



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
MARCH 11, 2026**

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

EX OFFICIO: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Conor Campobasso, Senior Transportation Planner; Tim Sanderson, Transportation Director; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney; Jaron Ehlers, Planner I; Alec Barton, Senior Planner; Lillian Zollinger, Planner III; Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner II

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Christin Van Dine called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. All Commissioners are present with the exception of Commissioner Henry Sigg.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

- A. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from February 25, 2026.**

MOTION: Commissioner Shand moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from February 25, 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

- A. Planning Commission Chair Pro Tem Election –** The Planning Commission Will Elect One of Its Members to Serve as Chair Pro Tem.

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

4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

5. WORK SESSION

A. Transportation Planning Update.

Senior Transportation Planner, Conor Campobasso, and Transportation Director, Tim Sanderson, shared transportation updates with the Planning Commission. Presentation materials titled “Re-Create 248 - Planning Commission Update” were reviewed. Planner Compabasso explained that the City is looking at transit improvements along the 248 corridor and into the downtown area. This includes Bonanza Drive and Deer Valley Drive all the way to the Old Town Transit Center. He reported that 248 has been studied for a while to determine how to get people out east into town as efficiently as possible while still being mindful about the amount of disruption. The City Council decided to move forward with a transit project. The goal is to have it implemented before the 2034 Olympic Games, but this is not a project specifically planned for the future Olympic Games.

Planner Compabasso shared information about the evaluation process. The idea was to start with an evaluation of several different options, such as rail and BRT. However, there were discussions throughout the process about tunnels, one-way loops, and commuter rail. There were several transportation modes studied during this process. He reported that Pre-Screening took place, which was followed by a Level 1 Initial Evaluation, a Level 2 Detailed Evaluation, and a Locally Preferred Alternative.

The Level 1 Alternatives Evaluated included three modes and two alignments. Planner Compabasso reported that one of the alignments was the Rail Trail Alignment. There was feedback received from the public, and there was also an internal analysis conducted. It was determined that this alignment would not be feasible, so it was eliminated. The three modes that moved forward were: Exclusive Bus Lane, Light Rail, and Automated Guideway Transit (Monorail). Those modes were evaluated and ultimately, the Exclusive Bus Lane and Light Rail moved forward. The Level 2 Evaluation looked at the two modes to see which scored highest. That information was then brought to the City Council on January 20, 2025, and the decision was to move forward with Side Running Bus Lanes.

Planner Compabasso reported that the Side Running Bus Lanes will use some easement areas and there will also be some land use changes related to the park and ride. The Planning Commission will be involved in this process, so the intention is to provide updates as much as possible. He shared an image that represents a typical section of the bus lanes, which there is a desire to implement. Timeline information was provided. Planner Compabasso explained that the Re-Create 248 Transit Study is almost complete. After this phase, there will be the Environmental Study and Preliminary Design phase, which will take approximately 24 months. The goal is to have construction done before 2034.

Information about the park and ride was provided. Planner Compabasso reported that the locally preferred alternative has impacted the park and ride discussions. In addition, the Deer Valley agreement with the City related to park and ride improvements has moved things forward. In August 2025, the City Council decided to evaluate a two-location concept, which included Gordo and Richardson Flat. The City Council made a decision to move forward with the Gordo site as the first phase. This decision was made for a variety of reasons, including the fact that environmental work needs to be done at Richardson Flat. The City owns the Gordo property; there are utilities running next to it already, and there is direct access. Planner Compabasso shared information about the costs associated with the work. Projects are being merged together, so there is one transit solution for the east-west connection. This looks good when funding requests are made.

Commissioner Frontero expressed appreciation for the updates provided by Staff. He asked that there be quarterly updates shared so the Planning Commission is aware of work that is moving forward. Transportation is a priority, and it is important for the community to see that there are plans in place. Commissioner Frontero believed Option 1 made sense, but asked for additional information about Option 2. Planner Compabasso explained that it is a secondary option. If it were pursued now, there would be an expansion to Option 1 at a later date. Director Sanderson shared additional information about the recommendation for Gordo to be included in the first phase. There are a lot of unknowns at Richardson Flat at this time. When there is a better understanding of what is happening there, an appropriate solution can be determined.

Commissioner Frontero asked about the number of parking stalls anticipated at Gordo. Planner Compabasso reported that the lowest that Staff would like to see there is 250 stalls. The highest number that has been discussed is 900. 250 is the lowest amount desired for a capture lot in the area. The 900 parking stalls have to do with the Deer Valley agreement, as there is some language that mentions 450 stalls dedicated to Deer Valley use and another 450 stalls for park and ride offset. Different options will be presented to the City Council. Ultimately, the City Council will make a decision about the final number.

Commissioner Rick Shand wanted to know more about the capacity at Richardson Flat. Planner Compabasso reported that it is approximately 750 stalls, 100 of which is dedicated to the Montage. It is being used on a daily basis, and the maximum capacity has only been reached once this past year. There are higher numbers of parked vehicles out there each year. There is a desire to have a more convenient park and ride area, which is the reason that the Gordo site has been contemplated. Commissioner Shand agreed that Gordo would be more convenient. He believed that when buses pick up people at Richardson Flat, the stops are Snow Park, Park City Mountain Resort, and the Transit Center. Planner Compabasso confirmed that in the winter, those are the stops. In the summer, it takes passengers to Old Town, where connections can be made to the resorts.

B. 1750 Kearns Boulevard – Modification to a Conditional Use Permit –
The Applicant Proposes to Modify Condition of Approval #15 of the June 25, 2025, Final Action Letter to Convert the Emergency Vehicle Lane between the Park City High School and Dozier Field into a Bus Lane Located Within the Recreation Open Space District and Lucky John Open Space Buffer. PL-25-06712.

Planner I, Jaron Ehlers, presented the Staff Report and explained that this Work Session item is related to 1750 Kearns Boulevard. He reported that the applicant representative, J.D. Simmons, is attending the meeting as well as a representative from Fehr & Peers. There is a proposal to modify a Conditional Use Permit (“CUP”) that the Planning Commission approved in June 2025. There was a Condition of Approval that mentioned an approved emergency access lane that would be limited to emergency access. If the School District wanted to use that lane for school bus use, there would need to be a Modification to a CUP pursued. The applicant recently applied for that modification.

Planner Ehlers reported that there is no public hearing on the Modification to a CUP request at this time. Members of the public can submit comments to planning@parkcity.gov. There will be a future public hearing, which will be noticed at a later date. All public input that Staff received prior to this meeting has been forwarded to the Planning Commission and will be included in the next Meeting Materials Packet.

There are 17 CUP criteria in the Land Management Code (“LMC”). The criteria related to traffic, vehicular circulation, and transportation were shared with the Commission:

- Traffic considerations, including capacity of the existing streets in the area;
- Emergency vehicle access;
- Internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation system;
- Noise, vibrations, odors, steam, or other mechanical factors that might affect people and property off-site;
- Reviewed for consistency with goals and objectives of the Park City General Plan.

Planner Ehlers shared an aerial image that shows the school and other developments in the area. The yellow oval indicates the approximate location of the emergency lane and the proposed bus lane. There are red lines on Lucky John Drive and Monitor Drive to show the proposed bus circulation. Another image indicated the potential location of vehicle control gates, which would provide access to emergency vehicles and buses.

In April 2025, the Planning Commission voted to approve the CUP. Revised plans were submitted, and the Commission approved a Revised CUP in June 2025. As mentioned, there is Condition of Approval #15, which limits the emergency vehicle lane to emergency vehicles only. It included language about the modification process. In September 2025, the School District applied for a Modification to a CUP and submitted a Traffic Study. The

City hired a third-party consultant who reviewed the study and provided comments. Those comments were reviewed by the School District and its consultant. A revised study was submitted, which was also reviewed by the third-party consultant.

