

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
October 13, 2010

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Dick Peek, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan

EX OFFICIO:

Kirsten Whetstone, Planner; Francisco Astorga, Planner; Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney

=====

REGULAR MEETING - 6:00 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Wintzer called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present except Commissioners Pettit and Luskin, who were excused.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - September 22, 2010

MOTION: Commissioner Strachan moved to ADOPT the Work Session Notes of September 22, 2010. Commissioner Hontz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously by those who attended that meeting. Commissioner Savage abstained since he had not attended.

MOTION: Commissioner Strachan moved to ADOPT the Minutes of September 22, 2010. Commissioner Hontz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously by those who attended that meeting. Commissioner Savage abstained since he had not attended.

II. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There was no comment.

III. STAFF & COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS/DISCLOSURES

Commissioner Peek disclosed that his brother is involved in trails and he had mentioned that the Planning Commission would be discussing trails this evening. His was in attendance to hear the discussion.

Chair Wintzer disclosed that he owns the property adjacent to the Yard on Kearns Boulevard. He did not believe it presented a conflict or would affect his decision.

CONTINUATION(S) AND PUBLIC HEARING.

Park City Heights - Master Planned Development
(Application #PL-10-01028)

The Planning Commission discussed traffic, trails, and the revised site plan during the work session.

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing.

Charlie Sturgis, the Executive Director for Mountain Trails, commented on the issue related to the Old Dump Road. He would like the name to remain because it has been there for 25 to 30 years and changing the name would not change the specifications of the road. It is still the Old Dump Road. Mr. Sturgis stated that the Rail Trail, which crosses the Old Dump Road has significantly increased in use over the years. Access to the sports park and the skating rink is significant. Increased trail use, combined with increased traffic on the Dump Road, has created a dangerous situation at the intersection and he is amazed that a significant accident has not occurred. He believed the Park City Heights project was a good time to look for outside of the box solutions, and to improve the Old Dump Road to the acceptable level it should be to accommodate additional traffic from US40, from the development and expected vehicle/pedestrian traffic from this transportation/recreation corridor. Mr. Sturgis remarked that this is one of the wimpiest pedestrian/vehicular intersections in town and it has never been considered in any part of the Walkability Plan. He suggested that they consider ways to improve this road for pedestrians and vehicle traffic to make it safer.

Mr. Sturgis pointed out that there are significant drainage issues where the Rail Trail crosses the Old Dump Road and grade changes would possibly create additional problems. He thought it was important to be aware of those issues from the State Parks' point of view. Mr. Sturgis explained that Mountain Trails manages the Rail Trail for State Parks. During the winter there are issues with the ability to run a snow cat in that area. They currently run a snow cat through the tunnel underneath the SR248 area. Any plans for the Dump Road/Rail Trail intersection should be wide enough to easily accommodate snow equipment.

Chair Wintzer encouraged Mr. Sturgis to stay involved in the process. Spencer White, representing the applicant, offered to meet with Mr. Sturgis to address the issues he raised.

Mark Fischer felt it was important to study the transportation corridor from the Park and Ride lots up the Rail Trail into Bonanza Park in anticipation of possible improvements and transit 20 to 30 years into the future.

Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Strachan agreed with Chair Wintzer's earlier comment regarding the bike path. He thought Mr. Sturgis made a good point about room for snow cats. That area is becoming increasingly popular for cross country skiing and he would like to see that continue. Mr. White recalled that the minimum standard is 8 foot paved. Commissioner Strachan stated that the

route parallel to US40 to the Deer Valley gondola should be installed because it is an important connection.

In terms of the site plan, Commissioner Strachan wanted to know why the four-plexes and eight-plexes were clustered at the entrance and not interspersed around the entire project. Mr. White explained that a number of issues played into that decision, including walkable proximity to the transit stop and utility issues. Depending on the type of unit, they tried to look at mass with regards to single family detached units in an effort to achieve a grid pattern that emphasizes something you would see in Old Town. Mr. White stated that interspersing attached units with single family detached units throws off the balance of the design concept. He has conducted studies with the attached units on the interior, but they somehow gravitate to the outside of the project and act as a buffer for going from single family units to attached units.

