



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
FEBRUARY 25, 2026**

**COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:** John Frontero (Chair Pro Tem), Rick Shand, Grant Tilson, Seth Beal, Henry Sigg

**EX OFFICIO:** Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Virgil Lund, Planner II; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney; Elissa Martin, Planning Project Manager

---

**1. ROLL CALL**

The Planning Commission Meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. In the absence of Chair Christin Van Dine, the Planning Commission conducted a roll call. It was noted that Commissioner Bill Johnson recently resigned from the Planning Commission. A Chair Pro Tem must be determined for the current Planning Commission Meeting.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Shand moved to NOMINATE Commissioner John Frontero as the Chair Pro Tem for the Planning Commission Meeting. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Beal. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

**2. MINUTES APPROVAL**

**A. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from January 28, 2026.**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Shand moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from January 28, 2026. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Beal. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

**3. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES**

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that on February 7, 2026, Bill Johnson resigned from the Planning Commission. She highlighted some of the items that he took part in as a Commissioner. He was appointed in April 2021 and attended approximately 120 Planning Commission Meetings. In addition, he attended City Council Meetings as a liaison and representative of the Planning Commission. Projects during his tenure included Founders Place, Sommet Blanc, Engine House, HOPA, Snow Park Village,

Bonanza Park Small Area Plan, and General Plan update. As a Park City local and land use professional, he knows the area well and brings expertise to the Commission.

On behalf of Staff, Bill Johnson was thanked for his commitment and service to the community. Director Ward also informed those present that there will be two terms ending in July 2026. The Commission will be updated as the recruitment process takes place.

#### 4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

#### 5. WORK SESSION

- A. Municipal Sign Code Amendments** – The Planning Commission will Conduct a Work Session Regarding Possible Amendments to Municipal Code of Park City Section 12-10-2(B) *Construction Marketing Signs*. PL-26-06819.

Planner II, Virgil Lund, presented the Staff Report and explained that the Work Session item is related to Municipal Sign Code Amendments. He explained that there are some proposed amendments to the Municipal Sign Code, which is found in Title 12. Information about the existing code was shared. There is one Construction Marketing Sign allowed per project and the size is limited to 24 square feet and a height not exceeding 7 feet above finished grade. The Temporary Construction Marketing Sign must be removed upon issuance of the final Certificate of Occupancy. One of the purposes of the Sign Code is to: “allow each individual business to clearly identify itself and the goods and services which it offers in a clear and distinctive manner.” The proposed Sign Code amendments will allow greater flexibility for residential and commercial developments to advertise the units for sale, the development, and the builder of the project.

Planner Lund shared a list of the proposed amendments. He clarified that these fall under the section of the Sign Code that is related to temporary signs. These amendments are not related to permanent signs. The first amendment will refine the definition of Construction Marketing Sign. He reviewed the proposed language for this definition:

- Construction Marketing Sign: A construction sign identifying the financial institution of a development or identifying the contractors and builders responsible for a project or development; may include a plat map and real estate information for purposes of marketing units within the development.

The proposal for a new definition of Freestanding Construction Marketing Sign was as follows:

- Freestanding Construction Marketing Sign: A Construction Marketing Sign that is

supported by one or more uprights or braces which are fastened to or embedded in the ground or a foundation in the ground and are not attached to any building.

There are also some proposed amendments to allow Freestanding Construction Marketing Signs and larger Construction Marketing Signs that are mounted on a construction barricade or fence. The proposed language is now as follows:

- Freestanding Construction Marketing Signs shall not exceed thirty-six square feet (36 sq. ft.) in area;
- Construction Marketing Signs mounted on a construction barricade or fence shall not exceed thirty-two square feet (32 sq. ft.) in area.

There is also a desire to establish flexibility for Construction Marketing Signs for projects that have two or more street frontages. Planner Lund read the following language:

- Number of Signs. One (1) Construction Marketing Sign is permitted per project. Properties with two (2) or more street frontages shall be permitted one (1) additional Construction Marketing Sign per street frontage.

Planner Lund shared information about the duration. The existing code requires the temporary signs to be removed from the premises upon issuance of the last Certificate of Occupancy. The Planning Director can extend that duration for up to six months with certain parameters and the payment of a deposit. The following questions were proposed:

- Is the Planning Commission supportive of the proposed Sign Code amendments?
- Does the Commission have any input or changes to the proposed amendments?