Planner Ehlers shared additional information about the Traffic Impact Study (“TIS”) and the proposal. He reported that the TIS included a possible Phase 3, but this phase has not been proposed to the City at this time and would need to come to the Planning Commission as a separate CUP. He reiterated that Phase 3 is not being evaluated. As for the buses, there would be up to 18 buses from 2:25 p.m. to 2:35 p.m. The Traffic Study counted westbound vehicles on Lucky John Drive that were turning south onto Monitor Drive. Planner Ehlers reported that there were 39 westbound vehicles between 2:15 p.m. and 2:30 p.m. and 41 westbound vehicles between 2:30 p.m. and 2:45 p.m.

The Police Department and Engineering Department shared comments about the current situation. The main concern has to do with eastbound turns onto Kearns Boulevard. This involves turning across multiple lanes of traffic, and sometimes personnel has to be sent out to usher the buses through. It is a situation the Police and Engineering Departments have been evaluating and there is an analysis in the Meeting Materials Packet. The School District has proposed potential mitigations. The proposal is to use the emergency vehicle lane for buses only in the afternoon. In addition, vehicle control gates are proposed so only emergency vehicles and school buses will be allowed to enter.

There are certain recommendations included in the TIS, such as dedicated turn lanes. At this time, the City and Utah Department of Transportation (“UDOT”) are not considering any road widening outside Re-Create 248. There was also a suggestion to link the school buses into the same priority signal system that the City bus system uses. Another recommendation is to reduce the number of staff and student parking permits that the School District issues to allow for parking where there is permission to do so. That would help address the parking situation, but it would not necessarily address the traffic situation. Another recommendation was to improve on-site bicycle and active transportation facilities. That would assist with the parking, but it is unclear what impact that would have on the traffic. Planner Ehlers shared Staff recommendations:

- Increase student and staff ridership on the City transit system;
- Evaluate a connection to the Comstock Drive traffic light to facilitate left turns onto Kearns Boulevard for buses.

Staff has several questions for the Planning Commission, which include the following:

- Does the January 2026 Traffic Impact Study provide sufficient information for the Commission’s analysis?
- Is there additional information needed for Final Action?
- Which of the proposed measures does the Commission find best mitigates impacts?

- Are there additional measures not proposed that the Commission would like Staff and the applicant to evaluate?

The applicant representative shared clarifying information with the Planning Commission. It would be pick up only, so the buses would still come in off of Kearns Boulevard and enter into the lane between Dozier Field and the high school. It is not suggested that this be used daily, but when there are heavy traffic flows. Currently, when there is heavy traffic, the buses block the lanes in order to leave. Chair Van Dine appreciated the clarification. She pointed out that traffic on Fridays tends to be different because school is out earlier. She does not believe the TIS accounted for this. It was reported that a TIS generally looks at when the land use will have the largest impact on adjacent streets. The study looked at the peak hour of the adjacent street and when the land use would have the biggest impact on that street. The worst-case scenario has been analyzed in the TIS.

There was discussion about the proposed route. Chair Van Dine did not believe anything would turn right on Monitor Drive and then into Park Meadows to access 248 on the back side. This was confirmed. Commissioner Grant Tilson asked if all 18 buses would use this route. It was confirmed that when the route is utilized, there would be 18 total buses.

Commissioner Shand reported that of the 18 buses, nine need to go west on 248 and nine need to make a left-hand turn and go east. In the Meeting Materials Packet, it mentions a turn lane on Lucky John Drive and an additional turn lane on Monitor Drive. He asked if there had been consideration about the intersection at the light. The Fehr & Peers representative reported that the TIS was based on a Phase 3 development, which meant there would be additional traffic added to Lucky John Drive beyond the buses. There was additional traffic considered in the TIS that is not being addressed at this time. The recommendations in the TIS are intended to mitigate impacts beyond the 18 buses.

The Commission discussed the way buses leave the school currently. It was clarified that buses inch their way out, and when there is an opportunity, the buses leave all at once. It presents an unsafe condition for the bus drivers and those around the buses. It was added that it is a State Road, which means the Park City Police Department officers do not want to be in the right-of-way, as the Highway Patrol has jurisdiction in that area.

There was a meeting with UDOT to discuss the TIS. There was a discussion about a signal, but given the proximity to the Bonanza light, the spacing is difficult. There are challenges because of the amount of traffic on the road and the queues. Commissioner Shand understands the work that has gone into this proposal, but he is having a difficult time rationalizing what has been presented so that nine buses can make a left-hand turn.

Commissioner Seth Beal had a question about the measurement of cars. It looks like cars were measured at Lucky John Drive and Monitor Drive. He is more concerned about the intersection with 248. The stop sign is not the problem, but the problem is getting onto 248. He did not see an analysis that would make him comfortable with the proposal.

Commissioner Beal wanted to understand why the buses are not being routed to the existing light that has historically been used for buses. Information about Phase 3 was shared. When the district developed its Master Plan, there was a Phase 3, which is where the existing ballfields are now. That would be turned into parking, and there would be some additional work done to the high school. There is an interconnection between the high school and Comstock Drive. That is the preferred route, but it is an extensive phase. The last time it was priced out, it would cost approximately \$90 million. It is a goal being worked toward, but what is proposed is an interim solution until that is realized.

Commissioner Beal believed the road connection could be done for far less than the \$90 million, as that includes all of the other work in the phase. It was clarified that there would need to be engineering done to determine the cost for only the road connection. Commissioner Beal likes that the facilities are being improved and he likes the plans, but he has concerns about what has been proposed, given the existing traffic issues. Chair Van Dine pointed out that what has been proposed is considered an interim solution. This is something that can be done immediately to address existing safety issues in the area. The proposal is only for 30 minutes, and it would not occur every day of the week. Commissioner Beal thought the proposal would simply create different safety issues.

The Commission further discussed the proposal. Commissioner Beal thought the proposal could shift the problem elsewhere. He would like to see ways to solve the entire problem rather than simply being an interim solution. Information about the intersection at Lucky John Drive and Monitor Drive was shared. It was noted that it was one of 10 intersections that were analyzed. On Page 6 of the Staff Report is Table 1, which shows all of those intersections and what the impact would be. It was reiterated that this assumes Phase 3, where there would be much more traffic being added to the area.

Commissioner Frontero asked that Figure 1 be shared with the Planning Commission. Currently, a bus pulls out and blocks traffic so the other 17 buses can leave, and then the last bus leaves behind them. It takes approximately five minutes for the buses to leave. It sounds like this proposal is intended to solve a current problem that lasts for five minutes. He asked how many days a year this problem happens. It was reported that there is some uncertainty about how often it occurs, but it does not happen every day.

Commissioner Frontero estimated that this is a five-minute problem that happens around four days a week. He does not believe the current proposal makes sense, as it would be preferable for the buses to get to 248 as quickly as possible. It makes sense to have additional discussions with UDOT about a signal, despite the spacing concerns. It would be possible to activate that light only when the school buses need to leave. The Commission was informed that there has not been support from UDOT for that, but there is support for the interim solution that has been proposed. Commissioner Frontero reiterated that he does not support the current proposal. He suggested that there be another discussion with UDOT where a well-defined plan is shared with them.

Commissioner Tilson agreed with the comments from other Commissioners. He mentioned the TIS mitigation recommendations. One is to reduce the number of staff and student parking permits. He did not believe it should be made more difficult for staff and students to get to and from the school. While he appreciates the softer approach that is mentioned later on, which mentions encouraging more carpooling and having parking priority for carpool vehicles, reducing the parking permits for staff and students would place the burden on people who live in Park City and need to get to school. It was noted that a lot of the proposed mitigation measures are based on Phase 3 conditions. Transportation Demand Management (“TDM”) strategy information was provided.

Planner Ehlers asked if the Commission would like to answer any of the questions posed before moving on to the next Work Session item on the agenda. He summarized the Work Session discussion. At this time, the Commission does not appear to support the current proposal. More information should be brought to the Commission in the future, and more effort should be put into the Comstock Drive option. Some members of the Commission thought UDOT should be approached again. The Commission also expressed a desire for more information about how this will interact with the existing intersection.

C. Land Management Code Amendments – Swimming Pools and Hot Tubs – The Planning Commission will Review and Provide Input on Proposed Updates to the Land Management Code to Define and Regulate Swimming Pools and Hot Tubs. PL-26-06833.