Phyllis Robinson, representing the City, asked if Commissioner Strachan was referring to the placement of the units within this phase or within the project as a whole. Commissioner Strachan replied that it was the project as a whole. Ms. Robinson remarked that it was a phasing issue. The City wants to make sure that the green units, which represent the units associated with the Burbs IHC annexation, are built in Park City Heights and not across the street in front of the USAA. She pointed out that the lower piece is Phase One of the project. If those units are moved elsewhere in the project, it could potentially be several years before they are built. Ms. Robinson noted that timing is an issue because currently there is a deferred application to build those units on the five acre parcel across the street.

Commissioner Savage asked for clarification on why those units should not be built across the street. Ms. Robinson explained that when the City went through the annexation process for the Burbs annexation, the preference was not to have the units built on site. The land had already been donated to the City for that project and the City Council asked the Burbs and IHC if they would be willing to wait and see if there was an alternative location. At that point the planning process was beginning for Park City Heights and they were able to look at moving those units to that project. The applicant for the IHC units is getting restless and wants to move forward to complete the project. They submitted an application for an MPD to construct the units on that site and the period of time has gone beyond the time they agreed to wait. Ms. Robinson remarked that the units would create a better community in the Park City Heights project, as opposed to having a few units isolated across the road. Commissioner Savage understood that the property on the other side would never be developed. Ms. Robinson replied that the property is in City ownership and would be converted to open space.

Commissioner Strachan understood that those are realities they need to deal with, but he did not believe it was a good answer to the philosophy of interspersing the housing. He believes a better philosophy for development is to mix affordable housing throughout the entire development, since that is how good communities thrive. Commissioner Strachan was fearful of creating something similar to the Prospector Apartments next to the Rail Trail that are clustered, individualized and separate from the rest of the suburban neighborhood of Prospector. In his opinion, that is not a good community and it presents a problem. When he looks at this plan, he thinks of Prospector and the Prospector Apartments.

Mr. White explained that they are trying to reach a critical mass at the entrance area where there is more activity. People would be able to sit on their porches and communicate with their neighbors, and have easy access to the clubhouse and amenities. At this point, they are unsure whether the units further up into the project would be primary residences or second homes. Mr. White reiterated that their focus was the critical mass at the entrance and it had nothing to do with separating larger homes from affordable units. That was the reason for bringing market rate units into the mix of affordable units.

Commissioner Strachan remarked that the reasons for creating mass at the entry were valid; however, he still questioned whether it was correct.

Chair Wintzer like the revised plan. He thought it was better to have the affordable units and the market rate units off the main road. Chair Wintzer agreed with Commissioner Strachan's concern, and he understood the reasons explained by Mr. White. However, he would like to see the units mixed so all the eight-plexes and four-plexes are not clustered into one spot and separated from the other homes. Chair Wintzer suggested moving the green units further off the road. Mr. White pointed out that there is a natural berm that would screen the units from the road. Chair Wintzer preferred to push some of the four-plexes up the hill if possible. He agreed with idea of creating mass around the parks and the entrance.

Chair Wintzer recalled from the plan proposed years earlier, that there was a mix of duplexes with affordable on one side and market rate on the other. He like the idea of tightly intermixing the units to avoid any type of distinction between market rate and affordable. Mr. White replied that the same goal could be easily accomplished with architecture. Chair Wintzer believed the plan had come a long way in terms of creating a neighborhood community.

Commissioner Hontz concurred with Commissioners Peek and Strachan regarding the trails and connectivity. She also concurred with Chair Wintzer on the site plan. Commissioner Hontz stated that she was still struggling with the design and requested that the Staff Google some earth maps to show a birds eye comparison with other developments. She suggested the New Park/Redstone area and Bear Hollow. She offered to email the Staff with names of subdivisions and small communities outside of Jackson and White Fish. Commissioner Hontz understood the reasons for creating energy at the entrance, but she was not completely comfortable with the design. She agreed that this plan was better than the first or the second iterations that were presented and she particularly liked the second entrance.