Commissioner Rick Shand wanted to understand the rationale for shifting to 36 square feet for the Freestanding Construction Marketing Signs. Planner Lund explained that it was based on similar cities that have this requirement in place. It will also allow for better visibility. Commissioner Shand asked about the rationale for the proposed amendments at this time. Planner Lund reported that at the City Council Meeting in December, there was some discussion about the Studio Crossing development and a need for greater visibility for the leasing signs and Construction Marketing Signs.

Commissioner Shand expressed support for one sign that is 32 square feet. This sign could include whatever information there is a desire to share. For instance, it could include the general contractor and subcontractors at the bottom. However, he pointed out that the developer is ultimately responsible, not the contractors. If there are banners being considered for fencing, then he would like to see those be 32 square feet as well.

Commissioner Seth Beal asked about signs for each street frontage. It does not look like there are size requirements included in this proposal, so he asked for additional

clarification. Planner Lund shared the existing code and explained that Construction Marketing Signs are limited to a specific development size. It is for projects containing four or more dwelling units or at least 4,000 square feet of commercial floor area.

Commissioner Beal understands the desire to have a second sign when there is a larger project, but he is less convinced the signs need to be larger. It might be appropriate for there to be multiple sign locations at Studio Crossing, but it would be less appropriate for a four-plex development. He reiterated that smaller signs are preferable to larger signs.

Commissioner Henry Sigg agreed with Commissioner Beal about the size of the signs. He also agreed with Commissioner Shand that the ultimate responsibility lies with the developer, and this sign is not necessarily a place for contractors and subcontractors to market themselves. There are more efficient ways that kind of messaging can be shared. He feels there should be a distinction between marketing and the actual construction.

Commissioner Grant Tilson asked whether the fence signs and freestanding signs could be located on the same frontage. Planner Lund stated that there can be language added to clarify that there must be sort of setback between a freestanding sign and a barricade or fence sign. How it is currently written, there would be one sign per street frontage, but there can be additional clarification provided if that is desired by the Commission.

Chair Pro Tem Frontero mentioned the Studio Crossing development and pointed out that there are multiple corners and it is a busy area. He can understand the rationale for signage there, but there seem to be two separate needs related to signs. During construction, the construction company wants to state who is working on the project. It sounds like the code allows for that, but there are some proposed amendments to improve the current code. Once the project is complete and there is a Certificate of Occupancy issued, those construction signs come down. At that point, leasing signs will be displayed. He is not certain the current code captures that. Planner Lund reported that small real estate signs are allowed on properties. Additional discussions were had about signage.

Chair Pro Tem Frontero believed the code should allow for leasing signage for a certain period of time. It could be six months, eight months, or until there is a reasonable amount that has been leased. There should be some allowance for signage during the leasing period, particularly when there are more than 20 or 30 units. He does not see that in the current presentation, as the focus seems to be only on construction signage. Planner Lund believed the suggestion is to draft an additional definition with specific requirements for leasing signs, which was confirmed. Chair Pro Tem Frontero believed two different areas need to be addressed: the construction signs and the leasing signs.

Planner Lund asked if there is Commission support for what has been proposed by Chair Pro Tem Frontero. Commissioner Shand agreed that leasing is important, but he wanted to know if the leasing sign would apply only to workforce and affordable housing or if it would apply to private developments as well. Chair Pro Tem Frontero asked if the City

currently allows a private project to place large signs advertising that the units are being leased. Planner Lund believed it would fall under the definition of the existing Construction Marketing Sign, but it would have to be taken down at the time of Certificate of Occupancy. The existing definition for Construction Marketing Signs states that it may include a plat map and real estate information for the purpose of marketing units within the development. Commissioner Shand pointed out that a project might be complete but not fully leased. Even with the last Certificate of Occupancy issued, the units still could be available to be leased. There was additional discussion about appropriate signage.

Commissioner Beal does not believe there should be a distinction between public-private partnerships and private partnerships. Whatever is decided with respect to leasing should apply to all projects, regardless of whether the City is involved in some capacity. He is skeptical about the effectiveness of signs. While there is value to signage, in his experience, most people find out about developments on the internet rather than on a physical sign. He is hesitant to add more signage to the community when information is found in other ways. Commissioner Shand pointed out that if the Sign Code is changed to accommodate Studio Crossing, it will impact other projects in the community as well.

Chair Pro Tem Frontero asked that at a future Work Session, there be information shared about leasing at Studio Crossing and Engine House. If the leasing is going well so far, then it might make sense to lean toward the strategy outlined by Commissioner Beal. However, if leasing is slow, there could be additional discussions about leasing signs.