Senior Planner, Alec Barton, presented the Staff Report and explained that this Work Session item relates to LMC Amendments for Swimming Pools and Hot Tubs. He explained that there is no definition in the LMC for either a swimming pool or a hot tub, and there is no clear permitting threshold established in the code. Staff is guided by an internal interim policy that determines when something requires a CUP and needs to come to the Planning Commission for review and approval, and when something can be handled at the Staff level. A related challenge is that there is no specific criterion for the Commission to rely on during a review of a swimming pool or hot tub. Planner Barton explained that the proposed amendments would address deficiencies in the code.

There is an opportunity to establish clear definitions for both a swimming pool and a hot tub and to update the Zoning Districts where these uses are allowed. In the case of swimming pools, it would be a CUP, and in the case of hot tubs, it would be an allowed use. The amendments would establish specific review criteria for the Commission to use. Planner Barton explained that the amendments would support the General Plan goals of maintaining a small-town feel and mountain community character, specifically in the Historic Districts. The amendments also relate to initiatives that support water reduction and sustainability efforts. The proposed definition for a swimming pool was shared as follows:

- A permanent or semi-permanent outdoor structure associated with a single-family dwelling intended for recreational swimming or wading, containing water with a depth of 18 inches or more and not exceeding a surface area of 800 square feet or 10% of the lot area, whichever is less.

Planner Barton clarified that the proposed amendments relate to swimming pools and hot tubs associated with single-family homes. These amendments do not relate to swimming pools in condominium projects or apartment complexes. Within the last several years, the Planning Commission has approved several CUPs for swimming pools. Planner Barton shared a table with the Commission and reported that only one of the pools exceeded the 800 square foot threshold that is proposed in this definition. He reported that the table illustrates what a lot in several Park City neighborhoods would be permitted to have. The proposed definition of a hot tub was shared with the Planning Commission:

- An outdoor accessory structure associated with a single-family dwelling containing water with a depth of 18 inches or more and a surface area of 72 square feet or less.

There are in-ground custom hot tubs that have been permitted, including more recently, but the trend has shifted toward prefabricated hot tubs. Planner Barton shared a table with sample size information from three major manufacturers. The 72 square foot threshold is based on the largest model hot tubs. He explained that a hot tub that size would accommodate between seven and 10 individuals. Most of the prefabricated models would be considered a hot tub and would be an allowed use under this definition.

Planner Barton reported that there is also an update proposed to the existing definition of Private Recreation Facilities. The proposed language is as follows:

- Recreation Facilities operated on private property and were not open to the general public, including Recreation Facilities such as swimming pools, tennis courts, outdoor pickleball courts, and similar facilities for use by owners and guests for a condominium project or private recreational use.

Planner Barton posed the following questions to the Planning Commission:

- Are the proposed definitions for swimming pool and hot tub appropriate?
- Is there additional information that should be included in these definitions?

Commissioner Shand felt that 72 square feet for a hot tub was appropriate for administrative approval. Anything larger than that should require a CUP. As far as the definition and dimensions of a swimming pool, 800 square feet would still allow someone to have a lap pool. He expressed support for what has been proposed. Planner Barton

confirmed that anything larger than 72 square feet would need to be reviewed by the Commission. Commissioner Frontero finds the square footages to be appropriate.

Commissioner Beal stated that the square footages make sense, but asked about the depth requirements. He wanted to understand the purpose of the references to 18 inches. Planner Barton offered to check with the Building Team, but his understanding is that this is based on Building Code requirements. 18 inches is the standard in other cities. The goal is not to require permits for a temporary pool structure that would be set up in a yard, such as a splash pool for children. He offered to share additional information in the future.

Planner Barton reported that the next set of updates are related to the Zoning Districts where these uses would be permitted, either as an allowed use or a conditional use. The proposal is that a swimming pool will come to the Commission and require a CUP. A hot tub is proposed to be an allowed use in most of the Zoning Districts. Currently, the Protected Open Space ("POS") Zoning District and Public Use Transition ("PUT") Zoning District prohibits Private Recreation Facilities. Staff recommends that these uses be prohibited in the two zoning districts. The following questions were asked:

- Are the Zoning Districts where swimming pools are proposed as allowed, conditional, and prohibited uses appropriate?
- Should these facilities be limited to fewer Zoning Districts?

Commissioner Tilson wondered why the swimming pool is a CUP as opposed to an allowed use. Planner Barton explained that some General Plan goals are related to community character, reduction in water use, and helping achieve sustainability goals. Based on the interim policy in place, swimming pools are already brought to the Planning Commission for a CUP. This would formalize the process that is already in place.

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, added that for a hot tub, where it is an allowed use, the property owner would submit a Building Permit. In the case of a swimming pool application where a CUP is needed, there would be public notice provided to adjacent property owners. Through the CUP criteria, the Planning Commission can look at neighborhood context, noise, fencing, and screening. There would be a higher level of review for compatibility, as a swimming pool is more impactful than a smaller hot tub. Commissioner Frontero expressed support for the Zoning District language proposed.

Planner Barton reported that the final set of proposed updates relates to criteria that could be established for the Planning Commission review of swimming pools. There are already adopted standards related to noise, but there could be additional considerations with these facilities at nightly rentals. It is possible to look at the existing off-street parking requirements, as the existing requirement may not reflect the actual demand for swimming pools. There could be an opportunity to reduce that requirement.

It is possible to clarify that maintenance vehicles that are servicing pools must be in an off-street parking space to avoid impacting City streets, particularly in Old Town and other districts where there are physical constraints. Planner Barton noted that it is also possible to work with the Snyderville Basin Water Reclamation District to establish drainage requirements for swimming pools and hot tubs. In addition, the Planning Commission could look into specific considerations in Historic Districts, such as screening. This could mitigate impacts on neighborhood character. The Commission can also evaluate whether swimming pools and hot tubs are appropriate on rooftop decks within Historic Districts.

Planner Barton shared a final set of questions with the Planning Commission:

- Do the proposed review criteria for swimming pools account for the impacts these facilities may have in residential areas? Are there additional criteria the Planning Commission should consider when reviewing CUPs?
- The proposed regulations apply to outdoor swimming pools. Does the Planning Commission find it necessary to regulate indoor swimming pools to reduce water and energy use?

Commissioner Frontero does not believe it is necessary to regulate indoor swimming pools. He has not seen an indoor swimming pool come to the Planning Commission for consideration. Director Ward pointed out that there could be some additional clarification made to the language. If there is an indoor swimming pool, then the review is handled through the Building Permit process. The proposed amendments are intended to mitigate the impacts of swimming pools and hot tubs when those are outdoor uses.

Commissioner Shand agreed with Commissioner Frontero. There is no desire to regulate indoor swimming pools. As for the other questions, swimming pools have come to the Planning Commission before, and parking, noise, and screening have all been evaluated. He supported the existing criteria. Commissioner Beal echoed those comments. It is possible to handle concerns through the CUP process, with the exception of parking requirements. There was an issue somewhat recently where the swimming pool required far more parking spots than needed. It would make sense to require fewer parking spots.

Commissioner Tilson does not find it necessary to regulate indoor swimming pools. The additional criteria, as written by Staff, address the mitigation needed. Chair Van Dine echoed those comments. Planner Barton thanked the Planning Commission for providing feedback. He reported that the amendments will be discussed again in the future.

The Planning Commission took a short break before moving into the Regular Session.

6. REGULAR SESSION

- A. 685, 695, 705, 725 Saddle View Way – Condominium Plat Amendment**
– The Applicant Proposes to Construct Separate 337-Square-Foot Additions of Private Area for Units 7, 8, and 10, and a 19-Square Foot Addition of Private Area for Unit 6 of Saddle Condominiums in the Residential Development Zoning District. PL-26-06826.

Planner Barton presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Condominium Plat Amendment application for 685, 695, 705, and 725 Saddle View Way. After publication of the Staff Report and Draft Final Action Letter, a request was received from the applicant for a minor modification to the Plat Amendment. He will present the proposed amendments to the application as well as the modified Draft Final Action Letter.