Commissioner Hontz was still concerned about traffic. She was using the traffic study to come up with numbers, recognizing that it was not an accurate method. However, she believed this project would generate significant additional traffic to that portion of SR248. Commissioner Hontz appreciated receiving the 2009 Traffic on Utah Highways, because that one page had important data and you could calculate the ADT numbers on particular roads. When she ran the numbers for Park City Heights, the project would add approximately 20% to the current ADT. Commissioner Hontz remarked that background traffic volumes are good and it helps to understand the current and to project forward. However, she wanted to know how this project relates to the road and the added traffic. She appreciated how the current design reduces the number of vehicles, but she needed to understand it better.

Mr. Braley explained that currently the ADT on SR248 in that area is approximately 9,000-10,000. The trip generation for this development, as currently planned for primary occupancy, is approximately 2,000 new trips per day at full buildout, assuming that it is 100% primary homes. Twenty years from now it could be 20,000 plus, so that percent would be smaller. Mr. Braley pointed out that not all the trips would be to Park City. In addition, the numbers assume that nobody rides bikes. Hopefully the trails and transit system would reduce those numbers. Mr. Braley stated that some of the traffic would be going between Park City Heights and IHC. He did not believe the number was as bad as the 20% calculated.

Commissioner Savage felt an important aspect was tying the project into the large scale Transportation Master Plan so they can see where the real problems would occur. He commented on the berm that runs along the side of Highway 40 and curb appeal. In his opinion, the curb appeal from SR248 or the front of the complex, is all the houses that are tucked down on the inside like a fortress. He suggested that if the units were tucked further back into the berm and interspersed to taper up, it would make the appearance from the road more attractive. Mr. White pointed out that there is not much of a berm and the highway is elevated as it goes over Old Dump Road. Looking down from US40 at that point, you would be looking down on the rooftops. It then shifts as you go further up the frontage road as the highway starts to go further down. Commissioner Savage clarified that his comment was to find a way to tuck the larger buildings into the berm, even if they are moved down a little ways, and to taper other units to avoid the appearance of a wall of large buildings.

Commissioner Savage liked the clubhouse, but noticed that it was quite small. Mr. White replied that the clubhouse is 2,000 square feet. Based on other projects, smaller clubhouses are used more often than larger clubhouses.

Planner Whetstone noted that the Planning Commission should be seeing visuals very soon, and that would help them visualize the project from different perspectives. The visuals have not been provided because the site plan is still evolving.

Since it is apparent that construction would continue for several years before the project is completed, Commissioner Savage suggested that they plant large trees at the entrance early in the process to distract from the construction activity and to make this a community friendly development project.

Commissioner Peek concurred with the comments of his fellow Commissioners. He asked if a sound study was done for that area and whether the sound from US40 exceeds the standards, whereby future residents could petition for a sound wall. Commissioner Peek agreed with interspersing the affordable units up the hill, however, he was concerned that it would raise the houses into the amphitheater of sound projected from US40. For that reason, it could be a benefit to be under the berm. Commissioner Peek felt it was important to work towards connectivity with the Mayflower Trail, which is the Deer Valley gondola.

Commissioner Savage asked if the Mayflower Trail connection would require a joint meeting with Wasatch County. Planner Whetstone stated that she would look at the Wasatch County Trails Plan to see how far north they have come with the trails. Commissioner Peek echoed

Chair Wintzer regarding the safety of the Rail Trail/Dump Road Intersection.

Commissioner Peek clarified that even though the focus has been on the first phase site plan, his comments regarding the subdivision still hold for the upper area. Nothing has changed other than bringing the units down the hill to make it more dense. Commissioner Peek liked the improvements to the lower first phase, but thought there was still a situation with the subdivision parade of driveways. Planner Whetstone asked if there was consensus among the Planning Commission on Commissioner Peek's comment regarding the rest of the subdivision. Commissioners Hontz and Strachan concurred with Commissioner Peek. Planner Whetstone noted that they tried to make it more connected, but it takes up the open space and eliminates the trails. Chair Wintzer suggested that the applicants show the Planning Commission what they tried to do and why it would not work.