Commissioner Sigg noted that construction can have a broad meaning. He suggested there be references to new construction in the amendments, because restriping a parking lot is not the same as new construction. There should be a distinction made in the language to ensure signage is limited to new construction. Commissioner Tilson asked if construction would also include road reconstruction. Planner Lund read the definition, which mentioned the initial marketing of projects. Director Ward noted that if there is a City project where information needs to be shared, a different section of code applies.

Planner Lund summarized the Work Session discussion and the Planning Commission requests. At the next Work Session, there will be a discussion about how the leasing for certain developments. From there, the Commission can further discuss appropriate sign language. Chair Pro Tem Frontero agreed with Commissioner Sigg as far as limiting it to new construction. The Certificate of Occupancy could be used as the start date and there could be a time limit. Planner Lund thanked the Commission for sharing feedback on the Work Session item. He reiterated that there will be additional information brought back.

## 6. REGULAR SESSION

- A. 201 Heber Avenue – Condominium Plat Amendment** – The Applicant Proposes the Fourth Amended Union Square Condominium Plat to Decrease the Commercial Area for Unit COM-1, Re-Assign Square Footage of Commercial Area to Residential Limited Common Area for Unit SL-1, Re-Assign Square Footage of Common Area to Commercial Limited Common Area for Unit COM-3, and Increase the Commercial Area for Unit COM-4 within the Existing Building in the Historic Recreation Commercial Zoning District. PL-26-06812.

Planner Lund presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Condominium Plat Amendment for 201 Heber Avenue. He shared background information about the property. On November 10, 2004, the Planning Commission approved a Master Planned Development (“MPD”) and Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) for 201 Heber Avenue. On January 24, 2024, the Commission approved the Second Amended Plat. The Second Amended Plat reassigned 4,832 square feet of limited common area from Unit LB-1 to Unit COM-3. The Second Amended Plat was retired with the Third Amended Plat.

On January 8, 2025, the Planning Commission approved the Third Amended Plat, which converted 200 square feet of limited common area to common area, 308 square feet of common area to limited common area, and 1,555 square feet of commercial limited common area from Unit LB-1 to COM-3. The proposal currently before the Planning Commission is to reduce the square footage on the first level of Unit COM-1 and transfer some of that square footage to Unit SL-1 and Unit COM-3. On the fourth floor, the proposal is to cover 200 square feet of Unit SL-1 to Unit COM-4. Planner Lund pointed out the storefront property on Heber Avenue, which is part of Unit COM-3. There is no proposed change in use with this specific unit, but any future change must comply with the Storefront Property requirements outlined in the Land Management Code (“LMC”).

The proposal complies with the Storefront Property requirements, Off-Street Parking requirements, and the MPD and CUP Conditions of Approval. In addition, Staff finds Good Cause for the proposed Condominium Plat Amendment. Staff recommends the Planning Commission open a public hearing and consider approving the Condominium Plat Amendment for 201 Heber Avenue based on the Draft Final Action Letter.

The applicant representative, Sean Skanchy, explained that he is present at the Planning Commission Meeting to represent the Homeowners Association (“HOA”) and developer. Over the last two and a half years, the HOA has invested money into the Main & SKY project. There were exterior renovations done approximately two years ago and now there are interior renovations on the residential units. This Condominium Plat Amendment will make it possible to move forward with updated plans for the common areas on the first floor. The commercial space will receive a bit of a reduction on the first floor. On the fourth floor, there are two restrooms being added to the commercial space.

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

Commissioner Shand asked if the footprint of the building will change, which was denied. Mr. Skanchy reported that the proposed work is interior. There were no further questions.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Shand moved to APPROVE the Condominium Plat Amendment for 201 Heber Avenue, Fourth Amended Union Square Condominium Plat, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The Applicant proposes to:
  - a. Decrease the commercial area for Unit COM-1 by 1,904 square feet to increase the residential limited common area square footage in the first level of Unit SL-1 by 1,460 square feet and to increase the commercial limited common area of Unit COM-3 (on level one) by 444 square feet.
  - b. Increase the commercial area for Unit COM-4 by 200 square feet by reducing the residential limited common area square footage in the fourth level of Unit SL-1 by 200 square feet.
2. The Union Square Fourth Amended Plat complies with the Historic Recreation Commercial Zoning District Requirements for Setbacks, Floor Area Ratio, and Storefront Property.
  - a. There are no proposed expansions or additions to the Structure as part of this Plat Amendment.
  - b. 201 Heber Avenue is in the Heber Avenue Sub-Zone. The Floor Area Ratio limitation of the HRC District does not apply to properties within this Sub-Zone.
  - c. Unit COM-3 is Storefront Property, as defined in the LMC.
  - d. The proposed Plat Amendment will maintain compliant with the Storefront Property requirements. The existing Storefront Property use of Unit COM-3 is a lobby for the Union Square Development.
  - e. The Use for Unit COM-3 is not proposed to change with this Plat Amendment. See Condition of Approval 3.
3. The Union Square Fourth Amended Plat complies with the Parking Ratio requirements.

