director Ward pointed out that this item could potentially be combined with the first and second items. Commissioner Frontero expressed support for the pilot program. It would make sense to try it for a season, see what the results were, and then re-evaluate the program.

Chair Van Dine thought the item related to a community gardens ordinance was less of a priority. Commissioner Shand asked if those would be vacant City parcels or vacant privately owned parcels. Director Ward explained that it has not been specified at this point. Planner Larsen reported that a lot of community gardens are related to non-profit organizations. If that is the primary use, it would need to be specifically stated to determine whether it would be permitted in the district or not. Commissioner Shand agreed with Chair Van Dine that the community garden item would be a lower priority.

Commissioner Beal mentioned the third item on the list. He asked if feedback was received to indicate that there are inadequate bicycle parking and storage requirements currently. Chair Van Dine reported that the requirements were expanded. Finding incentives to bring existing developments into compliance might be beneficial. It would be interesting to see what incentives could be proposed. She does not know what would convince others to increase their indoor bicycle storage. Chair Van Dine added that the code was updated fairly significantly approximately two years ago. Director Ward mentioned the Request-A-Rack program that exists. Chair Van Dine thought it was worth looking into possible incentives, but she does not believe this item is the highest priority.

Commissioner Frontero mentioned the ninth item on the list, which relates to the SLO. He finds the SLO regulations to be sufficient, so he wanted to understand what the goal is with this item. Planner Larsen explained that it would involve research to make sure that the SLO encompasses the best practices for ridgeline protection and mitigation on steep slopes. Commissioner Frontero thought this was important, but also believed it would be a lower priority than some of the other items included on the prioritization list.

7. ADJOURNMENT

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

The meeting adjourned at approximately 6:40 p.m.