Background information about Saddle Condominiums was shared. Planner Barton reported that the original plat was recorded in 1981. The four units the Planning Commission will review during this meeting include Units 6, 7, 8, and 10. These are three-level units that originally had the same layout and dimensions, every 3,102 square feet. Last year, the Commission reviewed and approved a Plat Amendment for 318 square foot additions to Units 6 and 9. Unit 6 is being considered again by the Commission, and Units 7, 8, and 10 were being considered for an amendment for the first time.

Planner Barton shared images with the Commission and explained that the proposed addition on the left is what is in the Staff Report. The illustration on the right is what is proposed under the modified Plat Amendment. The area proposed for renovation is a crawl space under level two. That crawl space extends approximately two linear feet further back than what was originally understood. The applicants would like to convert all of that area into private ownership. For Units 7, 8, and 10, this increases the proposed addition to 391 square feet. Unit 6, which was already amended last year, has a smaller addition of 73 square feet, but it results in the same measurement, 3,493 square feet.

The proposed modifications increase the size of the additions by approximately 54 square feet. Planner Barton shared additional images to compare what was included in the Staff Report and what was later proposed. Another image was shared with the Commission.

Planner Barton reported that the additions are contained within the existing building footprint and are not visible from the exterior. Staff finds that the proposal complies with the Residential Development Zoning District requirements. The proposed amendments, including the modification, do not increase off-street parking requirements. There is Good Cause for the Plat Amendment, because it does not involve any exterior changes, is not visible from the public right-of-way, and is within the existing building footprint.

The Draft Final Action Letter was reviewed. Planner Barton reported that there are some proposed changes to accommodate the modifications. Most of the changes relate to the

square footages that are mentioned, but there is also another Condition of Approval recommended. Staff recommended the Planning Commission review the proposed Plat Amendment, conduct a public hearing, and consider approval based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval in the modified Draft Final Action Letter. He noted that Megan Blosser with Alliance Engineering can answer questions.

Commissioner Shand mentioned Figure 1 in the Meeting Materials Packet and asked if this shows the existing foundation that goes all the way down to the footing. This was confirmed. Ms. Blosser explained that it is because of Unit 9 that there was an awareness of the space available. Unit 9 will stick with the old amendment, but everyone else would like to go to the back foundation wall now that there is an awareness of how far back it is. Commissioner Shand asked about the intended use. Ms. Blosser believed there would be a television room and a bathroom. There were no additional questions.

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

Commissioner Frontero noted that this is a 16-unit condominium project. He asked if there will be similar applications in the future. Ms. Blosser reported that there could be future applications, because there are still other units in the building that have not pursued this. However, the neighbors have coordinated with one another, so there is an awareness of what is currently being requested. The intention was to include as many condominium owners in this Condominium Plat Amendment application as possible.

MOTION: Commissioner Frontero moved to APPROVE the Condominium Plat Amendment for the Saddle Condominiums Phase One Plat, amending Units 6, 7, 8, and 10, according to the following, as amended:

Procedural History:

1. Saddle Condominiums Phase One is a 16-Unit Condominium project in the Residential Development (RD) Zoning District.
2. The Saddle Condominiums Phase One Plat was recorded with Summit County on January 23, 1981 (Recorder Entry No. 175675).
3. Unit 6 was amended along with Unit 9 on June 25, 2025, when the Planning Commission approved a Plat Amendment to construct separate 318-square-foot additions within the existing Building Footprints.

Findings of Fact:

1. Units 6 (685 Saddle View Way), 7 (695 Saddle View Way), 8 (705 Saddle View Way), and 10 (725 Saddle View Way) are three-level units that originally had the same layout and dimensions, each 3,102 square feet.
2. The Applicants propose a 391-square-foot addition to the first floor of Units 7, 8, and 10, and a 73-square-foot addition to the first floor of Unit 6, all within existing Building Footprints. The proposed additions increase the private area for each unit to 3,493 square feet.
3. On February 9, 2026, 82.06% of the Saddle Condominiums Homeowners Association (HOA) ownership voted in favor of the proposed Plat Amendment.
4. On March 10, 2026, the Saddle Condominiums HOA President provided a letter certifying that the HOA approved the proposed modifications to the plat submitted after publication of the Staff Report and Draft Final Action Letter. Condition of Approval #4 requires the Applicant to provide notarized documentation of the HOA vote approving the modifications within 30 days of Plat Amendment approval.
5. The proposed Plat Amendment complies with the RD Zoning District requirements.
 - a. Setbacks for the RD Zoning District are as follows: Front – 20 feet, Rear – 15 feet, Side – 12 feet.
 - i. Complies. The proposed additions are within existing Building Footprints. The Structures maintain Setbacks greater than 120 feet from all property lines.
 - b. Building Height for the RD Zoning District is 28 feet from Existing Grade.
 - i. Complies. The proposed additions do not increase the Building Height of any Structure. The existing Structures are approximately 27 feet from Existing Grade.
 - c. Density for the RD Zoning District is three Units per acre.
 - i. Complies. The Lot for the Saddle Condominiums is 3.71 acres. The Saddle Condominiums were platted in 1981 for 16 units. The LMC in effect at the time did not have a Density limitation. The proposed Plat Amendment complies with LMC Section 15-9-6(A) because it does not create an additional Unit or enlarge any non-compliance. The proposed Plat Amendment complies with the original Condominium approval for 16 units.

6. The proposal complies with LMC Chapter 15-3, Off-Street Parking Requirements.
 - a. Condominiums greater than 2,000 square feet require two Parking Spaces per Dwelling Unit. Unit 6 is proposed to expand from 3,418 square feet to 3,439 square feet. Units 7, 8, and 10 are each proposed to expand from 3,102 square feet to 3,439 square feet. Each unit currently requires two Parking Spaces.
 - i. Complies. The proposed additions do not increase the Off-Street Parking requirement for any unit.
 - b. Two-car garages must have a minimum interior dimension of twenty feet in width by twenty feet in depth.
 - i. Complies. Each unit has a two-car garage that is approximately 26 feet wide by 20.33 feet deep.
7. The proposal complies with LMC § 15-7.1-3(B), Plat Amendment.
 - a. Changes to platted elements, including private area additions within a condominium, require a Plat Amendment. Plat Amendments shall be reviewed according to the requirements of LMC Section 15-7-1.6, and approval shall require a finding of Good Cause.
 - b. LMC Section 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.”
 - i. There is Good Cause for this Plat Amendment because the amendment does not require any exterior expansion or external changes to the existing units. The proposed additions do not increase the parking requirements, and the proposed Plat Amendment does not create any non-conformities. The original plat, approved in 1981, does not include plat notes that impose limitations on the size of the units. Saddle Condominiums was platted in 1981 for 16 units, and no additional unit is proposed. The LMC in effect at the time did not have a Density limitation. No Public Street, Right-of-Way, or easement will be vacated or amended.

8. The Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal on February 17, 2026, and confirmed the proposal conforms to their requirements.

Conclusions of Law:

1. There is Good Cause for this Plat Amendment.
2. The Plat Amendment is consistent with Land Management Code Section 15-7.1-3(B) *Classification of Subdivision*, Section 15-7.1-6 *Final Subdivision Plat*, Chapter 15-3 *Off-Street Parking*, and Chapter 15-2.13 *Residential Development District*.
3. No Public Street, Right-of-Way, or Easement has been vacated or amended.
4. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed Plat Amendment.
5. Approval of the Plat Amendment, subject to the conditions 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 Saddle Condominiums prior to recordation of the plat.
2. 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.
3. The Applicant shall update the plat to include plan views and section views for Unit 6 and then separately show Units 7, 8, and 10.
4. Within 30 days of approval, the Applicant shall provide notarized documentation of the Saddle Condominiums HOA vote approving the proposed modifications to the plat submitted after publication of the Staff Report and Draft Final Action Letter.

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

- B. 1456 and 1470 Amber Road – Condominium Plat Amendment –** The Applicant Proposes to Amend The Pinnacle at Deer Valley Plat to Convert Approximately 272 Square Feet of Common Area to Private and Approximately 899 Square Feet of Common Area to Limited Common for Units 46 and 47 in the Residential Development Zoning District and Sensitive Land Overlay. PL-26-06835.

Planner III, Lillian Zollinger, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Condominium Plat Amendment for 1456 and 1470 Amber Road. She reported that 1456 and 1470 Amber Road are both part of The Pinnacle at Deer Valley. 1456 is Unit 46 and 1470 is Unit 47. Both units fall within the Residential Development Zoning District and are inside the Sensitive Land Overlay. The applicant proposes the following:

- Add 32 square feet to the lower level and 32 square feet to the main level of Unit 46 as private space;
- Convert platted common space to limited common space to reflect existing decks (181 square feet on the lower level and 264 square feet on the main level);
- Add 104 square feet to the lower level and 104 square feet to the main level of Unit 47 as private space;
- Convert platted common space to limited common space to reflect one existing lower-level deck, remove an existing main-level deck, and add one new main-level deck (94 square feet for the lower level and 246 square feet for the main level).

Commissioner Shand asked about Unit 46. He wanted to know if the 32 square feet would increase the footprint, which was confirmed. Planner Zollinger shared an image of the existing conditions. The decks were built differently from what was platted, so the Plat Amendment is looking to correct how the decks were built. She reviewed an image that outlines the proposed work. There are three levels and no changes are proposed to the upper level, but to the main and lower levels. The decks on the left side are proposed to be recorded as they were built, which is different than the original recorded plat. The middle portion has proposed changes. Commissioner Shand asked if there were two property owners involved in this. It was clarified that there is only one property owner.

Ms. Blosser reported that the purpose of the amendment is to connect the two units. The units will still be separate, but the intention is to add a door between them. Commissioner Tilson asked about the lower deck that is not highlighted. He wanted to know if that will remain the same as it is currently. It was reported that the deck area will be redone.

Commissioner Frontero noted that there are two units with one owner. He asked if the units are proposed to be combined, which was denied. Michael Stoker from Stoker Architecture, Inc. introduced himself to the Commission. The green section shown will

not be accessible from Unit 46, so it is essentially a deck for Unit 47. Commissioner Frontero wondered what would happen if the current owner decided to sell one of the units. It was clarified that Unit 46 has separate decks. If the owner decides to sell one or both units, there will not be a situation where someone does not have deck access.

Planner Zollinger reported that the proposal complies with the Residential Development and Sensitive Land Overlay requirements as well as the parking requirements. There is also Good Cause for this application. One of the Conditions of Approval was shared:

- 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.

Staff recommends the Commission review the Condominium Plat Amendment, conduct a public hearing, and consider approving the proposal based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter.

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

MOTION: Commissioner Frontero moved to APPROVE the Condominium Plat Amendment for The Pinnacle at Deer Valley, amending Units 46 and 47, according to the following:

Procedural History:

1. The 2nd Supplemental Pinnacle at Deer Valley Condominium Project is a 27-Unit Condominium in the Residential Development (RD) Zoning District and Sensitive Land Overlay (SLO).
2. In 1982, the City approved a Conditional Use Permit for the Pinnacle Deer Valley Planned Unit Development (PUD).
3. On December 28, 1984, the 2nd Supplemental Pinnacle Deer Valley Condominium Project Plat was recorded (Summit County Recorder Entry No. 228750).

Findings of Fact:

1. 1456 Amber Road is Unit 46 and 1470 Amber Road is Unit 47 of The Pinnacle at Deer Valley PUD.
2. The Applicants propose amending the plat to:

- Add 32 square feet to the lower level and 32 square feet to the main level of Unit 46 as Private Space and convert platted Common Space to Limited Common Space to reflect existing decks (181 square feet on the lower level and 264 square feet on the main level).
 - Add 104 square feet to the lower level and 104 square feet to the main level of Unit 47 as Private Space and convert platted Common Space to Limited Common Space to reflect one existing lower-level deck, remove an existing main level deck, and add one new main level deck (94 square feet for the lower level and 246 square feet for the main level).
3. On February 9, 2026, 68.6% of the Pinnacle Units voted in favor of the proposed Plat Amendment.
 4. Land Management Code (LMC) Chapter 15-2.13 outlines Lot and Site Requirements for the RD Zoning District:
 - a. Maximum Density - Three Units/Acre
 - i. Complies: There are currently 2.35 Units per acre. The proposal does not change the Density.
 - b. Setbacks - Front – 20 feet, Rear – 15 feet, Side – 12 feet
 - i. Complies: The proposed addition and deck are at least 100 feet away from the property line and outside of the Setbacks.
 - c. Maximum Building Height - 28 feet
 - i. Complies: The Applicant does not propose increasing the height of the structure. The existing structure has roof pitches of 5:12 and 6:12 and is approximately 26.5 feet above existing grade.
 5. LMC Chapter 15-3 *Off-Street Parking* requirements requires the following for the Units:
 - a. Condominium Units greater than 2,000 square feet require two Parking Spaces per Dwelling Unit. Unit 46 is proposed to expand from 3,511 square feet to 3,575 square feet. Unit 47 is proposed to expand from 3,511 square feet to 3,719 square feet. The proposed addition does not increase the parking requirement for either Unit.
 6. The Proposed Plat Amendment does not impact Sensitive Lands. The proposed additions will go on previously disturbed area with no significant vegetation. The existing area for the addition has been regraded and is not near a ridgeline and the closest wetland is the Silver Creek pond,

approximately 500 feet away. The Applicant does not propose disturbing anything beyond the existing disturbed area for the Condominiums.

7. LMC Chapter 15-7.1 outlines requirements for Condominium Plat Amendments.
 - a. Plat Amendments shall be reviewed according to the requirements of LMC Section 15-7-1.6 and approval shall require a finding of Good Cause.
 - b. LMC Section 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.”
 - c. The proposed Condominium Plat Amendment has Good Cause because it memorializes work previously completed and updates the existing condition of the site.
8. The Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal on March 3, 2026, and confirmed the proposal complies with their required standards.

Conclusions of Law:

1. There is Good Cause for this Plat Amendment.
2. The Plat Amendment is consistent with Land Management Code Section 15-7.1-3(B) *Classification of Subdivision*, Section 15-7.1-6 *Final Subdivision Plat*, Chapter 15-3 *Off-Street Parking*, Chapter 15-2.13 *Residential Development (RD) District*, Chapter 15-2.21, and *Sensitive Land Overlay (SLO) Zone*.
3. No Public Street, Right-of-Way, or Easement is vacated or amended.
4. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed Plat Amendment.
5. Approval of the Plat Amendment, subject to the conditions 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 CC&Rs, if required, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. 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 Shand. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

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

Planner II, Jacob Klopfenstein, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit (“SSCUP”) for 405 Woodside Avenue. He reported that this is a Significant Historic Structure located in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. The applicant is proposing an addition to the existing Significant Historic Structure. The rear of the site has an average slope of 45%, so a SSCUP is required.

The Planning Commission previously reviewed this in October 2025 and requested some changes, mostly involving the massing of the building and the height. The applicant submitted some revised plans last month addressing Commissioner concerns. The width, slope, and length of the driveway was reduced, the interior and exterior building heights were reduced, and the separation between the existing historic structure and the proposed rear addition was increased. An image of the existing conditions was shared.

As conditioned, this proposal complies with setbacks, building footprint, and building height regulations for the Zoning District. It also complies with off-street parking requirements. The Site Plan shows the Significant Historic Structure in blue, the rear addition and transitional element in green, and the existing guest house in red. Planner Klopfenstein clarified that the existing guest house is proposed to be removed.

The proposal complies with the SSCUP requirements, including the location of development, visual analysis, access, terracing, building location, building form and scale, setbacks, dwelling volume, and building height. Renderings of different views were

shared, including the northeast view, northwest view, southeast view, and southwest view. The applicant also provided a streetscape rendering for the Commission.

Planner Klopfenstein reviewed several Conditions of Approval included in the Draft Final Action Letter. Condition of Approval #16 limits the height of retaining walls and requires Planning Commission approval if there are additional retaining walls proposed in the future. There is also a condition that requires an Encroachment Agreement for the driveway access. Additionally, there is a condition that requires the guest house and shed to be removed. There are other conditions related to modifications. Commissioner Frontero asked for additional information about the Encroachment Agreement. Planner Klopfenstein reported that it is a typical requirement the Engineering Department requires.

Staff recommended the Planning Commission review the SSCUP, conduct a public hearing, and consider approval based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter. It was noted that the applicant representative, Jonathan DeGray, is present at the Planning Commission Meeting. Director Ward shared clarifying information about the Encroachment Agreement. The reason it is required is because Woodside Avenue is not built where it is platted. To make that connection to the proposed home, the applicant will need to build a driveway in platted right-of-way. The Encroachment Agreement is needed for access.

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

Mr. DeGray explained that the previous Planning Commission comments were taken into consideration. The driveway was dropped so the addition is lower than the main house. There was also work done with Staff on the mass, scale, and placement of windows. Chair Van Dine expressed appreciation for the changes that were made. What has been presented is an improvement over what was reviewed previously by the Commission. Commissioner Frontero also appreciated the adjustments that were made.

MOTION: Commissioner Frontero moved to APPROVE the Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit at 405 Woodside Avenue, according to the following:

Procedural History:

1. 405 Woodside Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure and part of the 405 Woodside Avenue Subdivision Plat.
2. 405 Woodside Avenue is a 7,500-square-foot Lot in the Historic Residential - 1 (HR-1) Zoning District.
3. The Applicant proposes to Lift the Significant Historic Structure to construct a new foundation and rear addition on a Steep Slope.

4. In conjunction with the SSCUP, the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application (PL-25-06510).

Findings of Fact:

1. The addition is proposed on an existing Slope of 45% over an excess of 200 square feet and, therefore, a SSCUP application is required.
2. The minimum Lot size in the HR-1 Zoning District is 1,875 square feet. The Lot is 7,500 square feet.
3. The maximum Lot size in the HR-1 Zoning District is 3,750 square feet. The Lot is 7,500 square feet.
 - a. The 405 Woodside Avenue Subdivision Plat was approved on July 21, 2022, prior to the Maximum Lot Size being established in the HR-1 Zoning District on October 26, 2023 (Ordinance No. 2023-50).
 - b. Pursuant to Land Management Code (LMC) Section 15-2.2-4, Historic Building that exceed the maximum Lot size are valid Non-Complying Structures.
4. The minimum Lot width in the HR-1 Zoning District is 25 feet. The Lot is 50 feet in width.
5. The maximum building footprint in the HR-1 Zoning District for a Lot that is 7,500 square feet is 2,460 square feet. The total Building Footprint including the Significant Historic Structure and proposed addition is 2,392 square feet.
6. Minimum Front and Rear Setbacks for Lots greater than 100 feet in depth in the HR-1 Zoning District are 15 feet each.
 - a. Pursuant to LMC Section 15-2.2-4, Significant Historic Structures that do not comply with Building Setbacks are valid Non-Complying Structures.
 - b. The Applicant proposes a 49-foot Front Setback and 34-foot Rear Setback for the addition to the Significant Historic Structure.
7. Minimum Side Setbacks for Lots up to 50 feet in width are five feet each in the HR-1 Zoning District.
 - a. The proposed addition meets a five-foot Side Setback for each side.

8. The maximum building height is 27 feet from Existing Grade in the HR-1 Zoning District. The proposed maximum building height is 20 feet, 1 inch above Existing Grade.
 - a. Pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-5, Final Grade must be within four vertical feet of Existing Grade, except for the placement of approved window wells, emergency egress, and a garage entrance. The Applicant proposes a Final Grade that is approximately 5 feet, 1 inch above Existing Grade at the garage entrance. Final Grade is proposed to be within four feet of Existing Grade elsewhere on the Site.
9. The HR-1 Zoning District requires a ten-foot minimum horizontal step in the downhill façade. The Significant Historic Structure is 17 feet, 5 inches above Existing Grade and measures 28 feet, 10 inches back. The Significant Historic Structure acts as the stepback for the proposed addition.
10. Structures cannot exceed 35 feet from the lowest floor plane to the point of highest wall top plate that supports the ceiling joists or roof rafters in the HR-1 Zoning District. The proposal has an interior height of 35 feet.
11. The roof pitch for the Contributing Roof Form must be between 7:12 and 12:12 in the HR-1 Zoning District and occupy a minimum horizontal distance of 20 feet measured from the primary façade to the rear of the building, as viewed from the primary public right-of-way. The Significant Historic Structure has a roof pitch of 10:12 that measures 26 feet back as viewed from Woodside Avenue. The proposed addition has a Contributing Roof Form of 7:12 that measures 27 feet back, as viewed from Woodside Avenue.
12. The proposal is designed to step within the steeply sloped Lot:
 - a. The slope of the Site increases to above a 30% slope near the middle of the Lot. The proposed structures are set at least 40 feet away from the rear of the Lot to avoid additional disturbance of Steep Slopes.
 - b. To evaluate compatibility, the Applicant provided panoramic views, streetscape elevations, 3D model from Vantage Points, and renderings.
 - c. The addition will be accessed to the south side of the Historic Structure, off Woodside Avenue. The driveway will be built on a flatter portion of the Lot and limited to 10 feet in width.
 - d. The Applicant proposes many concrete retaining walls around the site. All proposed walls are four feet or less from Final Grade to break up the height of the walls and to help create a Final Grade that

is closer to Existing Grade. Two walls on the southern end of the site are proposed to slope instead of terrace. Condition of Approval 20 requires the Applicant to update the project plans to terrace one of the walls.

- e. The Applicant proposes an addition to the rear of the Significant Historic Structure that complies with Setbacks, Footprint, and Height as outlined above. The addition is set back at least 49 feet from the front Lot line, exceeding the required 15-foot Front Setback. The addition is also set back at least 50 feet from the rear Lot line, exceeding the required 15-foot Rear Setback. The proposed Building Footprint on the Lot is 2,392 square feet – approximately 68 feet less than the maximum allowed Building Footprint. The proposed Building Height is also a maximum of 20 feet, 1 inch above Existing Grade – approximately 6 feet, 11 inches under the maximum allowed Building Height. The proposed new addition will be set back approximately 30 feet behind the current location of the existing guest house at the site.
 - f. The proposed addition steps with the grade of the Lot. The mass of the structure has also been broken up to reflect the massing of the Significant Historic Structure.
 - g. The proposed addition is compliant with Setbacks. Because of the Significant Historic Structure, the addition is set back 54 feet from the Front Lot Line and 40 feet from the Rear Lot Line.
 - h. The maximum height of the addition is 20 feet, 1 inch above Final Grade – approximately 6 feet, 11 inches below the maximum allowed Building Height.
13. Pursuant to LMC Section 15-2.2-4, Significant Historic Sites are exempt from Off- Street Parking requirements. Though Off-Street Parking is not required for the Site, the Applicant proposes two tandem parking spaces in the garage of the addition. Both spaces are 11 feet wide by 20 feet deep.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with the LMC requirements pursuant to Chapter 15-2.2 *Historic Residential – 1 (HR-1) District*.
2. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with the LMC requirements pursuant to Chapter 15-2.2-6 *Development on Steep Slopes in the HR-1 District*.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect compliance with the plans reviewed March 11, 2026, by the Planning Commission, pending design modifications required for Historic District Design Review compliance. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved in advance by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.
2. The Applicant shall obtain approval of a Historic District Design Review prior to submitting a Building Permit application.
3. If the Applicant does not obtain a complete Building Permit within one year of the date of this approval, this SSCUP approval will expire unless the Applicant submits a written extension request to the Planning Department prior to the expiration date and the Planning Director approves an extension.
4. The Applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning Department prior to making any changes to the approved plans.
5. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or designee prior to construction.
6. Residential fire sprinklers are required for all new or renovation construction on this Lot, per requirements of the Building Department.
7. The property is located outside the Park City Landscaping and Maintenance of Soil Cover Ordinance (Soils Ordinance) and therefore not regulated by the City for mine-related impacts. If the property owner does encounter mine waste or mine waste-impacted soils they must handle the material in accordance with State and Federal law.
8. Any areas disturbed during construction surrounding the proposed work shall be brought back to their original state. The Final Grade shall be within four feet of Existing Grade.
9. City approval of a Construction Mitigation Plan (CMP) is a condition precedent to the issuance of any Building Permits. The CMP shall include language regarding the method of protecting adjacent structures.