- a. No change in Use is proposed with this Plat Amendment. The Applicant proposes to reassign square footage from one Unit to another. As part of the MPD and CUP approval for 201 Heber Avenue, the Planning Commission granted a reduction in the required Parking Spaces to 46, based on the intended uses of the commercial area and the number of residential units.
  - b. The proposed reassignment of square footage from common area to commercial limited common area and residential limited common area does not increase the parking demand for the development, does not change the Uses or density of the existing units. Designated common areas do not have parking requirements in the LMC and are intended as support areas for the existing commercial and residential areas. Since there is no change in Use, unit type, or density, additional parking demand is not created by the proposed Plat Amendment.
4. The Union Square Fourth Amended Plat complies with the Master Planned Development and Conditional Use Permit for 201 Heber Avenue/Union Square.
    - a. The Union Square Fourth Amended Plat complies with all Conditions of Approval outlined in the Final Action Letter for the MPD and CUP for Union Square approved by the Planning Commission on November 10, 2004.
  5. There is Good Cause for the Union Square Fourth Amended Plat.
    - a. Staff finds Good Cause for the Union Square Fourth Amended Plat because this amendment does not change the mass of the existing structure or the parking requirements, will remain compliant with the MPD and CUP approved on November 10, 2004, and does not create non-conformities.
    - b. No Public Street, Right-of-Way, or easement will be vacated or amended.

**Conclusions of Law:**

1. There is Good Cause for this Plat Amendment.
2. The Plat Amendment is consistent with Land Management Code § 15-7.1-3 *Classification of Subdivision*, § 15-7.1-6 *Final Subdivision Plat*, Chapter 15-3 *Off- Street Parking*, and Chapter 15-2.5 *Historic Recreation Commercial (HRC) District*.

3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed Plat Amendment.
4. Approval of the Plat Amendment, subject to the conditions of approval below, does not adversely affect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

**Conditions of Approval:**

1. The City Planner, City Attorney, and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, the Conditions of Approval, and the amended Declaration of Condominium of the Union Square Condominiums prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The Applicant or Applicant's Representative 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, 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. Any future change in Use with Unit COM-3 must comply with the Storefront Property requirements and restrictions outlined in the Land Management Code.

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

- B. 322 and 324 Main Street – Plat Amendment –** The Applicant Proposes the Red Banjo Plat Amendment to Reconfigure the Lot Lines of Historic Lot 6, in Block 69 of the Millside Reservation Park City Survey and Portions of Lot 5 and 6 in Block 22 of the Park City Survey to Create Two Lots and Adjust the Shared Lot Line Between 322 Main Street and 324 Main Street to Resolve an Existing Encroachment in the Historic Commercial Business Zoning District. PL-25-06637.

Planning Project Manager, Elissa Martin, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Plat Amendment application. She clarified that 322 Main Street is the location of the Red Banjo Pizza building and is also a Landmark Historic Site. The plat also includes 324 Main Street and 325 Swede Alley, which is the location of the Park Place building.

The properties are within the Historic Commercial Business Zoning District and each property contains two parcels. There are four legal parcels in total. Manager Martin explained that the existing conditions survey shows the Red Banjo Pizza building

encroaches 0.31 feet onto 324 Main Street. The existing lot widths along Main Street and Swede Alley do not meet the minimum 25-foot lot width requirement of the Zoning District.

On February 10, 2026, the Board of Adjustment approved a Variance from the Historic Commercial Business Zoning District's minimum lot width requirement for the Red Banjo and Park Place properties. The proposed plat will create two contiguous lots extending from Main Street to Swede Alley. The lot widths would remain unchanged. The plat would also adjust the shared lot line between 322 and 324 Main Street to resolve the existing encroachment. As conditioned, the proposed plat complies with the Historic Commercial Business Zoning District's lot and site requirements, including the sidewalk provision in LMC 15-2.6-3(D), which requires a sidewalk along Swede Alley. Manager Martin shared an image with the Commission and explained that some of the adjacent buildings are built to the property lines. No sidewalk is provided there, but there are other sections of Swede Alley that have a sidewalk, and those generally have a width of five feet.