Mr. White stated that once an engineer is hired, they can begin to look at retaining walls and grades of roads. He noted that the layout is based on the topography. None of the roads are over 10% and they tried to minimize cuts, fills, and retaining walls. Commissioner Peek assumed that is why so many subdivisions are planned as they are. However, the General Plan discourages subdivision-like development in Park City.

MOTION: Commissioner Peek moved to CONTINUE the Park City Heights MPD to November 10, 2010. Commissioner Strachan seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

1. 2700 Deer Valley Drive - Amendment to Record of Survey
(Application #PL-10-01042)

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing. There was no comment. Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

2. 1251 Kearns Blvd. - The Yard Subdivision
(Application #PL-10-01058)

Chair Wintzer remarked that the discrepancies in the survey is that they were all interior parcels. It did not affect any of the outside property lines.

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing. There was no comment. Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Strachan moved to APPROVE the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Hontz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact - 2700 Deer Valley Drive - Amendment to Record of Survey

1. The property is located at 2700 Deer Valley Drive East.
2. The property is subject to the Deer Valley Resort Tenth Amended and Restated Large Scale Master Planned Development.
3. The Courchevel Condominium record of survey plat was approved by the City Council on December 27, 1984 and recorded at Summit County on December 31, 1984.
4. The Courchevel Condominium record of survey plat recorded 40 residential condominium units of 759 square feet each with 60 parking spaces in a shared underground garage.
5. November of 1989, an amended record of survey plat was approved and recorded increasing the number of residential condominium units to forty-on (41) (Exhibits B and C).
6. Two of the three (3) approved Courchevel buildings (Buildings B and C) were constructed beginning in 1984 and completed in 1988. Building A was not constructed. Currently there are 27 condominium units and 29 parking spaces. Each existing condominium unit contains 759 square feet for a total of 20,493 sf and a developed unit equivalent of 10.25 UE.
7. The Deer Valley Resort MPD assigned 20.5 Ues for the Courchevel parcel, under the unit equivalent formula. The MPD was amended in 2001 to transfer 7 Ues as 14,000 sf to the Silver Baron condominium project, adjacent to the north, leaving 13.5 Ues for the Courchevel property. Of the 13.5 Ues, 10.25 are currently developed and 3.25 UE remain. There are not sufficient Ues remaining to construct Building A as shown on the plat.
8. On May 10, 2010, Courchevel Condominium owner's association voted to approve construction of additional floor area and the transfer of common space to private space for units B301 and B303. The only exterior changes proposed are the addition of windows on the north side of Building B.
9. On September 3, 2010, the City received a completed application for a condominium record of survey plat amendment requesting conversion to private area, of 608 square feet of common attic area above each of Units B301 and B303 (1,216 sf total). These units are located on the third floor of Building B.
10. The total proposed increase in residential floor area is 1,216 sf equating to a 0.61 UE increase to 10.86 UE total. This increase is allowed under the existing Deer Valley Resort, Tenth Amended and Restated Large Scale MPD (Deer Valley MPD). If the increase in residential floor area is approved, 2.64 UE remain undeveloped.

11. Twenty-nine parking spaces exist in the parking structure. No additional parking is proposed. The expanded units comply with the current LMC requirement of 2 spaces for each of the amended units. The other units of 759 sf are existing non-conforming regarding parking.
12. There is undeveloped land on the property available for construction of additional off-street parking; however lack of parking for this property has not been an issue in the past. The property is located at the base area for Deer Valley Resort and on the Park City bus route. Given the relatively smaller unit size the existing parking situation is adequate.
13. The LMC allows the Planning Commission to reduce parking requirements within Master Planned Developments per Section 15-3-7 provided the base requirements is at least 8 parking spaces.

