



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
APRIL 8, 2026**

**COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Christin Van Dine (Chair), Rick Shand, Adam Strachan, John Frontero, Henry Sigg, Grant Tilson, Seth Beal

**EX OFFICIO:** Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner II; John Robertson, City Engineer; Alec Barton, Senior Planner; Meredith Covey, Planner II; Becky Gutknecht, Assistant City Engineer; William Popp, Staff Engineer; Nan Larsen, Senior Planner

---

**1. ROLL CALL**

Chair Christin Van Dine called the Planning Commission Meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. All Commissioners were present. Adam Strachan was welcomed to the Commission.

**2. MINUTES APPROVAL**

**A. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from March 11, 2026.**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Shand moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from March 11, 2026. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Frontero. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Strachan abstained from the vote.

**B. Consideration to Approve the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from March 25, 2026.**

**MOTION:** Commissioner Frontero moved to APPROVE the Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from March 25, 2026. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Beal. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Strachan abstained from the vote.

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

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that she attended the Resort Town Summit from the Urban Land Institute on March 26, 2026. It was a sold-out event, and there were many local developers, real estate agents, elected officials, community stakeholders, and partners. Jason Glidden was at one of the panel discussions. He was the Housing

Development Manager when the Planning Commission worked on the Affordable Master Planned Development (“AMPD”) code to incentivize affordable units. He was also the Housing Development Manager during the Engine House project. Mr. Glidden commended the work done by the Planning Commission and their review of the code. Additionally, he noted that the Commission completed the review of Engine House in four meetings, which included one Work Session, a site visit, and two public hearings.

Director Ward recognized consistent Planning Commission participation when it comes to advancing affordable housing. There will be continued refinements made to the AMPD code this year. In addition, there will be incentives explored for seasonal workforce housing. She reiterated her appreciation for the efforts made by the Planning Commission. She acknowledged the different areas of expertise that Commissioners provide.

On February 25, 2026, the Planning Commission was scheduled to review an appeal of Planning Staff approval for driveway improvements in a platted easement on 200 King Road. However, the appellant requested that the Planning Commission continue that appeal to the current meeting. The appellant has since withdrawn the appeal.

#### **4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no public communications.

#### **5. WORK SESSION**

- A. Land Management Code Amendments –** The Planning Commission Will Conduct a Work Session Regarding Updates to the Transportation Impact Study Guidelines and Potential Code Amendments Regarding Transportation Demand Management and Parking. PL-25-06513.

Planner II, Jacon Klopfenstein, reported that the first Work Session item relates to Land Management Code (“LMC”) amendments. There will be information shared about the Transportation Impact Study (“TIS”) and Transportation Demand Management (“TDM”) updates. He noted that City Engineer, John Robertson, and Senior Planner, Alec Barton, are also present to share information and answer Commissioner questions. Consulting partner, Corey Mack, from WCG is attending the Planning Commission Meeting virtually.

Planner Klopfenstein outlined the goals of the Work Session, which includes the following:

- Provide an overview of the TDM Toolbox to the Commission and gather feedback;
- Discuss possible LMC amendments regarding parking and transportation;
- Address remaining Commissioner questions ahead of possible LMC amendments.

It was noted that TIS and TDM will be referred to throughout the presentation. Planner Klopfenstein provided clarification about those terms for the benefit of those present:

- Transportation Impact Study (“TIS”):
  - Technical traffic study prepared by professionals and based on engineering standards that assesses a development’s impact on traffic, including major intersections.
- Transportation Demand Management (“TDM”):
  - USDOT defines TDM as a set of strategies aimed at maximizing traveler choices; reducing single-occupancy vehicle trips is usually one goal.

Background information was provided to the Commission. Planner Klopfenstein explained that transportation was a major component of the 2025 General Plan update. Advancing multi-modal transportation options, managing traffic, and creating walkable/bikeable neighborhoods were all mentioned as goals. The Planning Commission first reviewed the TDM Toolbox in August 2025 and then again in January 2026. The Commission previously expressed a need for more objective standards. In response to that feedback, the Engineering, Transportation Planning, and Planning Departments worked with the consultant team, WCG, to develop the TDM Toolbox.