The Planning Department and Engineering Department recommend a five-foot-wide pedestrian easement to be added to the plat, which is included in the Draft Final Action Letter as Condition of Approval #1. Staff finds there is Good Cause for the proposed Plat Amendment, because it creates two contiguous lots reflecting current ownership and existing conditions. In addition, the proposed Plat Amendment will resolve the existing encroachment. Staff recommends the Planning Commission review the Red Banjo Plat Amendment, conduct a public hearing, and consider approval based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval in the Draft Final Action Letter.

The applicant representatives, Bryan Markkanen and Megan Blosser, were introduced to the Planning Commission. Mr. Markkanen referenced Page 7 of the Staff Report. He asked if there is a way to recommend the sidewalk setback be equal to the adjacent building frontage rather than 5 feet. He shared information about the adjacent buildings and noted that stepping back might not continue the street frontage very well. Mr. Markkanen clarified that his suggestion is to match the street frontage of the adjacent building. Alternatively, 3.6 feet is the approximate sidewalk of the adjacent buildings in this section of Swede Alley. There is no sidewalk wider than that in the immediate area.

Commissioner Shand asked to review photographs of the site. Discussions were had about Condition of Approval #1 included in the Draft Final Action Letter. Director Ward shared an image with the Commission that highlights the current conditions in the area.

Commissioner Shand asked the applicant representative to reiterate his request. Mr. Markkanen explained that something actionable would be a Planning Department determination at the time of permit application. There could also be a requirement for 3.6 feet instead of 5 feet. Director Ward noted that, based on the code language, the City Engineer would need to create a determination. A modification to the Draft Final Action Letter language would require an update to Finding of Fact #15, which currently states:

- Planning and Engineering find a nine-foot-wide pedestrian easement is not appropriate in this location and a five-foot-wide pedestrian easement is required to be added to the Plat along Swede Alley prior to recordation.

In addition, Condition of Approval #1 currently mentions a 5-foot width, but there could be direction provided to evaluate this within the context of adjacent structures. Commissioner Shand believed the applicant would like to reduce the width of the required pedestrian easement in order to maximize a future extension to one of the buildings. Director Ward reported that in the Historic Commercial Business Zoning District, it is based on floor area ratio, so there are certain regulations that will need to be complied with. She noted that this will govern the overall size of the building. In this case, the applicant is asking that there be some consideration of the streetscape alignment.

Commissioner Sigg would prefer the City Engineer weigh in on this rather than there be a direct request made to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Beal noted that this request is not within the complete discretion of the Commission, so he would like to hear from the Engineering Department about whether an exception makes sense in the area. It feels there should be a broader discussion rather than a specific request made.

Commissioner Shand noted that one of the options is to consider the application as it stands, with the five feet that have been referenced. It is also possible for the applicant to hold off and explore the 3.6 feet that was mentioned. Chair Pro Tem Frontero confirmed that the application could be continued to receive input from the City Engineer. Mr. Markkanen suggested the application move forward with 5 feet, as proposed.

Chair Pro Tem Frontero opened the public hearing.

*Officer Davis Coppin* explained that he is with the Park City Police Department and has been working within the downtown area over the last two months. Encroaching on that public right-of-way will only continue to create problems. There is a lot of traffic backup in the area already, which he has seen during his time on Main Street. Commissioner Shand asked if the public right-of-way is the street. Director Ward reported that the current phase of the Main Street Area Plan that is going through the design and public process, is for pedestrian improvements within what is currently platted right-of-way.

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

**MOTION:** Commissioner Sigg moved to APPROVE the Plat Amendment for 322 Main Street and 324 Main Street, Red Banjo Plat Amendment, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

**Findings of Fact:**

1. 322 Main Street, known as Red Banjo Pizza, is a Landmark Historic Site constructed circa 1900.
2. 324/325 Main Street, known as Park Place, is a non-Historic site.
3. The properties are in the Historic Commercial Business (HCB) Zoning District.
4. 322 Main Street contains Historic Lot 6, Block 69 of the Millsite Reservation to the Park City Survey and a portion of Lot 5, Block 22 of the Park City Survey, and straddles Parcels PC-278 and PC-560.
5. 324 Main Street and 325 Swede Alley contain a portion of Historic Lot 6, Block 22 of the Park City Survey and Lot 7, Block 69 of the Millsite Reservation to the Park City Survey, and straddles Parcels PC-279-1 and PC-556-B.
6. The Existing Conditions Survey shows the Landmark Historic Structure at 322 Main Street encroaches 0.31 feet onto 324 Main Street. The proposed Plat Amendment adjusts the common Lot line between 322 and 324 Main Street to resolve the encroachment.
7. The Applicant proposes a Plat Amendment to reflect existing conditions and ownership and to consolidate the Historic Lots.
8. The HCB Zoning District requires a minimum Lot Area of 1,250 square feet.
  - a. The Applicant proposes Lot 1 with 3,118.48 square feet of Area and Lot 2 with 2,224.82 square feet of Area.
9. The HCB Zoning District requires a minimum Lot width of 25 feet.
  - a. The existing and proposed Lot width of 322 Main Street (proposed Lot 1) is 24.19 feet wide on Main; 24.83 feet on Swede Alley.
  - b. The existing and proposed Lot width of 324/325 Main (proposed Lot 2) is 16.68 feet on Main; 20 feet on Swede Alley.
  - c. Because the existing Lot widths do not meet the HCB minimum Lot width of 25 feet, the property owners requested a Variance.
  - d. On February 10, 2026, the Board of Adjustment approved the Variance to allow the existing Lot widths to remain, providing an exception to the minimum Lot width requirement of the HCB Zoning District.

10. The HCB Zoning District requires a minimum Lot depth of 50 feet. The proposed Lot 1 and proposed Lot 2 both have a depth of 125 feet.
11. The HCB Zoning District has no minimum required Setbacks or maximum Lot Area.
12. The HCB Zoning District has a maximum Floor Area Ratio of 4.0.
  - a. Both proposed Lots and existing buildings comply with the Maximum FAR requirement; the existing FAR for the Landmark Historic Site is 1.33 and the existing FAR for Park Place is 1.53.
13. LMC § 15-2.6-3(D) states, "Buildings must be located so as to provide an unobstructed sidewalk at least nine feet (9') wide on both Main Street and Swede Alley. The sidewalk width is measured from the front face of curb to the front of the Building. The alignment of new Building fronts with adjacent Historic fronts is encouraged. A narrower sidewalk may result from the alignment of Building fronts.
14. The Planning and Engineering Departments may grant an exception to the minimum sidewalk width to facilitate such alignment.
  - a. The Applicant requested Planning and Engineering Department approval for a reduced sidewalk width.
  - b. The Planning and Engineering teams researched the sidewalks along Swede Alley and found the following:
    - No sidewalk easements were provided on the immediately adjacent properties, which are built to or nearly to the property lines.
    - Other properties within the block provide a five-foot-wide pedestrian easement.
    - Planned pedestrian improvements along Swede Alley outlined in the Main Street Area Plan are within the Right-of-Way.
15. Planning and Engineering find a nine-foot-wide pedestrian easement is not appropriate in this location and a five-foot-wide pedestrian easement is required to be added to the Plat along Swede Alley prior to recordation.

**Conclusions of Law:**

1. The proposed Plat Amendment complies with LMC Chapter 15-2.6 *Historic Commercial Business (HCB) District*.

2. The proposed Plat Amendment complies with LMC § 15-7.1-6, *Final Subdivision Plat*.
3. There is Good Cause for the Plat Amendment because it resolves the encroachment of the Landmark Historic Structure and creates two contiguous Lots that align with existing conditions and ownership.
4. No Public Street, Right-of-Way, or easement has been vacated or amended as a result of the Plat Amendment.

**Conditions of Approval:**

1. During the plat redline process and prior to recordation, a public access easement for a five-foot-wide sidewalk shall be added to the Plat along the rear property lines that front Swede Alley.
2. The City Planner, City Attorney, and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
3. The Applicant shall record the Plat Amendment within one year from the date of Planning Commission approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year, this approval will be void, unless the applicant submits a request for an extension in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the Planning Director.

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

- C. 7885 Aster Lane – Condominium Plat Amendment –** The Applicant Proposes the Knoll at Silver Lake Phase I, Seventh Amended Plat to Adjust the Platted Limited Common Area of Unit 1 to Allow for Expansion of the Front Façade Deck on the Main Level in the Residential Development Zoning District. PL-25-06715.

Manager Martin presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Condominium Plat Amendment for 7885 Aster Lane. This is for the Knoll at Silver Lake Phase I, Seventh Amended Plat. 7885 Aster Lane is a four-unit condominium development in the Deer Valley MPD within the Residential Development Zoning District. Knoll at Silver Lake Phase I was originally platted in 1982 and was subsequently included in the 1992 Deer Valley Club Estates Subdivision. The plat has been amended six times in the past to adjust private, common, and limited common boundaries of the various units. The

applicant proposes the Seventh Amended Plat to expand the second level front deck on Unit 1, which requires adjusting the limited common area boundary for Unit 1.

Of the six previous amendments, Unit 1 was amended once, which was in the Fourth Amended Plat. Manager Martin explained that the boundaries reflected in the Fourth Amended Plat do not represent the existing build out of Unit 1. The proposed plat reflects what is currently built out as well as the expanded deck area. She reported that the proposed Condominium Plat Amendment complies with the Residential Development Zoning District lot and site requirements, including the front setback exception for decks. The exception is for decks not more than 10 feet in width and not projecting more than 5 feet into the setback. In this case, 8.5 feet of the proposed deck encroaches into the front setback 3 feet 3 inches. This meets the requirement for the front setback exception.

Staff finds there is Good Cause for the Condominium Plat Amendment, as it corrects existing non-conformities with the plat and reflects as-built conditions. As stated earlier, there have been six amendments to the Knoll at Silver Lake Phase I. Staff recommends the Planning Commission review the Condominium Plat Amendment at 7885 Aster Lane, conduct a public hearing, and consider approval based on the Draft Final Action Letter.

The applicant representative, Chris Mousley, of Crossbeam Builders, LLC, introduced himself to the Planning Commission and offered to answer Commission questions. Commissioner Tilson asked if there was an HOA vote on this, which was confirmed. Mr. Mousley reported that the HOA approved it, and there was confirmation submitted.

Commissioner Sigg asked if the encroachment into the setback is a cantilever or if it is off of a post with a footing holding it. Manager Martin shared an image with the Planning Commission and asked for clarification from the applicant. Mr. Mousley confirmed that there will need to be a footing and a post. The deck cantilevers out approximately four feet past the post. The post is in line with the existing two that are seen in the photograph. Manager Martin stated that the post meets the setback requirement and does not encroach. Commissioner Shand wanted to know if there is a height limit for deck encroachments. Manager Martin denied that there is a height limit in the code.

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

**MOTION:** Commissioner Beal moved to APPROVE the Condominium Plat Amendment for 7885 Aster Lane, the Knoll at Silver Lake Phase I Seventh Amended Plat, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The Knoll at Silver Lake Phase I Condominium Plat was recorded with Summit County on April 5, 1982 (Entry No. 190071).

2. Subsequently, the parcel was included in a larger subdivision, the Deer Valley Club Estates, recorded with Summit County in October of 1992 (Entry No. 370399).
3. On August 18, 2005, City Council approved the Knoll at Silver Lake Phase I Fourth Amended Record of Survey to adjust the Unit 1 private and limited area boundaries.
4. The Applicant submitted a Plat Amendment application to adjust the common area of Unit 1 of the Knoll at Silver Lake Phase I condominiums to construct a front deck on the second (main level).
5. The Applicant's Existing Conditions Survey shows the boundary of Unit 1 was not built to the amended boundary as shown in the Fourth Amended Plat Amendment, except for the front deck on the main level, which was constructed in 2002; the proposed Seventh Amended Plat reflects the existing footprint of Unit 1.
6. The Knoll at Silver Lake Phase I Seventh Amended Plat complies with the Residential Development (RD) Zoning District Setbacks.
  - a. The proposed deck expansion projects 3 feet 3 ¼ inches into the Front Setback and the length of the deck that is within the Front Setback is 8 feet, 6 inches, an allowed exception according to RD Front Setback exceptions, LMC § 15-2.13-3(C)(2)(c), which states: "Decks, porches, and Bay Windows, not more than ten feet (10') wide, projecting not more than five feet (5') into the Front Setback" are allowed within the Front Setback.
7. There is Good Cause for the Knoll at Silver Lake Phase I Seventh Amended Plat.
  - a. The Plat reflects existing conditions and allows for the expansion of the front deck on the main level, like previous approved Amendments made to the Plat to expand Units 2, 3 and 4.
  - b. No Public Street, Right-of-Way, or easement will be vacated or amended.

**Conclusions of Law:**

1. There is Good Cause for this Plat Amendment, as required by LMC § 15-7.1-6 *Final Subdivision Plat*.

2. The Plat Amendment is consistent with Land Management Code Chapter 15-2.13 *Residential Development (RD) District* and § 15-7.1-6 *Final Subdivision Plat*.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed Plat Amendment.
4. Approval of the Plat Amendment, subject to the conditions of approval below, does not adversely affect the health, safety, and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

**Conditions of Approval:**

1. The City Planner, City Attorney, and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat for compliance with state law, the Land Management Code, the Conditions of Approval.
2. The Applicant shall submit an amended Declaration of Condominium of the Knoll at Silver Lake Phase I Condominiums prior to recordation of the plat for City Planner and City Attorney review.
3. 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, 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.

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 next agenda item.

- D. 200 King Road – Appeal of Planning Staff Final Action** – The Appellant Appeals Planning Staff’s Building Permit Approval of Driveway Plans for 220 King Road Across a Platted Easement on 200 King Road, Lot 1 of the Treasure Hill Subdivision Phase 1 Plat in the Historic Residential -1 – Master Planned Development Zoning District. PL-25-06787.

Chair Pro Tem Frontero reported that this agenda item is an Appeal of Planning Staff Final Action and the Planning Commission will be acting as the Appeal Body. He asked each attorney to share updates. Justin Keys explained that as stated in the submitted letter, the claims are subject to litigation. There are active settlement negotiations regarding the claims, and he is hopeful there will be agreement reached. That would actually moot this appeal because there would be agreement with the work proposed. As

a result, he suggested that the Planning Commission continue this item to a date uncertain. Ideally, the appeal will be withdrawn if there are terms reached. Bruce Baird confirmed there are settlement discussions underway and a continuance makes sense.

Based on feedback from Mr. Keys and Mr. Baird, it was determined that there is support for a continuation of this agenda item. Chair Pro Tem Frontero stated that he would prefer to move this to a date certain rather than to a date uncertain. However, it sounds like there is no clarity about the timeline of the negotiations. The preference is for this to be resolved between the two parties. Mr. Keys suggested that the item be continued to a date uncertain, as there is still some additional discussion that need to take place.

Chair Pro Tem Frontero asked about proper procedure. Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, explained that a motion can be made to continue this item to a date uncertain. Commissioner Shand made a motion to continue the Appeal of Planning Staff Final Action for 200 King Road to a date uncertain. Commissioner Beal asked to comment before there was a second made to the motion. He spent a fair amount of time reviewing the Meeting Materials Packet and believes this is a relatively straightforward issue. The parties have had ample time to resolve this and he would prefer to make a ruling. Commissioner Beal stated that he will not be in favor of a motion to continue the item.

Commissioner Shand explained that the Commission has been down this road before, where an applicant cancels at the last minute after the Planning Commission has invested a lot of time into a review of the materials. In light of the complications associated with this particular application, he is not as concerned about the time that has been spent on the review. That being said, he respects the position shared by Commissioner Beal.

Chair Pro Tem Frontero asked Director Ward to share information about the timing of continuation requests. Director Ward explained that if a continuation request is submitted seven days before the public hearing, Staff has the authority to grant the continuance. That means the Meeting Materials Packet will not include a Staff Report or other materials related to the application. It also means the Commission will not invest time reviewing and preparing for the public hearing. In this case, there was a request received at 9:30 a.m. the same day as the meeting. In Section 15-1-12.5, the Planning Commission has the discretion to determine whether there is reasonable cause to continue an item. If there is no reasonable cause, the item remains on the agenda and the Commission can take final action. With the recent code updates adopted in December 2025, there were examples of reasonable causes included in the language. The Planning Commission has discretion about whether final action should be taken or if this item should be continued.

Mr. Baird clarified that no request was submitted to continue the item this morning. There had been a discussion about a possible continuance, and he asked the Senior City Attorney that morning if there was a policy in place. He agrees with Commissioner Beal that this application is straightforward but acknowledged that it is preferable when parties

can work out issues on their own. He is open to whatever decision the Planning Commission chooses to make about the current agenda item.

Commissioner Shand would rather see this matter resolved between the two parties than have the Planning Commission vote on the item at this time. Commissioner Beal asked how close the parties are to reaching some sort of agreement. Mr. Keys reported that the driveway proposed is significantly different than what was proposed a year ago. The parties are close to reaching an agreement due to the changes proposed to the driveway.

Commissioner Sigg is encouraged by the prospect of the parties reaching an agreement. He suggested that the item be continued to a date certain in order to encourage the agreement to occur in a timely manner. Director Ward reported that potential dates are March 11, 2026, or April 8, 2026. Mr. Baird reported that he will be out of the country on March 11, 2026. Commissioner Beal expressed support for a continuance to a date certain based on the comments made during the discussion. Commissioner Shand rescinded his previous motion and made a new motion with reference to a date certain.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Shand moved to CONTINUE the Appeal of Planning Staff Final Action for 200 King Road to April 8, 2026. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Sigg. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

## 7. ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION: Commissioner** Beal moved to ADJOURN. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Shand. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:52 p.m.