Conclusions of Law - 2700 Deer Valley Drive

1. There is good cause for this record of survey.
2. The record of survey is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding condominium plats.
3. As conditioned, the record of survey plat is consistent with the Deer Valley Resort MPD, 10th amended and restated.
4. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed record of survey.
5. Approval of the record of survey, subject to the conditions state below, does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval - 2700 Deer Valley Drive

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the record of survey for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, including the removal of Building A, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant will record the plat amendment at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year's time, this approval and the plat will be void.
3. All construction requires a Building Permit and approvals from the Building and Planning Departments.

4. Any future construction of units requires parking to be provided according to the Land Management Code requirements in effect at the time of the building permit.

Findings of Fact - 1251 Kearns Boulevard - Subdivision

1. The site is located at 1251 & 1225 Kearns Boulevard.
2. The site is located within the General Commercial District with the Frontage Protection Zone Overlay.
3. The overall site contains 200,276 square feet (4.6 acres).
4. The site consists of eight (8) separate metes and bounds parcels.
5. Some of these parcels overlap, have gaps, or do not close.
6. Any future development will have to comply with the development standards of the current zoning district.
7. The subdivision will create one lot of record.

Conclusions of Law - 1251 Kearns Boulevard - Subdivision

1. There is good cause for this subdivision as the site contains eight (8) separate metes and bounds parcels which overlap, have gaps, or do not close.
2. The subdivision will eliminate the overlaps, gaps, or errors in the descriptions and unify the eight (8) parcels into one (1) lot of record.
3. The subdivision is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable state law regarding subdivisions.
4. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed plat amendment.
5. Approval of the subdivision, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval - 1251 Kearns Blvd. - Subdivision

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the subdivision for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant will submit the subdivision plat for recordation at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one

year's time, this approval for the plat will be void.

REGULAR AGENDA - DISCUSSION, PUBLIC HEARING, AND POSSIBLE ACTION

3. 1251 Kearns Boulevard, The Yard - Extension of Conditional Use Permit
(Application #PL-08-00481)

Planner Francisco Astorga reviewed the application to extend the Conditional Use Permit for the Yard located at 1251 Kearns Boulevard. Last year the Planning Commission granted a conditional use permit for an indoor entertainment facility and a commercial parking lot. A condition of that approval required a one-year review for extension of the conditional use permit.

Planner Astorga noted that the CUP was approved in July 2009. Staff workload was the reason this review was not scheduled until October.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission grant the extension as requested based on the findings of fact, conclusions of law and conditions of approval.

Chair Wintzer asked about the length of this extension. Planner Astorga replied that a conditional use permit runs with the land and typically there is not a time frame. However, this CUP had a one year approval and the Planning Commission has the discretion to specify another review period if they choose.

Commissioner Peek recalled that a condition of the original approval required a review by the Planning Commission if three complaints were received from residents. Planner Astorga replied that the condition would still apply with the extension. He noted that in the last fifteen months they only received one complaint from an event that took place in 2009. That event was not approved as part of this indoor entertainment facility. There was an outdoor component that was approved through Special Events.

Chair Wintzer clarified that under the conditional use permit, any outdoor activity would go through the Special Events process. Planner Astorga replied that this was correct. The CUP is specifically for indoor uses.

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing.

Mary Cook, representing the Homestake Condominiums, stated that generally the neighbors have a good relationship with the Yard. She remarked that the City only received one complaint from the Summer 'Ween event, because that was the only written complaint. She believed other comments were made. Ms. Cook was concerned that like any other situation, boundaries get overstepped. She preferred that it be a year-to-year conditional use permit until decisions are made about the Bonanza Park Development area. Ms. Cook remarked that once things begin working, the limits of noise and traffic can get stretched to higher levels. She believed that a one year, year to year approval would help keep the neighborhood livable for the residents.

Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Savage believed there has been responsible behavior as it relates to the conditional approval and that the three complaints rule would work effectively.