On January 14, 2026, the Planning Commission requested a review of the full list of TDM Toolbox strategies. There was also feedback provided at that time. WCG has since updated the TDM Toolbox to increase the credit amount possible for airport shuttles. Provisions have also been built in to encourage developers to implement a variety of TDM options and strategies, rather than investing in one single option. As an example, the TDM Toolbox does not allow a developer to install 50 benches in order to reach the required TDM threshold. There needs to be a broader variety of options implemented.

Planner Klopfenstein reported that the TDM Toolbox provides applicants and the Commission with consistent and measurable criteria to address transportation concerns during land use reviews. It provides developers with the flexibility to implement transportation options that not only suit their specific needs but also have positive impacts on the City’s transportation network. The TDM Toolbox is modeled after similar tools in peer communities. One of the exhibits in the Meeting Materials Packet is a memo that highlights similar tools in peer communities, including resort towns in the west.

The strategies included in the TDM Toolbox are backed by research and have been informed by Park City community context. Planner Klopfenstein explained that the tool is designed to incentivize developers to provide more multi-modal transportation options for sites and reduce single-occupancy vehicle use. He reported that the TDM Toolbox is designed to build up a varied, well-rounded, multi-modal transportation network over time.

The TDM Toolbox would apply to any proposed development expected to generate more than 10 peak-hour vehicle trips. Planner Klopfenstein explained that the TDM Toolbox

uses the number of trips expected to be generated from the development, then converts that number into a credit percentage. The tool uses that information to assess the proposed TDM strategies. He noted that developers will fill out the TDM Toolbox to show that their proposal will provide TDM options that amount to at least 50% credit.

Planner Klopfenstein shared additional information about the credit system that is proposed. He next reviewed the TDM Toolbox with the Planning Commission. It includes the full list of strategies that are proposed to be included. These are grouped into different categories. Planner Klopfenstein reported that the categories include the following:

- Site Design and Layout;
- Site Programs;
- On-Site and/or Off-Site Features/Infrastructure;
- Custom/Site-Specific TDM Features, Programs, and/or Elements.

Planner Klopfenstein explained that the spreadsheet has been filled out with an example project to highlight what this would look like once a developer has filled it out with their proposed TDM strategies. The first tab asks the developer to define the project. The tool looks at the mix of uses and determines the peak hour vehicle trips that the mix of uses is expected to generate. Once that is determined, the tool looks at a percentage credit. From there, the developer has to choose a variety of TDM strategies to reach the 50% credit. Planner Klopfenstein shared additional information about the example project.

Each category and strategy is weighted based on local transportation goals as well as the research that has been conducted. Planner Klopfenstein discussed the low percentage and high percentage information included in the document. He clarified that each category includes a level of application. By filling out the TDM Toolbox, the developer can see the total peak hour trips, required credit percentage, required credit trips, and credited trips. The example scenario provides more than is actually required.

Planner Klopfenstein posed the following question to the Planning Commission:

- Are there any outstanding items or questions regarding the TDM Toolbox?

Chair Van Dine expressed appreciation for the work that has been done on the TDM Toolbox. She likes that there is a more predictable way to move through the process. Commissioner Rick Shand likes the TDM Toolbox because it gives developers an idea of what is expected from them. The intention is to reduce vehicle traffic in the City. He noted that there is a custom option where a developer can bring a new idea forward, so there is still some level of flexibility included. Commissioner John Frontero likes that the developer can choose from a variety of tools that have been proven to be effective. He also likes that there is some level of flexibility throughout, since the developer can choose the items. He expects the TDM Toolbox will be modified over time after applications are received. It is possible to continue to fine-tune this as developers use the TDM Toolbox.

Commissioner Tilson asked what the developer will need to fill out in order to understand the requirements. Planner Klopfenstein explained that the idea is for developers to fill out the spreadsheet that was shown earlier. The developers fill out what it is they are proposing to provide. The tool will then assign a credit percentage. The spreadsheet was further reviewed. Commissioner Tilson noted that the interface might need to be modified in the future to make it easier for a developer to fill out the spreadsheet. Planner Klopfenstein reported that there will be community engagement.

Commissioner Seth Beal asked if there are alternatives to the percentage-based system. He wanted to know if other communities use something other than points and percentages. Mr. Mack reported that a number of peer communities were researched during this process, and it tends to come down to points, credits, or mitigated trips. For the latter, there might be a development with a certain number of proposed trips and there would be a requirement to mitigate those. The only alternative that he has seen is a region-wide vehicle miles traveled assessment tool, which is a more robust analysis.

Commissioner Beal expressed support for what has been included in the TDM Toolbox, but wondered whether the TDM proposals will actually work effectively. Chair Van Dine pointed out that the different options are weighted. Something that will likely be discussed in the future is whether the options in the toolbox are weighted appropriately. Commissioner Shand mentioned the shuttle service option. A developer might not have considered a shuttle service without the TDM Toolbox, but the credit amount might encourage a developer to implement one. Commissioner Beal explained that it is easier to measure the impacts of a shuttle than it is to measure the impacts of a bench. Commissioner Shand noted that a bench is weighted much less than a shuttle service.

Planner Klopfenstein explained that the intention is to build a framework that the Commission and Staff can revisit on a periodic basis. The TDM Toolbox can be discussed every so often to evaluate how it is working and ensure that the strategies are current and up to date. Some of the options included in the TDM Toolbox directly mitigate a vehicle trip, but others do not. The idea is to give developers flexibility to choose from different options, but still provide a measurable framework. Engineer Robertson reported that the TDM Toolbox is a way to incorporate strategies that have been seen throughout the nation. These strategies can result in a mode shift in the community. He reminded Commissioners that developers will still need to prepare a TIS, which will show deficiencies at certain intersections. There are several tools to address transportation.

There was additional discussion about the different options in the TDM Toolbox. Chair Van Dine believed there was a strong framework to start with. She pointed out that there is more weight given to certain items, such as a shuttle service. What is proposed will provide more predictability for developers. Commissioner Henry Sigg agreed with the comments made by Chair Van Dine. This is a proactive way to look at traffic, and it will

also provide predictability to developers. He believed the TDM Toolbox will save time during reviews.

Commissioner Shand asked if an example scenario could be created where the TDM Toolbox is applied to an existing development that has already been approved. Planner Klopfenstein reported that this has been done internally, but he is hesitant to share that information publicly, as it could single out a development. He stated that there are additional presentation materials that will be reviewed about potential LMC amendments.

Planner Barton explained that in addition to the TDM Toolbox, there are opportunities to update the LMC in order to support the TDM program. Currently, the code allows the Planning Commission to reduce a parking requirement for Master Planned Developments ("MPD"), AMPD, and Conditional Use Permits ("CUP"). Planner Barton reported that there could be clarifications made to the LMC in the following sections:

- Parking in Master Planned Developments and Conditional Use Permits;
- Master Planned Development Requirements, Off-Street Parking;
- Affordable Master Planned Developments, Parking.

The Code is structured to outline general requirements for off-street parking. With the growth in app-based platforms that allow property owners to separately lease required parking spaces for other uses, Staff is recommending that a section of code be updated:

- LMC Section 15-3-2 (D):
  - Off-street parking required for approved uses shall not be separately leased for off-site or alternate uses unless specifically approved by the Planning Commission.

The General Plan also recommended replacing minimum parking requirements over time with maximum parking allowances. This is a trend that is happening in jurisdictions nationwide, particularly in mountain and resort communities. Several years ago, there was a recommendation to implement a maximum parking allowance of 125% of the minimum required parking for most newly constructed developments within one-quarter mile of a transit stop. There are opportunities to evaluate whether that is appropriate and whether parking maximums should be extended beyond that quarter-mile radius. Planner Barton posed the following question to the Planning Commission:

- What considerations should Staff, the Planning Commission, and the City Council evaluate in the transition from minimum parking requirements to maximum parking allowances, as envisioned by the General Plan?

Commissioner Frontero reported that he previously sent Planner Barton a note about the parking. He asked how the 125% was determined and how that would work in practical terms. His sense is that 125% will not be impactful enough. If the goal is to remove

single-occupancy vehicles from the road, he would like to see an analysis that contemplates even more of a reduction. Commissioner Beal echoed those comments.

Planner Klopfenstein shared information from the Recommended Amendments Report from Lisa Wise Consulting. One of the recommendations was to set a parking maximum and not allow more than 125% of the required parking to be provided. Director Ward noted that when this comes back to the Commission for review, there will be more clarification provided. The recommendation was for projects within a quarter mile of transit. Commissioner Shand agrees with many of the other comments shared.

Commissioner Strachan referenced the third sentence in the redline text, which mentions shared parking areas. He asked if there is a definition for “shared parking areas.” Planner Klopfenstein does not believe it has been formally defined, but that can be considered.

Planner Barton stated that the Commission can consider incentives for existing developments to allow flexibility to replace excess surface parking. Examples include sidewalk and trail easements, transit improvements, uses that activate the space, and publicly accessible or green community outdoor spaces. He asked the following:

- Are there other Zoning Districts outside of the draft Bonanza Park Mixed-Use District (“BPMX”) where a CUP process allowing an applicant to replace surface parking with connectivity improvements is appropriate?

Commissioner Beal does not believe it should be limited to the BPMX, as there are likely other areas where it would make sense. He would apply it in areas where the Planning Department feels there are opportunities to reduce parking spots. Chair Van Dine mentioned Prospector, especially when there is more redevelopment in that area. She does not necessarily believe Old Town would be appropriate. Commissioner Frontero is not sure that he would restrict this to specific zones. He suggested that it be considered on any application above a certain number of units, regardless of the Zoning District.

**B. 209 and 215 Norfolk Avenue – Plat Amendment and Steep Slope Conditional Use Permits** – The Planning Commission Will Conduct a Work Session on the Proposed Single-Family Dwellings on Steep Slopes in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District to Provide Input on Access and Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit Criteria. PL-24-06189.

Chair Van Dine reported that the next Work Session item relates to 209 and 215 Norfolk Avenue. This has to do with a Plat Amendment and Steep Slope Conditional Use Permits (“SSCUP”). She noted that there was a site visit conducted earlier in the day. The applicant representatives, Douglas Ogilvy and Jonathan DeGray, introduced themselves.

Planner II, Meredith Covey, explained that 209 and 215 Norfolk Avenue are owned by the same property owner. The applicant is proposing a Plat Amendment to create two lots.

Lot A would be 215 Norfolk Avenue and Lot B would be 209 Norfolk Avenue. As discussed during the site visit, the right-of-way along Norfolk Avenue is wide. What has been discussed with the applicant over the last several months is the access needed to access the proposed lots. Planner Covey shared an image with the properties outlined in red and the right-of-way in green. The portion of Upper Norfolk Avenue is highlighted in orange, and the pink area is a private driveway located in the unbuilt public right-of-way.

Planner Covey reported that the applicant is proposing one singular access off of the orange portion shown, which would then split into two different driveways. The applicant has been through variations of this access in coordination with Staff and the Engineering Department. In all of the iterations, the applicant has proposed widening Upper Norfolk Avenue. There is a concentration of disturbance proposed with the shared driveway access and sloping retaining walls. The proposed site disturbance for access is 1,212 square feet, which excludes the portion of Upper Norfolk Avenue that would be widened.

The SSCUP criteria regarding access is that access points and driveways must be designed to minimize grading of the natural topography and reduce overall building scale. Shared driveways and parking areas are strongly encouraged, where feasible. The applicant is seeking input from the Planning Commission about the proposed access.

- Does the Planning Commission have feedback on the proposed access and impacts to steep slopes?

Commissioner Frontero stated that the shared driveway strategy is sound. The retaining walls, which are proposed to be 4 feet high and 3.5 feet high, also seem to be reasonable. As long as the City Engineer is supportive of the wording included in the Encroachment Agreements, he feels comfortable with what has been proposed. Commissioner Sigg agreed that the details of the Encroachment Agreement and approval from the City Engineer are both important. Commissioner Beal commended Planning Staff and the applicant for their efforts, because the various iterations have resulted in an improved proposal. He also appreciated the site visit that was scheduled ahead of the meeting.

Commissioner Shand was unable to attend the site visit, but he has visited the site twice. He agreed with the other Commissioners that this is well thought out. The current version is preferred over the previous iterations. Planner Klopfenstein shared additional information about the proposal. He explained that this proposal will require a SSCUP. The Planning Commission will look at nine specific criteria for the SSCUP, which includes:

- Location;
- Visual Analysis;
- Access;
- Terracing;
- Location;

- Form and Scale;
- Setbacks;
- Volume; and
- Height.

Planner Klopfenstein shared renderings of 209 and 215 Norfolk Avenue. The applicant also provided a streetscape illustration taken from the lower portion of Norfolk Avenue. The applicant is looking for general feedback from the Planning Commission on the proposal as it relates to the SSCUP criteria. Planner Klopfenstein asked if the Commission requires any additional materials or information to evaluate compliance.

Commissioner Frontero noted that the Staff Report included some form and scale, volume, and height information. As currently presented, he finds the proposal meets the code. However, if there are any changes made, this might change. Planner Covey explained that when the plans are finalized, this will come back to the Planning Commission. Planner Klopfenstein noted that the applicant has prepared some preliminary sketches of the proposed dwellings, so there is general feedback requested.

Commissioner Beal stated that a bay window is referenced on 209 Norfolk Avenue. He asked that the location of the bay window be pointed out on the renderings. Mr. DeGray introduced himself as the architect for the project and pointed out the location.

## **6. REGULAR SESSION**

- A. 2026 Park City Municipal Standards and Specifications Update – The Planning Commission Will Review Updates to the Park City Municipal Standards and Specifications Based on the Approval and Implementation of the 2026 Updates to the Utah APWA Standards and Specifications. GI-26-00595.**

Assistant City Engineer, Becky Gutknecht, and Staff Engineer, William Popp, introduced themselves to the Planning Commission. Engineer Gutknecht reported that this item has to do with the 2026 Park City Municipal Standards and Specifications updates. Engineer Popp asked the Planning Commission to consider forwarding a recommendation to the City Council. This has to do with the Park City 2026 Supplemental Standard Plans and Specifications. A few years ago, the Engineering Department made the first major upgrade to this in approximately 10 years. The idea is to look at it on a regular basis.

This year, the American Public Works Association (“APWA”) made its first update to its specifications and standards since 2017, so the Park City document was updated accordingly. There were a few technical updates made based on the APWA updates. Additionally, there was clarification provided based on feedback received. There was also a reference added to the Park City Crosswalk Treatment Guidelines. Commissioner

Sigg asked if the APWA is a national standard or if it was created specifically for Utah. Engineer Popp confirmed that it is a national standard, but there is a Utah Division.

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

**MOTION:** Commissioner Sigg moved to forward a recommendation of APPROVAL to the City Council for the 2026 Park City Municipal Standards and Specifications Update. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Tilson. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Commission.

**B. 830 Empire Avenue – Plat Amendment –** The Applicant Seeks a Plat Amendment to Create a 1,721-Square-Foot Lot for a Landmark Historic Site in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. PL-25-06587.

Senior Planner, Nan Larsen, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Plat Amendment request for 830 Empire Avenue. The site is unique because it fronts along Crescent Tram Road and Empire Avenue. It is located in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District, was built around 1911, and is a designated Landmark Historic Site.

This is a metes-and-bounds parcel, and the unusual lot configuration is surrounded on three sides by Empire Avenue and Crescent Tram Road. The southern portion of the property adjoins a neighboring property. Planner Larsen reported that there are a number of encroachments on the subject property. These encroachments are on both City-owned property and Empire Avenue public right-of-way. She shared an image of the area and explained that the encroachments are highlighted in blue and red. The structure also encroaches onto 820 Empire Avenue, which is the property to the south. This is highlighted in gray in the image. In light green, it is possible to see where the 830 Empire Avenue parcel extends into Crescent Tram Road, which is a previously built roadway.

The proposed Plat Amendment would remove internal property lines where the structure extends over property lines. The Plat Amendment would also require 22.5 square feet to be dedicated as public right-of-way, which would be along Crescent Tram Road. Planner Larsen reported that the site was approved for a Variance on March 31, 2026, and it was a Variance from the minimum lot size in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. The minimum lot size in the zone is 1,875 square feet, but the existing property is 1,743 square feet. If the Plat Amendment is approved, the lot would be reduced to 1,721 square feet.

During the Staff analysis, it was found that the requested Plat Amendment complies with the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District regulations, the Off-Street Parking regulations, and the Subdivision Procedures. There is Good Cause for a Plat Amendment, as it would allow for structural updates on the foundation. This would result in the continued preservation of the structure and would help preserve the historic character of the neighborhood.

Staff recommends the Planning Commission review the proposed Plat Amendment and consider approval based on the Draft Final Action Letter. There is one recommended modification to the Conditions of Approval, which is a modification to Condition of Approval #3. Director Ward explained that this is an unusual area where there is city-owned property east of the home. It is located between the home and Crescent Tram Road. There are encroachments there that will require City Council approval for removal. She read the following language, which is proposed to amend Condition of Approval #3:

- Condition of Approval #3: The Applicant shall obtain an Encroachment Agreement for existing improvements in the rights-of-way and City property.

Planner Larsen reported that Condition of Approval #5 is proposed to be added:

- Condition of Approval #5: Prior to plat recordation, the Applicant shall sufficiently address all encroachments on neighboring properties.

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

Commissioner Shand asked if the Planning Commission is being asked to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council or make a decision. Director Ward reported that the Planning Commission will take final action on the plat. She clarified that any Encroachment Agreement on City property will be considered by the City Council.

Commissioner Frontero asked what improvements are envisioned for the home. Mr. DeGray explained that the plan is to improve the foundation, as there is not really one in place right now. The house will be put on a foundation and be structurally updated. Commissioner Frontero wondered whether the application would come back to the Planning Commission. Planner Larsen noted that this is a Landmark Historic Site, so requests related to lifting would be considered by the Historic Preservation Board.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Beal moved to APPROVE the Plat Amendment for 830 Empire Avenue, according to the following, as amended:

**Background:**

1. 830 Empire Avenue was constructed in 1911 during the Mature Mining Era.
2. On June 18, 2025, the Applicant applied for a Plat Amendment to create a Lot for the Landmark Historic Site. On October 23, 2025, staff deemed the application complete.

3. On February 18, 2026, the Applicant applied for a Variance to the Historic Residential – 1 (HR-1) Zoning District's minimum Lot Area requirement. On March 4, 2026, staff deemed the Applicant's Variance application complete.
4. On March 31, 2026, the Board of Adjustment held a public meeting and approved the Variance.

**Findings of Fact:**

1. 830 Empire Avenue is an unusually shaped metes-and-bounds parcel with frontage along Crescent Tram Road and Empire Avenue.
2. The parcel is within the HR-1 Zoning District, contains a Single-Family Dwelling (SFD) constructed circa 1911, and is a Landmark Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The property is an unusually shaped 1,722.6-square-foot metes-and-bounds parcel (SA-144) consisting of portions of historic Old Town Lots and a portion of Empire Avenue Right-of-Way (ROW) that was vacated in 1967.
4. The property is surrounded on three sides by Crescent Tram Road, a City-owned parcel, and Empire Avenue.
5. 830 Empire Avenue contains several existing encroachments on City property and ROW along Crescent Tram Road to the north and east, and onto Empire Avenue to the west.
6. The Applicant proposes structural updates to the Landmark Historic Structure, including foundation improvements. Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-2.2-3 states "no Building Permit shall be issued for a Lot unless such Lot has the Area, width, and depth as required . . ." The creation of a Lot for this Landmark Historic Site is therefore required prior to Building Permit submittal.
7. The proposed Plat Amendment would remove the internal Lot Lines of the Old Town Lots and the previously vacated portion of Empire Avenue ROW.
8. The SFD is an Allowed Use in the HR-1 Zoning District.
9. The minimum Lot Area for HR-1 is 1,875 square feet.
  - a. The property is currently 1,743.4 square feet, 132.6 square feet short of the minimum Lot Area requirement.

- b. The Engineering Department requires 22.5 square feet along Crescent Tram Road be dedicated to the City as ROW to reflect the existing ROW and decades of public use, further reducing the proposed Lot to 1,721 square feet.
  - c. On March 31, 2026, the Board of Adjustment approved a Variance from the minimum Lot Area.
10. Pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-3(E), Building Footprint for the site is 781.18 square feet. The existing Landmark Historic Structure Building Footprint is approximately 860 square feet. To preserve the Historic Structure, LMC § 15-2.2-4 exempts the Landmark Historic Structure from the maximum Building Footprint.
11. The existing Landmark Historic Site encroaches into the west, east, and south Setbacks and the unusually shaped property contains Front Lot Lines of varying widths. To preserve the Historic Structure, LMC § 15-2.2-4 exempts the Landmark Historic Structure from Setback requirements and LMC § 15-2.2-3(B) establishes Planning Director discretion to determine Lot Widths for unusual Lots. As a result, on March 31, 2026, the Planning Director issued a Setback and Lot Width Determination pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-3(B) *Lot Width* and § 15-4-17 *Setback Requirements for Unusual Lot Configurations*.
12. To preserve the Historic Structure, LMC § 15-2.2-4 exempts Landmark Historic Sites from on-site parking requirements.
13. There is Good Cause for the proposed Plat Amendment because it:
  - a. Allows for structural updates to the Landmark Historic Structure, including foundation improvements, to support the preservation of the Structure.
  - b. Preserves the character of the neighborhood and of Park City by allowing for improvements to a Landmark Historic Structure in compliance with Historic Regulations.
  - c. Complies with the General Plan recommendation to preserve the historic character and scale.
  - d. Requires the encroachments onto City property and ROW to either be removed or for the property owner to enter into an encroachment agreement with the City.
  - e. Requires 22.5 square feet be dedicated to formalize the Crescent Tram Road.

**Conclusions of Law:**

1. The proposed Plat Amendment complies with LMC Chapter 15-2.2 *Historic Residential-1 Zoning District*.
2. The proposed Plat Amendment complies with LMC Chapter 15-3 *Off-Street Parking*.
3. The proposed Plat Amendment complies with LMC Chapter 15-7.1 *Subdivision Procedures*.

**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 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 obtain an Encroachment Agreement for existing improvements in the rights-of-way and City property.
4. The Applicant shall dedicate Right-of-Way for any land within the bounds of the property from the back of the curb into the Crescent Tram as depicted in Attachment 2 in a form approved by the City Engineer.
5. Prior to plat recordation, the Applicant shall sufficiently address all encroachments on neighboring properties.

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

- C. 8200 Royal Street #10 – Plat Amendment** – The Applicant Proposes to Enclose a 73-Square-Foot Portion of a Main Level Deck for Private Ownership and Create a 380-Square-Foot Loft Area within the Existing Structure in the Residential Development Zoning District. PL-26-06846.

Planner Barton presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Plat Amendment for 8200 Royal Street, Unit 10. He reported that Megan Blosser with Alliance Engineering is attending the meeting virtually to represent the applicant. Planner Barton noted that this Plat Amendment relates to Unit 10 of the Stag Lodge Condominiums, which are

located at 8200 Royal Street. The original plat for Phase I was recorded in 1985. He clarified that Unit 10 is a 2,298 square foot two-level unit above a common garage.

There were prior Plat Amendments that impacted this unit. One of the Plat Amendments enclosed a portion of the main level deck. Another Plat Amendment expanded the main level deck and removed common area walls around a private ownership area. The proposed amendment currently before the Planning Commission is to create a loft within the attic area and enclose a 73 square foot portion of the main level deck. The proposal complies with the Residential Development Zoning District requirements, does not create any new Off-Street Parking requirements, and does not create any non-conformities.

Staff recommends the Planning Commission review the proposed Plat Amendment, conduct a public hearing, and consider approval based on the Draft Final Action Letter.

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

Chair Van Dine asked if it would be possible to change applications like this so they are handled through an administrative review rather than being presented to the Planning Commission. She noted that there have been a lot of similar applications recently.

**MOTION:** Commissioner Shand moved to APPROVE a Plat Amendment for 8200 Royal Street, Unit 10, according to the following:

**Procedural History:**

1. Stag Lodge Phase I Condominiums is a 24-Unit project in the Residential Development (RD) Zoning District.
2. The Stag Lodge Condominiums Phase One Plat was recorded with Summit County on March 4, 1985 (Recorder Entry No. 231328).
3. The Stag Lodge Phase I First Amended plat recorded January 17, 2003, enclosed a portion of the main level deck for private ownership.
4. The Stag Lodge Phase I Second Amended plat did not create changes to Unit 10.
5. The Stag Lodge Phase I Unit 10 Third Amended plat was recorded on May 24, 2017, and expanded the main level deck and removed common area walls around Private Ownership "Area B" from the First Amended plat.
6. The Stag Lodge Phase I Fourth and Fifth Amended plats did not create changes to Unit 10.

**Findings of Fact:**

1. Unit 10 is a 2,298-square-foot two-level unit in the 24-unit Stag Lodge Phase I Condominiums project.
2. The Applicant proposes to enclose a 73-square-foot portion of a deck for private ownership and create a 380-square-foot loft area within the attic of the existing structure. The proposal increases the private area for Unit 10 to 2,751 square feet.
3. On February 21, 2026, the Applicant received permission from the Stag Lodge Homeowners Association (HOA) to complete the requested modifications. On February 24, 2026, an HOA representative signed an acknowledgement confirming approval of the requested modifications.
4. Land Management Code (LMC) Chapter 15-2.13 outlines the lot, site, and height regulations for the RD Zoning District.
  - a. Setbacks for the RD Zoning District are as follows: Front – 20 feet, Rear – 15 feet, Side – 12 feet.
    - i. Complies. The proposed 73-square foot addition is within the existing deck, and the proposed 380-square foot loft area is within the attic of the existing structure. The existing deck and structure are well outside the required Front, Rear, and Side Setbacks. The Stag Lodge extends across the neighboring Lot to the south (Stag Lodge Phase II). The nearest property under separate ownership (Deer Valley Resort Company) is 26 feet to the east.
  - b. Building Height for the RD Zoning District is 28 feet from Existing Grade.
    - i. Complies. Stag Lodge Unit 10 reaches a maximum height of approximately 27 feet 11 inches above Finished Grade. The proposed loft level is within the existing Building Footprint.
  - c. Density for the RD Zoning District is three Units per acre.
    - i. Complies. The Lot for Stag Lodge Phase I is approximately 3 acres. The Stag Lodge Phase I Condominiums were platted in 1985 for 24 units. The LMC in effect at the time did not have a Density limitation. The proposed Plat Amendment complies with LMC § 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 24 units.

5. LMC Chapter 15-3 outlines on-site parking requirements.
  - a. Condominiums greater than 2,000 square feet require two Parking Spaces per Dwelling Unit. Unit 10 is proposed to expand from 2,298 square feet to 2,751 square feet.
    - i. Complies. The proposal does not increase the Off-Street Parking requirement. Stag Lodge Phase I Condominiums includes a common parking garage. The owners of Unit 10 are entitled to two parking spaces within the common garage.
6. 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 § 15-7-1.6 and approval shall require a finding of Good Cause.
  - b. LMC § 15-15-1 defines Good Cause as “providing positive benefits and mitigating negative impacts, determined on a case by case basis to include such things as: providing public amenities and benefits, resolving existing issues and non-conformities, addressing issues related to density, promoting excellent and sustainable design, utilizing best planning and design practices, preserving the character of the neighborhood and of Park City and furthering the health, safety, and welfare of the Park City community.”
    - i. There is Good Cause for this Plat Amendment because the amendment includes an addition within an existing deck and a loft area within the attic of the existing structure. The proposal does not increase the parking requirements, and the proposed Plat Amendment does not create any non-conformities. The original plat, approved in 1985, does not include plat notes that impose limitations on the size of the units. Stag Lodge Phase I Condominiums was platted in 1985 for 24 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.
7. The Development Review Committee reviewed the proposal on March 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 § 15-7.1-3(B) *Classification of Subdivision*, § 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 Stag Lodge Condominiums Phase I 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 name of the plat to Stag Lodge Phase 1 Sixth Amended Amending Unit 10.
4. The Applicant shall prepare and submit a draft amended declaration of condominium.

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

**7. ADJOURNMENT**

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

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:04 p.m.