10. City Engineer review and approval of all lot grading, utility installations, public improvements, and drainage plans for compliance with City standards is a condition precedent to Building Permit issuance.
11. All outdoor lighting must be down-directed, fully shielded, with bulbs 3000-degree 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. Final lighting details shall show compliance with this condition and shall be reviewed by the Planning Staff prior to installation.
12. Construction waste should be diverted from the landfill and recycled when possible.
13. The Applicant shall submit a final geotechnical report and slope stability prior to submitting a Building Permit, subject to Engineering and Building Department approval.
14. The Applicant shall provide soil stabilization and drainage details documenting how the disturbed area will be restored and stabilized prior to submitting a Building Permit, subject to City Engineer approval.
15. Prior to submitting a Building Permit, the Applicant shall submit a plan demonstrating how they will provide the temporary shoring needed during construction, subject to Engineering and Building Department approval.
16. Retaining walls shall not exceed the height approved as part of this SSCUP without modifying the SSCUP. Additional retaining walls, not approved under this SSCUP, require Planning Commission review and approval prior to construction.
17. The Applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Agreement for driveway access with the Engineering Department.
18. Per requirements of Ordinance No. 2022-27, the guest house and sheds on the northeastern side must be removed. New structures must be reconstructed entirely on the property and out of the Right-of-Way.
19. Any modification of the area to the rear of the site, near the transmission line, requires coordination with the Water Department to ensure the water line is not undermined.

20. The Applicant shall update the project plans to terrace the retaining wall adjacent to the driveway to the south pursuant to LMC Section 15-2.2-6(C)(4) instead of sloping the wall

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

- D. 6453 Silver Lake Drive – Plat Amendment** – The Applicant Proposes a Plat Amendment to Revise the Platted Area of Disturbance to Reflect Existing Conditions and Accommodate a Future Addition to a Single-Family Dwelling in the Residential Development Zoning District. PL-24-06225.

Planner Klopfenstein presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Plat Amendment for 6453 Silver Lake Drive. The applicant is proposing a Plat Amendment to expand the area of disturbance for the 17,408 square foot lot. The increase would be from 2,919 square feet to 4,769 square feet. This is an increase of 1,850 square feet. The Plat Amendment would reflect existing conditions and accommodate an expansion to the existing single-family dwelling on the lot. The existing home was constructed in 1991, but it was constructed outside of the originally platted area of disturbance.

The Planning Commission reviewed this previously in November 2024 and June 2025. It was continued during both of those meetings. With the current proposal, the applicant representative has submitted additional revised materials. This includes the following:

- Revised proposed plat (Attachment 1) seeking a smaller expansion of the area of disturbance and granting a ski easement to Deer Valley Resort;
- Building height exhibit (Exhibit B);
- Revised Landscaping Plan (Exhibit C);
- Arborist site visit summary (Exhibit D);
- Additional slope analysis exhibit (Exhibit F).

Planner Klopfenstein shared an image of the proposed plat. The originally platted area of disturbance is outlined in red and the blue section is the proposed expanded area of disturbance. The expanded area would reflect the existing conditions of the single-family dwelling that is on the lot as well as an 1,850 square foot addition. An image of the existing home was shared with the Planning Commission. Information about the building height was provided. He reported that the existing single-family dwelling is approximately 39 feet above existing grade and exceeds the Residential Development Zone height limit of 28 feet above existing grade. When this home was built in 1991, the limitation on height was 28 feet above natural grade, rather than existing grade. Natural grade refers to the grade prior to any development activity or any manmade disturbance on the lot.

The applicant provided an additional building height exhibit using more modernized surveying data to estimate the grade in 1991. There is a difference of approximately 4

feet between that survey data and the survey data that was used in 1991. Planning Staff still does not find that the building height exhibit is an accurate estimation of natural grade, because the definition of natural grade refers to the topography before any disturbance. The applicant has not provided a survey of the site that predates any development or disturbance in the area or any other records that could establish natural grade at the site.

The Planning Commission must make a finding of Good Cause to approve a Plat Amendment. Planner Klopfenstein shared the definition of Good Cause with the Commission. Staff finds Good Cause to approve the Plat Amendment to reflect existing conditions on the lot, as this promotes best planning practices by establishing an accurate record of the site. However, Staff does not find Good Cause to expand the platted area of disturbance beyond the built conditions to accommodate the proposed addition. This is because there are no public amenities or benefits provided, it does not resolve existing issues or non-conformities, and it does not promote best planning practices.

Several Conditions of Approval were reviewed. Planner Klopfenstein reported that Condition of Approval #1 would require a Plat Note stating that all construction shall comply with the Residential Development Zoning District requirements. Condition of Approval #2 would prohibit enlargement of portions of the existing single-family dwelling that exceed building height. Condition of Approval #8 would require the applicant to revise the area of disturbance on the proposed plat to reflect the existing conditions at the site prior to recordation. There are other Conditions of Approval in the Draft Final Action Letter related to future construction, vegetation, recordation timelines, and easements.

Staff recommends reviewing the Plat Amendment, conducting a public hearing, and considering approving the Plat Amendment, but limiting the approval to a reflection of the existing conditions. This decision would be based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter.

The applicant representatives, Justin Keys and Megan Blosser, introduced themselves to the Commission. It was noted that the applicant is also attending the meeting virtually. Mr. Keys explained that this is a Plat Amendment request for 6453 Silver Lake Drive. Several modifications have been made since the last Commission discussion about this property. He asked to discuss the proper measurement of building height over time. This home was originally constructed in 1991, and at that time, building height was measured differently. Alliance Engineering determined the natural grade at the time of construction.

Ms. Blosser reported that she determined natural grade two different ways. She digitized the contours from the 1989 survey that was done as part of the original permit. On Page 5 of the permit is an Existing Conditions Map from before the house was built. She has digitized the contours and it was determined that based on the 1991 Building Code and how height was supposed to be measured, it was 27.325 feet. She submitted another exhibit to interpolate natural grade. For this, the survey data from 1989 was not relied on, but there was a survey conducted of the oldest trees on the site. Those trees were shown

on the original Building Permits back in 1991. Those areas have never been disturbed and are accurate enough to determine what natural grade was. Using the same definition from back then, the height is just over 27 feet, at 27.535 feet. Both the Existing Conditions Map and the survey resulted in a similar building height determination.

Ms. Blosser reported that it is the opinion of Alliance Engineering that the building was in compliance at the time it was built. That is the reason it was stamped, signed, and approved by Park City back then. It was not approved in 1991 by error, but because the measurements were done differently than they are now. Commissioner Shand wanted to know why the building height is being discussed when the Planning Commission is being asked to adjust the area of disturbance to the as-built conditions. Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, explained that the application proposes a further expansion.

Commissioner Frontero noted that the area of disturbance could be expanded to encompass the as-built condition, which is what has been recommended by Staff. It is also possible to consider a larger expansion to allow for a future addition to the home.

Commissioner Shand would rather see a plan to expand the home before contemplating an expanded area of disturbance. Commissioner Frontero believed Staff is recommending the Planning Commission deny an expansion of the area of disturbance for the new expansion due to a lack of Good Cause. Planner Klopfenstein clarified that the Staff recommendation is to correct the record of the existing home, which was built outside the originally platted area of disturbance. Staff finds Good Cause to approve the Plat Amendment to reflect existing conditions and match what is built on the lot.

Commissioner Shand wanted to know how Staff feels about the applicant's request to further expand the area of disturbance. He asked if that is premature, given that there is uncertainty about what a future addition would look like. Planner Klopfenstein reported that the applicant has provided some details about what the addition would look like. Exhibit C, the Landscaping Plan that was submitted, shows the proposed addition. The applicant's request is twofold: adjust the area of disturbance to reflect what is built on the lot and expand the area of disturbance to allow for an addition to the existing home.

Exhibit C was reviewed by the Planning Commission. The existing home is shaded in dark gray, and the proposed addition areas are outlined in orange. The originally platted area of disturbance is shown in light gray. This exhibit also illustrates how the existing home was built outside of the platted area of disturbance. Commissioner Frontero believed the Staff recommendation is for the Commission to consider an area of disturbance that encompasses the current home, so the existing conditions are reflected. This was confirmed. He believed Staff is suggesting a denial of the additional area of disturbance that is shown in orange on the exhibit. Planner Klopfenstein confirmed this.

Mr. Keys reported that the City did not make an error in 1991. The code at the time was applied to this property. He shared the plans that were approved and stamped by Park

City Municipal back in 1991. There was a new area of excavation disturbance written on the plans. At the time, there did not need to be a Plat Amendment to change the area of disturbance, but the Homeowners Association (“HOA”) had to approve it. Director Ward asked if reconfiguration or expansion was allowed. Mr. Keys believed the process allowed for both reconfiguration and expansion, as that is what happened in many cases.

Director Ward asked how the topography on the submitted exhibit compares with the topography that was shown at the time of the Building Permit. Ms. Blosser referenced one of the exhibits and reported that the ground is still relative to the house. Nothing has been raised or lowered. She shared information about the process to collect data. Director Ward asked if there was a reference to the Residential Development regulations during the evaluation. Mr. Keys confirmed this. Alliance Engineering has looked at this and sought to determine the natural grade. He relied on the Alliance Engineering analysis.

Commissioner Beal does not believe it is possible to simply accept that Park City got it right back in 1991. He is interested in hearing more from Director Ward about the code at the time. Commissioner Shand believed the reason the Commission is talking about height now is that this will come into play when the addition is considered. Mr. Keys noted that it makes a difference whether this is a legal non-conforming use or a non-conforming use. If it is a legal non-conforming use, then it can stay in place and the height does not need to be reduced. It is also possible to pursue the desired addition.

Commissioner Beal asked if there is agreement with the statement in the Staff Report that there is no topographical survey of the site that predates the development. Ms. Blosser disagreed with that statement because the topographical map is shown in the approved plans. She shared a submission that shows the natural grade contours. There was discussion about the natural grade and the Alliance Engineering determination. Ms. Blosser reiterated that the exhibit she created shows what the natural grade would have been. The trees are the best evidence of what the natural grade was before development.

Mr. Keys reported that the first Staff Report measured height under the current version of the code, which he disagreed with. The next Staff Report appeared to agree with him that it must be based on the way building height was measured at the time the house was constructed. He thought there was agreement about how to measure height under the 1991 code and is confused that there does not seem to be agreement about that now. Director Ward explained that there was agreement that, regardless of how it is measured, it exceeds height. Mr. Keys clarified that he does not agree with that statement.

There was additional discussion about the measurements used. Ms. Blosser reported that the Staff measurements are based on how measurements would be done today, rather than how measurements were done back in 1991. Commissioner Beal asked what the 1991 measurement would be based on. Ms. Blosser read the following language:

“The total height of the building shall be measured as the vertical distance from the natural grade, as defined in this code, to the highest point of a flat roof, the deck line of a mansard roof, or to the point midway between the lowest part of the eaves and the ridge of a hip or gable.” The zoning language was next reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Director Ward stated that regardless of how height is measured, Staff finds that this exceeds the height. The Planning Commission can still find Good Cause for the Plat Amendment expansion, as the addition can comply with the current measurement for height. As outlined in previous Staff Reports, it is recommended that there be consideration of the steep slopes and the existing vegetation. Mr. Keys asked about the Staff conclusion related to height. Director Ward reported that regardless of how it is measured, there will still be a structure that is over the height. Ms. Blosser explained that the argument being made is that this is a legally non-conforming structure based on the data. Everything new that is envisioned for the site will comply with the current standards.

Attorney Harrington reported that Staff did not previously find the definition for legal non-conforming was met. There is legal right to apply to the Planning Director through a separate process to obtain that determination, but the Planning Commission cannot make a determination of a legally non-conforming use separately. If the applicant would like that determination, there can be a separate application process pursued. Mr. Keys stated that it is possible to pursue that application, but he expressed concerns about the language in the Staff Report. He pointed out that there have been Conditions of Approval drafted under the assumption that this is not a legal non-conforming use. Attorney Harrington reiterated that there is a formal process that can be pursued for that determination. Mr. Keys asked that the Conditions of Approval be removed, as those are not relevant. It does not make sense to punish the applicant over a determination that has not been made. He reiterated his concerns about the proposed conditions.

Mr. Keys asked to discuss Good Cause and some of the other issues mentioned. The Staff Report indicates that there is a desire to expand into steep slopes, but that is not accurate. Ms. Blosser reported that the area that is being called a steep slope is not natural ground and is part of what was disturbed when the original house was built. Even if it was natural ground, LMC 15-2.21-4(A) includes the following language:

- As used herein, an Area of Very Steep Slopes must cover a topographic Area at least twenty-five feet (25') vertically, upslope or downslope, and fifty feet (50') horizontally in any direction to be subject to this prohibition.

The steep slope areas have been dimensioned and are smaller than 25 x 50 feet. Mr. Keys does not believe there is a steep slope concern in this area. Looking back at the old plans, it is clear that these are manmade and it was a result of placing the house in that particular location. There are no naturally occurring steep slopes on this property.

Commissioner Shand noted that it appears the steep slopes are outside of the existing envelope, which was confirmed. He had a question about the Draft Final Action Letter and referenced Condition of Approval #8 and Condition of Approval #3. Commissioner Shand is leaning toward approving the area of disturbance to reflect the as-built condition.

Mr. Harrington clarified that Conditions of Approval #3 and #8 do not contradict one another. Mr. Keys next shared an image that illustrates the proposed expansion. The white area is the existing footprint of the home. The blue areas are the areas that are already disturbed, so there is a roof overhang in those locations. The peach-colored areas are additions that are not currently disturbed. Mr. Keys further reviewed the image and explained that the request has been substantially reduced. There was additional discussion about the image shown and the location of the existing home.

Commissioner Tilson asked about the purpose of the ski easement. Mr. Keys reported that Deer Valley currently uses an area for maintenance access, but there is no easement on the plan. There was communication with Deer Valley about an easement as part of this process. He noted that Good Cause exists for this Plat Amendment because it will preserve and replace vegetation, correct an existing non-conformity, add an easement reflecting actual use, add off-street parking, and improve site safety and accessibility.

Commissioner Frontero asked if there was language in an earlier plat that mentioned certain trees would not be removed. Mr. Keys does not recall any language like that. However, the language generally encourages trees to remain as much as possible.

Director Ward reported that in the 1991 Building Permit, there were handwritten notes about trees that would be preserved on the review. Planner Klopfenstein explained that this is illustrated in Figure 5 of the Staff Report. All of the trees highlighted in this image were required to be retained, but some of them no longer exist at the site. The trees shown in yellow no longer exist at the site and were removed at some point. The trees highlighted in blue remain at the site, but would not be impacted by the proposed expansion of the area of disturbance. The trees in green are still at the site and would be impacted by the expansion. Commissioner Frontero appreciated the clarification.

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

Commissioner Beal believed the Commission needs to consider whether there is Good Cause for amending this to the as-built conditions. He believes there is support for this. As for whether there is Good Cause to expand the area of disturbance to allow an addition, he is not persuaded at this point. Commissioner Frontero felt similar. He is open to reviewing additional submittals, but would like to see the applicant apply for the legal non-conforming determination. There can be further discussion once that is known.

Commissioner Shand is supportive of the current recommendation from Staff to approve an area of disturbance that reflects existing conditions. He would like to see a more detailed application for the addition. At that point, the height can be further discussed.

Commissioner Tilson expressed support for amending the plat to reflect existing conditions. When it comes to expanding the area of disturbance, the trees need to be taken into consideration with the design. He would need more information about the actual structure before considering approval. The ski easement provides some level of Good Cause and also reflects the existing use. He is open to seeing additional submittals.

MOTION: Commissioner Shand moved to CONTINUE the Plat Amendment at 6453 Silver Lake Drive to a date uncertain. Commissioner Frontero seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 8:25 p.m.

Approved 04.08.2026