MOTION: Commissioner Savage moved to APPROVE the extension of the conditional use permit for an Indoor Entertainment Facility and Commercial Parking lot at 1251 Kearns Boulevard, the Yard, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval as found in the Staff report, with the understanding that three complaints would cause the CUP to come back to the Planning Commission for review.

Commissioner Hontz asked if one person could make three complaints on the same event. Planner Astorga stated that they could. However, if that were to occur, the Planning Commission would have the purview to decide if that was appropriate.

Commissioner Hontz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Wintzer thanked the applicant, Mark Fischer, for his contribution to the community through events at the Yard. He noted that a number of free events occur at the facility that people never hear about. It has been a great community asset.

Findings of Fact - 1251 Kearns Blvd. - CUP Extension

1. The property is located at 1251 Kearns Boulevard.
2. The zoning is General Commercial (GC) within the Frontage Protection Overlay Zone (FPZ).
3. The site is approximately 4.57 acres.
4. The site is bounded by Kearns Blvd. (Highway 248), Homestead Road, and Woodbine Way.
5. The site has existing sewer, electrical, and water capacity.
6. The parking area has enough room to handle 329 parking spaces.
7. An Indoor Entertainment Facility with the square footage of 14,110 will require seventy-two (72) parking spaces (5 parking spaces per 1,000 sq. ft.).
8. The medical office uses seven (7) parking spaces mandated by the LMC towards the front of the building.
9. The existing buildings on site will not be changed with this application.

10. The site does not contain any usable open space.
11. The property owner has worked in the past with the Building Department regarding compliance with the Soils Ordinance. Currently the paved areas are in compliance with such ordinance.
12. The site has a legal non-conforming sign within the Frontage Protection Zone which has recently been updated.
13. The site has not changed since it was a lumber yard. The existing buildings on site will not be changed with this application.
14. The applicant does not expect any issues that might affect people other than what is currently found in a commercial area. The site will need to comply with the Park City Noise Ordinance.
15. The site plans (Exhibit A) shows the drop-off, loading, and (screened) dumpster areas located east of the building. The access to these areas is through the front, off Kearns Blvd.
16. The loading/unloading of the event equipment will take place prior to the actual events making the area free and clear when pedestrians are utilizing the same area for circulation.
17. The ownership is a limited liability company and has no unusual affects on taxing entities.
18. It is on relatively flat land and requires no slope retention and the buildings are pre-existing (no new buildings or remodeling on the outside on the buildings.)
19. The applicant requests to use temporary restroom facilities similar to that which is used for special events to meet this requirement depending on the events going on at the Yard.
20. Conditions of approval have been met by the applicant.

Conclusions of Law - 1251 Kearns Blvd, - CUP Extension

1. The application complies with all requirements of the LMC;
2. The uses will be compatible with surrounding structures in use, scale, mass and circulation;
3. The uses are consistent with the Park City General Plan, as amended; and

4. The effects of any differences in uses or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

Conditions of Approval - 1251 Kearns Blvd. - CUP Extension

1. The internal layout of the parking plan shall be compliant with the applicable codes. The driving lanes shall be twenty-four (24') minimum.
2. The parking lot may be accessed via the entrance on Homestake Road, while the pedestrian circulation system may be located at the entrance to the site directly off Kearns Blvd. As noted on the site plan (Exhibit A).
3. All uses must comply with the Park City Noise Ordinance.
4. The detailed submittal must be submitted to the Park City Planning Department at least two (2) weeks (ten business days) before any event for review and approval by the Chief Building Official and the Planning Department. The detailed submittal includes without limitation, a traffic mitigation plan that includes consideration of safety concerns for access to parking off of Homestake Road.
5. All exterior lights must conform to park City lighting regulations for height, type, wattage and shielding.
6. Permanent use of the property must conform to requirements for landscaping, snow storage, lighting and screening.
7. This CUP does not include any events programmed for the site that goes through the City Special Events licensing or Master Festival Special Event permitting or master festival license process, i.e. outdoor events, etc.
8. If the City receives more than three complaints from residents, the CUP would come back to the Planning Commission for modifications to the CUP.

The Park City Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission _____