## PARK CITY

## PARK CITY BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING

SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
October 18, 2022
MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 5:00 PM.

## 1. ROLL CALL

2. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES
2.A Swearing In New Board of Adjustment Member
2.B Elect a Board of Adjustment Chair
3. MINUTES APPROVAL
3.A Consideration to Approve the Board of Adjustment Meeting Minutes from July 12, 2022. July 12, 2022 Meeting Minutes

## 4. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

5. REGULAR AGENDA
5.A

51 Daly Avenue - Variance - On July 12, 2022, the Board of Adjustment Approved Variances for the Front Setback, Side Setback, and Building Height. The Board Will Review an Amended Final Action Letter. PL-22-05179 (5 mins.)
(A) Ratification

51 Daly Avenue Staff Correction Report
Exhibit A: Corrected Final Action Letter
5.B

1750 Kearns Boulevard (Park City High School) - Variance - The Applicant Requests a Variance for Building Height for the Park City High School Remodel and a Three-Story Addition in the Recreation Open Space Zoning District that has a Maximum Building Height of 47 feet and Six Inches. (PL-22-05393)
(A) Public Hearing; (B) Action

Park City High School Variance Staff Report
Exhibit A: Draft Final Action Letter
Exhibit B: Applicant's Request
Exhibit C: Ordinance No. 85-11
Exhibit D: 2008 Conditional Use Permit
Exhibit E: Site Diagram
Exhibit F: Proposed Plans

## 6. ADJOURN

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the Planning Department at 435-615-5060 or planning@parkcity.org at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.
*Parking is available at no charge for Council meeting attendees who park in the China Bridge parking structure.

## Board of Adjustment Agenda Item Report

Meeting Date: October 18, 2022
Submitted by: Levi Jensen
Submitting Department: Planning
Item Type: Staff Report
Agenda Section: STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND
DISCLOSURES

## Subject:

Elect a Board of Adjustment Chair
Suggested Action:
Attachments:

## PARK CITY

1884

## PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT <br> MINUTES OF JULY 12, 2022

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Ruthie Gezelius-Chair, Jennifer Franklin, Stefanie Wilson, Hans Fuegi

STAFF: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Lillian Lederer, Planner; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney; Jaron Ehlers, Planning Department

## 1. ROLL CALL

Chair Ruthie Gezelius called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that a quorum was present. Board Member Wintzer was excused.

## 2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Board of Adjustment Meeting Minutes from May 17, 2022.

It was noted that on page 4, paragraph 4 the first line should be corrected to read: "Board Member Wintzer stated that she had an opinion..."

It was clarified by Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, that the Board Members who were not present at the May 17, 2022, meeting could rely on the assertions of the other Board Members that the minutes were accurate.

MOTION: Board Member Wilson moved to APPROVE the Board of Adjustment Meeting Minutes from May 17, 2022, as amended. Board Member Franklin seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

## 3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

No ecomments were submitted and no hands were raised on Zoom.

## 4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken, thanked the Board Members who reapplied to serve. She reported that the reappointments and appointments to the Board would take place at the City Council Meeting on July 28, 2022, at 6:00 p.m. Anyone was welcome to attend that meeting. Staff would send out the information to the Board.

Board Member Fuegi confirmed that this would be his last meeting but stated that he would remain available for as long as needed until a new Board Member is appointed. Director Milliken noted that there would likely not be another Board of Adjustment ("BOA") Meeting before July 28 and thanked Board Member Fuegi for his service. Board Member Fuegi appreciated this comment and thanked Staff, in particular Mr. Harrington, and expressed his pleasure working with everyone.

Chair Gezelius recognized Board Member Fuegi's commitment to Park City through his service on the Board.

## 5. REGULAR AGENDA

A. $\quad 51$ Daly Avenue - Variance - The Applicant Requests Variances from the Front and South Side Setback and Maximum Building Height on a Non-Historic Single-Family Dwelling in the Historic Residential (HR-1) Zone. PL-22-05280.

City Planner, Lillian Lederer, presented the staff report and stated that 51 Daly Avenue is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) Zone but is not a historic home. The applicant requested three variances as follows:

1. An exception granting the front porch to encroach 3.65 feet into the Front Setback;
2. An exception granting the south side of the structure to encroach 1.65 feet into the Side Setback; and
3. An exception granting the Maximum Building Height of six feet.

She presented the most recent survey provided by the applicant and highlighted the locations of the setbacks. She noted that the areas highlighted in yellow are the areas not in compliance. With respect to the side setback, she explained that the home is not straight and, therefore, varied in terms of how far it encroaches into the side setback. Planner Lederer also presented portions of the originally approved plans that showed that the house was designed to comply with the 10-foot front setback, the 10-foot rear setback, and the five-foot side setbacks on either side. The survey demonstrated that the home was not built according to the approved plans. She also noted that the building was constructed to a height of 33 feet.

In response to an inquiry, Planner Lederer confirmed that the original plans were approved in 1992. She explained that the structure was compliant with both the 1992 and current version of the Land Management Code ("LMC") with respect to minimum lot size and lot width. It also complies with the maximum building footprint requirements,
which were not listed in the 1992 LMC. No variances were being requested for any of the requirements.

With respect to the front and rear setbacks, Planner Lederer stated that the building was compliant with the rear setback and, therefore, no variance was requested. She reported that in 1992, the building was built as a duplex, which required a 10 -foot front setback. As built, the structure was compliant, however, the deck encroached 3.65 feet into the front setback resulting in a front setback of only 7.35 feet.

Planner Lederer added that the deck is 24.7 feet long and pursuant to the current LMC, decks that extend into the front setback are only allowed to be 10 feet. She noted that although the building is now being proposed as a single-family dwelling instead of a duplex, it was still not in compliance with the current Code since the deck still extends 3.65 feet into the front setback and is 24.7 feet long rather than 10 . As a result, the applicant requested a variance of the front setback.

With regard to the side setbacks, Planner Lederer stated that the north side of the building is in compliance. The proposed variance only applies to the south side of the structure and she noted that the building was not constructed per the plans. As a result, part of the structure varies in how far it encroaches into the side setback. She explained that both the 1992 and current LMC require side setbacks be five feet. The applicant, therefore, requested a variance to the south side setback of 3.35 feet to bring the home into compliance.

Planner Lederer stated that in 1992, the maximum building height was 27 feet; however, roofs could extend up to five feet resulting in a maximum building height of 32 feet. She noted that the home was built to a height of 33 feet or one foot above compliance per the 1992 Code. She added that the current Code sets the maximum building height at 27 feet with no exception for roof heights. Therefore, the home is six feet above the allowed height.

Planner Lederer reiterated that the applicant requested variances from the front and side setbacks and the building height as follows:

To allow the deck as an exception to the Front Setback with the condition that no other structures would be allowed to be built out to the Front Setback;

To allow the entire south Side Setback to be reduced from five feet to 3.35 feet; and

- To allow the structure to remain at 33 feet in height, with the condition that no other structures would be allowed to be built above existing height requirements.

She added that with respect to the south side setback, the applicant requested that the variance be applied to the entire side and not limited to the existing structure to allow the addition of square footage on that side of the structure. She added that the applicant requested that Condition of Approval 3 be removed to allow for this construction.

Planner Lederer stated that to grant the requested variances, the Board must find that literal enforcement of the LMC would cause unreasonable hardship to the applicant that would not be necessary to carry out the general purpose of the Code. She added that there are special circumstances attached to the property that do not generally apply to properties in the same zone, and granting the variance would be essential to the enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other properties in the same zone.

In addition, the variance would not substantially affect the General Plan, and would not be contrary to the public interest. The spirit of the LMC would be observed and substantial justice is done by granting the requested variances. She referenced the comments of the applicant contained in the Staff Report and noted that the burden is on the applicant.

Planner Lederer reported that the Development Review Committee, Planning, Engineering, Public Utilities, and Legal Department all reviewed the application and no significant issues were raised. On June 28, 2022, Staff published notice on the City website, at City Hall, at the property, and mailed courtesy notices to adjacent property owners. Staff received inquiries and questions regarding the application but did not receive any public input. She explained that the BOA could approve the variances, deny the variances, and direct Staff to make findings for the denial, or the Board could request additional information and continue the matter to a date certain. Staff recommended the Board review the requested variances, conduct a public hearing, and consider approving the variances based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval set forth in the staff report.

The applicant, Patrick Van Horn, explained that with regard to the side setback, he was not trying to build closer to the neighbors; he just wanted to continue the existing structure.

Board Member Wilson asked if the special circumstance attached to the property was that they were trying to combine the two parcels into one. Planner Lederer explained that currently, the two lots are not recorded as one plat. To record it, the structure must be compliant.

Chair Gezelius clarified that this is a very large lot at 100 feet deep, compared to standard lots of 75 feet or less. Planner Lederer confirmed that combining the two lots would result in a lot width of 44.2 feet. Chair Gezelius noted that the lot was much larger than a single lot but lacks the width of a double lot. In response to her question about the square footage of the current structure, Planner Lederer stated that the maximum building footprint is 1,370 square feet.

Chair Gezelius asked what the square footage would be if the Board were to approve the south side enclosure of what is currently parking into living space. Planner Lederer believed that the proposal would not exceed 1,658 square feet. She confirmed that the applicant did not request additional square footage and that once the lot size is combined, the maximum allowed square footage would be 1,658 square feet. This building would therefore be in compliance.

Board Member Fuegi assumed that the applicant owned all of Lots 5 and 6. Planner Lederer explained that a prior application combined part of that lot for a different plat amendment.

Board Member Wilson asked for clarification that the front deck would be the only part of the structure within the front setback and any build-out would come out to the front door. Planner Lederer confirmed that was the case. In response to an inquiry from Board Member Wilson about compliance with parking requirements should the applicant enclose the garage, Planner Lederer explained that the applicant would have to comply with single-family home parking requirements.

Board Member Franklin referenced pages 46 and 47 of the Staff Report, specifically the layouts of the property, and noted that the south side elevation appears to show the deck wrapping around into the south side. Planner Lederer explained that the front portion of the deck is the only part that is non-compliant. Board Member Franklin understood that the green wall is where the measurement was obtained that represented the actual structure of the home.

Board Member Franklin noted that there were signs for parking spaces for 51 Daly Avenue in front of the neighboring parcel and asked about the impact of the single-family zone on parking. Planner Lederer explained that the structure was a duplex in 1992 but was now being used as a single-family home, requiring two parking spaces. Staff's Final Action Letter states that the structure could not be used as a duplex.

Chair Gezelius opened the public hearing. There were public comments. Chair Gezelius closed the public hearing.

She referenced the applicant's request to remove Condition of Approval 3 and asked Planner Lederer to address that request. Planner Lederer explained that to bring the structure into compliance with the current Code, the applicant has proposed to build into the proposed reduced setback so that he can create some more living space. She added that the Board would need to clarify whether the applicant would be able to build within the full setback, or if only the current structure would be allowed.

Chair Gezelius observed that if the applicant's request was granted, that would allow him to finish off that area for living space. If the Board felt there should not be additional living space, then the Condition of Approval should remain. She reiterated that voting for the Conditions of Approval as presented would not allow the applicant to enclose the space
on the south side that is currently in the setback. It was clarified that it could be enclosed up to the setback. Planner Lederer confirmed that the applicant could build to the current setback of five feet unless the Board allowed the setback to extend the length.

Attorney Harrington requested that Planner Lederer demonstrate the implications of these options on the graphic. She highlighted the strip along the south side of the structure that would be built out if they agreed with the applicant's request. Board Member Fuegi sought clarification that the wall would continue along the same line as currently exists. Planner Lederer stated that if the BOA approved the applicant's request to build out, the building would continue in the same line as currently exists.

Board Member Franklin asked how the Code requirements for depth and dimension for three-story structures might apply to this structure. Planner Lederer responded that this would make the façade look more even. She commented that the structure is unique in its form as far as a façade variation. She questioned whether they need any language on this issue as it is not a historic structure.

Board Member Wilson echoed Board Member Franklin's question and noted that if the south side were to be built flush, it would have one giant, flat wall. She wondered if that would comply with the architectural guidelines. Planner Lederer explained that the proposal would have to go through the Historic District Design Review ("HDDR") process in which the Design Guidelines would be reviewed to ensure that any addition would be compatible.

Mr. Harrington added that there was no requirement for a side plane of a single-family home unless it exceeds 100 feet. He acknowledged that the third story might have to have a shift, but not the side.

Board Member Fuegi noted that the applicant's letter did not mention any height variation. Mr. Van Horn stated that the height variation would need to be included and confirmed that the height variation was part of his request. Mr. Van Horn demonstrated what his intentions were in terms of the build-out of the south side.

Chair Gezelius commented that her experience with requests was to leave what exists, recognizing that they could not change the errors of the past. She noted that historically, they have disallowed the expansion of non-conforming uses; however, if they could get an improvement of the existing building, it seemed advantageous to the Historic District even if was a newer building being improved. She felt it would be onerous to ask a property owner to remove a 30-year-old deck, or to cut a house off by a foot. She stated that the next reviewing body would ensure that the architectural compatibility between this building and the surrounding buildings would be maintained.

Chair Gezelius confirmed that the applicant requested to improve the parking area into a living space with the existing encroachment permitted.

Mr. Harrington stated that if the Board was willing to grant the applicant's request to modify Condition of Approval \#3, he suggested something specific to the limitation of allowing that south plane wall to be extended provided it was approved in the HDDR process and would not result in exceeding the maximum building footprint of the zone.

Chair Gezelius commented that a motion could be subject to a revised Condition of Approval 3, per the suggestion of Mr. Harrington.

MOTION: Board Member Franklin moved to APPROVE the Variances for the front and side setbacks and maximum building height for 51 Daly Avenue, subject to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and the Conditions of Approval, with revised Condition of Approval 3 as stated by Mr. Harrington:

## Findings of Fact

1. The property is located at 51 Daly Avenue in the Historic Residential-1 (HR1) Zoning District.
2. The HR-1 zone is characterized by historic and contemporary homes on one (1) to two (2) lot combinations.
3. The structure on the site was built as a Duplex in 1992 but currently is a single-family dwelling.
4. The single-family dwelling resides on two lots. Lot 5 is 22.7 feet and Lot 6 is 21.5 feet, for a total width of 44.2 feet.
5. The property consists of 4,200 square feet.
6. There is an existing 1,370 square-foot non-historic single-family dwelling on the property.
7. The current structure is 33 feet, which is not compliant with the 1992 LMC or current LMC.
8. The Applicant is requesting a Variance to LMC § 15-2.2-4, to allow the structure to remain at six feet above zone height.

The current LMC requires a 12' Front Setback if the Rear Setback is 13 '.
10. The existing house has a rear Setback of 13 feet and is compliant with the LMC.
11. The existing house is set back from the front property line by 10 feet, which was compliant with the 1992 LMC.
12. Approximately 24 feet of the Deck on the front façade extends 3.65 feet into the front setback, which was not compliant with the 1992 LMC.
13. The Applicant is requesting a Variance to LMC § 15-2.2-3(G) to reduce the current required 12 -foot front yard Setback to 7.35 feet.
14. The current LMC requires a five-foot side setback for lots with widths up to 50 feet.
15. The north side of the structure is compliant with the required side setback in the LMC.
16. The south side of the structure encroaches into the side Setback by 2.65 feet.
17. The Applicant is requesting a Variance to LMC § 15-2.2-3(I) to reduce the required five-foot south side setback to 3.35 feet.
18. Literal enforcement of the LMC would cause an unreasonable hardship for the Applicant that is not necessary to carry out the general purpose of the LMC as there are circumstances specific to this property that are unique and are not conditions general to the neighborhood. Recording old town lots on Plats is a usual and encouraged practice by the City. Without the Variances, the Owner cannot record a Plat. (Criteria 1)
19. There are special circumstances attached to this property that do not generally apply to other properties in the same zone. Without granting the Variances, the Owner cannot record a Plat and cannot make external changes to their Single-Family Dwelling. (Criteria 2)
20. Granting the Variances are essential to the enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone. Granting the Variances allows the property owner to record a Plat, make external changes to their Dwelling, and fully enjoy their property rights. (Criteria 3)
21. The Variances will not substantially affect the General Plan and will not be contrary to the public interest. The proposal is compliant with Goals 1, 7, and 14 of the General Plan. (Criteria 4)
22. The spirit of the Land Management Code is observed, and substantial justice is done. Granting the Variances will allow the applicant to record a Plat and expand their home within the allowed Building Footprint of HR-1 Zone Requirements. (Criteria 5)
23. All other LMC-related site and lot criteria, including the other Setbacks, footprint, parking, Uses, etc. will be met.

## Conclusions of Law

1. Literal enforcement of the HR-1 District requirements for this property causes an unreasonable hardship that is not necessary to carry out the general purpose of the zoning ordinance.
2. There are special circumstances attached to the property that do not generally apply to other properties in the same district.
3. Granting the Variances is essential to the enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone.
4. The proposal is consistent with the General Plan.
5. The spirit of the zoning ordinance is observed by this application.

## Conditions of Approval

1. The Variances are limited to the existing Single-Family Dwelling as built and indicated on the plans submitted with this application dated June 30, 2022, unless otherwise approved with an HDDR approval.
2. Aside from the existing deck, no other structures are allowed in the front Setback. Front Setback Exceptions found in LMC § 15-2.2-3(G) are only allowed under the required zone Setback of 12'. Modification to the front deck, aside from structural repairs, is not allowed, or the owner is required to bring the deck into compliance with the current LMC.
3. Any additions to the south side of the current structure into the South Side Setback are allowed only if approved through the HDDR process and may not exceed the Maximum Building Footprint of the HR-1 zone.
4. The June 20, 2022, plans do not modify the current height of 33 ', and any future changes made to the structure must comply with zone height pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-5.
5. The Applicant shall record a Subdivision Plat for 51 Daly Avenue prior to the issuance of a building permit for any new construction. If a plat amendment is denied, this application shall be void and the structure shall remain regulated by the LMC § 15-9-6 re: non-complying structures.
6. The occupancy/single-family use following the new construction must be compliant with Off-Street parking regulations found in LMC § 15-3-6.
7. The Applicant will need to submit an HDDR application for the proposed design to the Planning Department for review for compliance with the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites prior to the issuance of a Building Permit for the new construction.
8. The Use of this structure shall be limited to Single-Family dwellings.
9. Any new construction must be compliant with the current LMC.

Board Member Wilson seconded the motion.
VOTE: The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

## 6. ADJOURN

Board Member Fuegi moved to ADJOURN. Board Member Franklin seconded the motion. The motion passed with the unanimous consent of the Board.

The Board of Adjustment Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:45 p.m.

Approved by
Ruth Gezelius, Board of Adjustment Chair

## Board of Adjustment Staff Report

## PARK CITY

## Subject:

51 Daly Avenue
Application:
Author:
Date:
PL-22-05280
1884

Type of Item:<br>October 18, 2022<br>Variance- Administrative

Lillian Lederer, Planner I

## Summary

On July 11, 2022, the 51 Daly Avenue Variance Application was reviewed and the Board of Adjustment approved the following:

1. Front Setback - an exception granting the front porch to encroach 3.65 feet in the front Setback;
2. Side Setback - an exception granting the south side of the structure to encroach 1.65 feet into the side Setback;
3. Building Height - an exception granting the maximum Building Height by six feet, pursuant to Land Management Code Section 15-10-8 based on the Draft Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval (Exhibit A).

The Applicant also applied for a Plat Amendment, and during this review, a mistake was noticed in the calculation of the lot size and the allowable maximum building footprint. This report is to record and ratify the following changes the Staff Report and Final Action Letter:

| Zoning | Analysis | Corrected Analysis |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Minimum Lot Size | Required- 1875 sf (for Single Family Dwelling) <br> Complies- 4200 sf | Required- 1875 sf (for Single Family Dwelling) <br> Complies- 4420 sf |
| Maximum Building FootprintDetermined by (LOT AREA/2) x $0.9^{\text {AREA } 1875}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline(4200 / 2) \times 0.9^{4200 / 1875} \\ & 2100 \times 0.9^{2.24} \\ & 2100 \times .789774707104278 \\ & 1658.526884918983 \\ & =7658.53 \text { sf_allod } \\ & \text { Complies- } 1370 \text { sf existing } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (4420 / 2) \times 0.9^{4420 / 1875} \\ & 2210 \times 0.9^{2.357} \\ & 2210 \times .780098773 \\ & 1724.01829 \\ & =1724 \text { sf allowed } \\ & \text { Complies- } 1370 \text { sf existing } \end{aligned}$ |

## Exhibits

Exhibit A: Corrected Final Action Letter

## PARK CITY <br> 1884

July 12, 2022
Patrick Van Horn
PO Box 681084
Park City, UT 84068
(920) 912-7277; patrick@vanhornre.com

## NOTICE OF BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS ACTION

## Description

Address:
Zoning District:
Application:
Project Number:
Action:
Date of Final Action:
Project Summary:

51 Daly Avenue
Historic Residential - 1 (HR-1)
Variance
PL-22-05280
Approved with Conditions
July 12, 2022
A request for Variances from the Front and South Side Setback pursuant to Section 15-2.2-3, and from Maximum Building Height pursuant to Section 15-2.2-4 in order to record a Subdivision Plat of the 51 Daly Avenue site.

## Action Taken

On July 12, 2022, the Board of Adjustments conducted a public hearing and approved the Variances to the existing Single-Family Dwelling according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval.

## Findings of Fact

1. The property is located at 51 Daly Avenue in the Historic Residential-1 (HR-1) Zoning District.
2. The HR-1 zone is characterized by historic and contemporary homes on one (1) to two (2) lot combinations.
3. The structure on the site was built as a Duplex in 1992, but currently is a SingleFamily Dwelling.
4. The Single-Family Dwelling resides on two lots. Lot 5 is 22.7 feet and Lot 6 is 21.5 feet, for a total width of 44.2 feet.
5. The property consists of 4,420 square feet.
6. There is an existing $\sim 1,370$ square foot non-historic Single-Family Dwelling on the property.
7. The current structure is 33 ', which is not compliant with the 1992 LMC or current LMC.
8. The Applicant is requesting a Variance to LMC § 15-2.2-4, to allow the structure to remain at six feet above zone height.
9. The current LMC requires a 12' Front Setback if the Rear Setback is 13'.
10. The existing house has a rear Setback of 13' and is compliant with the LMC.
11. The existing house is set back from the front property line by 10 ', which was compliant with the 1992 LMC.
12. Approximately 24 ' of the Deck on the front façade extends 3.65 ' into the front Setback, which was not compliant with the 1992 LMC.
13. The Applicant is requesting a Variance to LMC § $15-2.2-3(\mathrm{G})$ to reduce the current required 12' front yard Setback to 7.35'.
14. The current LMC requires a 5' Side Setback for Lots with widths up to 50'.
15. The north side of the structure is compliant with the required side Setback in the LMC.
16. The south side of the structure encroaches into the side Setback by 2.65 '.
17. The Applicant is requesting a Variance to LMC § 15-2.2-3(I) to reduce the required 5' South Side Setback to 3.35'.
18. Literal enforcement of the LMC would cause an unreasonable hardship for the Applicant that is not necessary to carry out the general purpose of the LMC as there are circumstances specific to this property that are unique and are not conditions general to the neighborhood. Recording old town lots on Plats is a usual and encouraged practice by the City. Without the Variances, the Owner cannot record a Plat. (Criteria 1)
19. There are special circumstances attached to this property that do not generally apply to other Properties in the same zone. Without granting the Variances, the Owner cannot record a Plat and cannot make external changes to their SingleFamily Dwelling. (Criteria 2)
20. Granting the Variances are essential to the enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone. Granting the Variances allows the property owner to record a Plat, to make external changes to their Dwelling, and fully enjoy their property rights. (Criteria 3)
21. The Variances will not substantially affect the General Plan and will not be contrary to public interest. The proposal is compliant with Goals 1, 7, and 14 of the General Plan. (Criteria 4)
22. The spirit of the Land Management Code is observed, and substantial justice is done. Granting the Variances will allow the applicant to record a Plat and expand their home within the allowed Building Footprint of HR-1 Zone Requirement's. (Criteria 5)
23. All other LMC related site and lot criteria, including the other Setbacks, footprint, parking, Uses, etc. will be met.

## Conclusions of Law

1. Literal enforcement of the HR-1 District requirements for this property causes an unreasonable hardship that is not necessary to carry out the general purpose of the zoning ordinance.
2. There are special circumstances attached to the property that do not generally apply to other properties in the same district.
3. Granting the Variances is essential to the enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same zone.
4. The proposal is consistent with the General Plan.
5. The spirit of the zoning ordinance is observed by this application.

## Condition of Approval

1. The Variances are limited to the existing Single-Family Dwelling as built, and indicated on the plans submitted with this application dated June 30, 2022, unless otherwise approved with an HDDR approval.
2. Aside from the existing deck, no other structures allowed in the front Setback. Front Setback Exceptions found in LMC § 15-2.2-3(G) are only allowed under the required zone Setback of 12 '. Modification to the front deck, aside from structural repairs, is not allowed, or the owner is required to bring the deck into compliance with current LMC.
3. Subject to approval of an HDDR, the Applicant may construct additional square footage that follows the existing structure, adjacent to the south property line, not to exceed the approved variance south side setback of 3.35 feet. The Applicant shall not exceed the maximum allowed building footprint of 1724 square feet.
4. The June 20, 2022, plans do not modify the current height of 33 ', and any future changes made to the structure must comply with zone height pursuant to LMC § 15-2.2-5.
5. The Applicant shall record a Subdivision Plat for 51 Daly Avenue prior to the issuance of a building permit for any new construction. If a plat amendment is denied, this application shall be void and the structure shall remain regulated by the LMC § 15-9-6 re: non-complying structures.
6. The occupancy/single family use following the new construction must be compliant with Off-Street parking regulations found in LMC § 15-3-6.
7. The Applicant will need to submit an HDDR application for the proposed design to the Planning Department for review for compliance with the Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites prior to the issuance of a building permit for the new construction
8. The Use of this structure shall be limited to Single-Family Dwelling.
9. Any new construction must be compliant with the current LMC.

If you have questions or concerns regarding this Final Action Letter, please call 435-615-5068 or email lillian.lederer@parkcity.org

Sincerely,

Ruth Gezelius
Board of Adjustments, Chair
CC: Lillian Lederer, Planner I

## Board of Adjustment Staff Report

| Subject: | 1750 Kearns Boulevard <br> Park City High School Addition |
| :--- | :--- |
| Application: | PL-22-05393 |
| Author: | Rebecca Ward |
| Date: | October 18, 2022 |
| Type of Item: | Variance - Building Height |

## PARK CITY

## Recommendation

Review the Applicant's request for a Variance from the Recreation Open Space Zoning District Building Height regulations for an addition to the Park City High School, conduct a public hearing, and consider approving the Variance, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the draft Final Action Letter (Exhibit A).

## Description

| Applicant: | Park City School District, represented by Todd Hansen |
| :--- | :--- |
| Location: | 1750 Kearns Boulevard - Park City High School <br> Parcel PCA-2-2300-X (38.97 acres) |
| Zoning District: | Recreation Open Space <br> Frontage Protection Zone |
| Adjacent Land Uses: | Aspen Villas, Parkside, and Holiday Village Multi-Unit <br> Dwellings, LDS Church, Holiday Ranchettes, Park <br> Meadows and Prospector Village Subdivisions, Recreation <br> Fields, McPolin Elementary School, Treasure Mountain <br> Junior High, and Park City Learning Center |
| Reason for Review: | The Board of Adjustment hears and decides Variances from <br> the terms of the Land Management Code |

CUP Conditional Use Permit
LMC Land Management Code
PCSD Park City School District
Terms that are capitalized as proper nouns throughout this staff report are defined in LMC § 15-15-1.

[^0]
## Summary

The Park City School District (PCSD) Campus includes the Park City High School (1750 Kearns Boulevard), McPolin Elementary (2270 Kearns Boulevard), Treasure Mountain Junior High ( 2530 Kearns Boulevard), and Park City Learning Center (2400 Kearns Boulevard) on 83.92 acres north of S.R. 224 and east of Monitor Drive.


The Applicant proposes constructing a 128,000-square-foot three-story addition to the west side of the Park City High School with a maximum height of 47 feet and six inches.


The PCSD Campus is in the Recreation Open Space (ROS) Zoning District. ${ }^{2}$ The maximum building height in the ROS Zoning District is 28 feet. ${ }^{3}$ The existing High School is 45 to 67 feet in height. The Applicant requests the Board of Adjustment consider granting a Variance from the 28-foot building height in the ROS Zoning District to allow an increase of 19 feet six inches for a total height of 47 feet six inches for consistency of design and reduced impacts to open space.

## Background

In the Recreation Open Space Zoning District, schools require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and Planning Commission review. ${ }^{4}$ The Applicant submitted a CUP application, scheduled for Planning Commission review on October 26, 2022. However, LMC § 15-1-11(B) requires the Board of Adjustment to review Variances prior to Planning Commission review of a CUP.

The Planning Commission issued two CUPs for the development of the PCSD Campus. On June 27, 1990, the Planning Commission approved a CUP for:

- a new elementary school (McPolin Elementary - 56,000 square feet)
- a high school expansion (32,000 additional square feet and locker room addition to the gym)
- 60 additional parking spaces (PL-90-00106)

On April 23, 2008, the Planning Commission approved a CUP for Park City High School to enhance interior function, energy efficiency, exterior appearance, and water conservation (PL-07-00181). The 2008 approval increased the Park City High School square footage by 20,000 but reduced the overall building footprint by 8,000 square feet due to the addition of second-story classrooms. The 2008 approval also included 65 additional parking spaces and replaced 174,760 square feet of irrigated area with a synthetic turf athletic field.

The 2008 Planning Commission Final Action Letter included Condition of Approval 8, which requires the PCSD to pursue a Variance or Master Planned Development for additions that exceed Zoning District Height:

No additional remodels may be constructed that do not conform to the height of the zone, unless appropriately approved by the Board of
Adjustment as a Variance or special exception, or by the Planning Commission per LMC Section 15-6-5(F) MPD - additional building height.

As a result, the Applicant requests Board of Adjustment review and approval.

## Analysis

Applicants may request the Board of Adjustment consider granting a Variance from the

[^1]terms of the Land Management Code (LMC). ${ }^{5}$ The Board of Adjustment may grant a Variance if five criteria are met:

- (1) Literal enforcement of the LMC would cause an unreasonable hardship for the Applicant that is not necessary to carry out the general purpose of the LMC
- (2) There are special circumstances attached to the property that do not generally apply to other properties in the same Zoning District
- (3) Granting the Variance is essential to the enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same Zoning District
- (4) The Variance will not substantially affect the General Plan and will not be contrary to the public interest
- (5) The spirit of the LMC is observed, and substantial justice is done

Each criterion is outlined below with staff analysis. LMC § 15-10-8(E) requires the Applicant to "bear the burden of proving that all of the conditions justifying a Variance have been met." Please see Exhibit B to review the Applicant's justifications for the Variance request.
(1) Literal enforcement of the Land Management Code would cause an unreasonable hardship for the Applicant that is not necessary to carry out the general purpose of the Land Management Code

The general purposes of the LMC are:

- To promote the general health, safety, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants, businesses, and visitors of the City
- To protect and enhance the vitality of the City's resort-based economy, the overall quality of life, the historic character, and unique mountain town community
- To protect and preserve peace and good order, comfort, convenience, and aesthetics of the City
- To protect the tax base and to secure economy in governmental expenditures
- To allow development in a manner that encourages the preservation of environmentally sensitive lands, historic structures, the integrity of historic districts, and the unique urban scale of original Park City
- To provide for well-planned commercial and residential centers, safe and efficient traffic and pedestrian circulation, preservation of night skies, and efficient delivery of municipal services
- To prevent development that adds to existing geologic hazards, erosion, flooding, degradation of air quality, wildfire danger or other conditions that create potential dangers to life and safety in the community or that detracts from the quality of life in the community
- To protect and ensure access to sunlight for solar energy systems

[^2]- To protect or promote moderate income housing ${ }^{6}$

The Applicant finds that "[i]t is the opinion of the architect of record that the exceeded height has no detriment to public health, safety or welfare. Given the existing structure has been in operation since the 1980's with a similar height above grade, considerations should be given for a variance."

Additional building height consolidates density to preserve open space. According to the Applicant, "[g]iven the limiting site conditions and the desire by the District/community to preserve as much open area around the building, the most economic and aesthetically consistent location for the expansion was to the west of the existing building . . . This location eliminated the need to relocate Kearns field and limited impact to the north/south of the property . . . the additional height . . . . allows for a third level to be added to the addition and maximizes land use on a very tight site."

A building height Variance allows for consistent building design. The existing Eccles Theater in the Park City High School is 67 feet in height; the 2008 addition that fronts Kearns Boulevard is 45 feet high. According to the Applicant, "[ t$] \mathrm{his}$ new addition height cohesively connects to the existing conditions while being extremely sensitive to the aesthetics associated with tying into an existing structure. It is the design teams belief that the height of the new building addition is necessary to achieve a cohesive appearance (avoid the look of an addition) for the school campus."

The Park City High School addition is not in the Sensitive Land Overlay or Frontage Protection Zone. While some portions of the PCSD Campus are within the Sensitive Land Overlay (Treasure Mountain Junior High), the Park City High School is not. The front portion of the Park City High School parcel along Kearns Boulevard is within the Frontage Protection Zone, which requires additional setbacks and landscape buffers between development and highway uses. However, the proposed addition is to the rear of the Park City High School and will not require construction within the Frontage Protection Zone.

## (2) There are special circumstances attached to the property that do not generally apply to other properties in the same Zoning District

Development of schools in Utah are subject to state regulations and limited municipal regulations. Utah Code § 10-9a-305(1)(a) requires a school district to conform to local land use regulations. However, Utah Code § 10-9a-305(3) prohibits municipalities from applying certain land use regulations to school districts, including:

- landscaping
- fencing
- aesthetic considerations
- construction methods or materials

[^3]- additional building inspections
- municipal building codes
- building use for educational purposes
- placement or use of temporary classroom facilities on school property

While the City is limited in aesthetic considerations, building height that exceeds the Recreation Open Space Zoning District regulations allows for an addition that consolidates density to protect open space and results in consistent design with the existing High School. The Eccles Theater within the High School is 67 feet in height; the 2008 addition that fronts Kearns Boulevard is 45 feet high. According to the Applicant, " $[t]$ his new addition height cohesively connects to the existing conditions while being extremely sensitive to the aesthetics associated with tying into an existing structure. It is the design teams belief that the height of the new building addition is necessary to achieve a cohesive appearance (avoid the look of an addition) for the school campus."

## (3) Granting the Variance is essential to the enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same Zoning District

In 1985, PCSD applied to annex what was then the Treasure Mountain Middle School into Park City (PL-85-00026). On October 3, 1985, the City Council enacted Ordinance No. 85-11, annexing the PCSD property and zoning the property ROS (Exhibit C).

The purposes of the ROS Zoning District are to:

- Establish and preserve districts for land uses requiring substantial areas of open land covered with vegetation and substantially free from structures, streets, and parking lots
- Permit recreational uses and preserve recreational open space
- Encourage parks, golf courses, trails and other compatible public or private recreational uses
- Preserve and enhance environmentally sensitive lands, such as wetlands, steep slopes, ridge lines, meadows, stream corridors, and forests
- Encourage sustainability, conservation, and renewable energy ${ }^{7}$

The LMC anticipates development of schools in the ROS Zoning District and establishes schools as a CUP with review and approval by the Planning Commission. ${ }^{8}$ When the Planning Commission considers CUP applications, the Commission evaluates 16 criteria, including building mass, bulk, and orientation, and the location of buildings on the site, including orientation to buildings on adjoining lots. ${ }^{9}$ Additionally, the Planning Commission reviews the physical design and compatibility with surrounding structures in mass, scale, style, design, and architectural detailing. ${ }^{10}$

[^4]As mentioned above, according to the Applicant, " $[\mathrm{t}]$ his new addition height cohesively connects to the existing conditions while being extremely sensitive to the aesthetics associated with tying into an existing structure. It is the design teams belief that the height of the new building addition is necessary to achieve a cohesive appearance (avoid the look of an addition) for the school campus."
(4) The Variance will not substantially affect the General Plan and will not be contrary to the public interest

The PCSD Campus is in the Park Meadows Neighborhood of the General Plan and the General Plan identifies the PCSD Campus as a neighborhood icon. ${ }^{11}$ According to the General Plan, the Park Meadows Neighborhood has mostly primary residents and the PCSD Campus serves as a community amenity. "Creating community amenities close to residential neighborhoods is essential to maintaining community while decreasing Vehicle Miles Traveled." ${ }^{12}$ The proposed Park City High School addition allows for clustered density to serve Park City students in an area of the community in which many primary residents live.

Goal 4 of the General Plan is to conserve a connected, healthy network of open space for continued access to and respect for the natural setting. ${ }^{13}$ Objective 4B is to buffer entry corridors from development and protect mountain vistas to enhance the natural setting, quality of life, and visitor experience. ${ }^{14}$ The PCSD Campus that fronts Kearns Boulevard is within the Frontage Protection Zone, which extends beyond Kearns into the property 100 feet. ${ }^{15}$ The proposed High School addition is in the rear of the property and will not increase the presence of the High School within the Frontage Protection Zone.

Community Planning Strategy 5.8 is to encourage energy efficiencies in construction including: infill, preservation, adaptive reuse, and redevelopment. ${ }^{16}$ According to the Applicant, the proposed building mass "is arranged to preserve open space around the building and provide a thermally efficient structure. The result of this stacked design allows the new building to achieve a targeted EUI (energy usage intensity) of 35 whereas the current facility has a calculated EUI of 84 . This system will not only save the District operating costs but is also a more sustainable approach which aligns with the city's energy goals. The building orientation and height is also anticipated to aid in the eventual installation of PV panels on the roof."
(5) The spirit of the Land Management Code is observed, and substantial justice is done

[^5]The proposal preserves open space, consolidates density, protects the Frontage Protection Zone, allows for an expansion consistent with existing height, and creates a more efficient building performance.

## Department Review

The Planning Department, Engineering Department, and City Attorney's Office reviewed this application.

## Notice

Staff published notice on the City's website and the Utah Public Notice website on September 28, 2022 and the Park Record published notice on September 28, 2022. Staff posted notice to the property and mailed courtesy notice to property owners within 300 feet on October 3, 2022. ${ }^{17}$

## Public Input

Staff did not receive any public input at the time this report was published.

## Alternatives

- The Board of Adjustment may grant the Variance and allow for an addition that is 47 feet six inches in height;
- The Board of Adjustment may deny the Variance and direct staff to make Findings for the denial; or
- The Board of Adjustment may request additional information and continue the discussion to a date certain.


## Exhibits

Exhibit A: Draft Final Action Letter
Exhibit B: Applicant's Narrative
Exhibit C: Ordinance No. 85-11
Exhibit D: 2008 Conditional Use Permit
Exhibit E: Site Diagram
Exhibit F: Proposed Plans

[^6]October 18, 2022
Park City School District
2700 Kearns Boulevard
(435) 645-5600

CC: Todd Hansen

## NOTICE OF BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ACTION

## Description

Address:

Zoning District: Recreation Open Space Frontage Protection Zone

Application: Building Height Variance
Project Number: PL-22-05393
Action:

## APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS (See Below)

Date of Final Action: October 18, 2022
Project Summary: The Applicant requests a Variance to construct an addition that is 47 feet six inches in height in the Recreation Open Space Zoning District.

## Action Taken

On October 18, 2022, the Board of Adjustment conducted a public hearing and approved the Building Height Variance according to the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval:

## Findings of Fact

1. The Park City School District (PCSD) Campus is in the Recreation Open Space (ROS) Zoning District.
2. The PCSD Campus includes the Park City High School (1750 Kearns Boulevard), McPolin Elementary ( 2270 Kearns Boulevard), Treasure Mountain

# PARK CITY <br> 1884 <br> Planning Department 

Junior High (2530 Kearns Boulevard), and Park City Learning Center (2400 Kearns Boulevard) on 83.92 acres north of S.R. 224 and east of Monitor Drive.
3. The Applicant proposes constructing a 128,000 -square-foot three-story addition to the west side of the Park City High School with a maximum height of 47 feet and six inches.
4. The maximum building height in the ROS Zoning District is 28 feet.
5. The existing High School is 45 to 67 feet in height.
6. The Applicant requests the Board of Adjustment grant a Variance from the 28foot building height in the ROS Zoning District to allow an increase of 19 feet six inches for a total height of 47 feet six inches for consistency of design and reduced impacts to open space.
7. In the ROS Zoning District, schools require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and Planning Commission review.
8. The Applicant submitted a CUP application, scheduled for Planning Commission review on October 26, 2022.
9. LMC § 15-1-11(B) requires the Board of Adjustment to review Variances prior to Planning Commission review of a CUP.
10. Previously, the Planning Commission issued two CUPs for the development of the PCSD Campus.
a. On June 27, 1990, the Planning Commission approved a CUP for a new elementary school (McPolin Elementary - 56,000 square feet); a high school expansion ( 32,000 additional square feet and locker room addition to the gym); 60 additional parking spaces (PL-90-00106).
b. On April 23, 2008, the Planning Commission approved a CUP for Park City High School to enhance interior function, energy efficiency, exterior appearance, and water conservation (PL-07-00181). The 2008 approval increased the Park City High School square footage by 20,000 but reduced the overall building footprint by 8,000 square feet due to the addition of second-story classrooms. The 2008 approval also included 65 additional parking spaces and replaced 174,760 square feet of irrigated area with a synthetic turf athletic field.
i. The 2008 Planning Commission Final Action Letter included Condition of Approval 8, which requires the PCSD to pursue a Variance or Master Planned Development for additions that exceed Zoning District Height: No additional remodels may be constructed that do not conform to the height of the zone, unless appropriately
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approved by the Board of Adjustment as a Variance or special exception, or by the Planning Commission per LMC Section 15-65(F) MPD - additional building height.
11.The Board of Adjustment may grant a Variance if five criteria are met:
a. Literal enforcement of the LMC would cause an unreasonable hardship for the Applicant that is not necessary to carry out the general purpose of the LMC.
b. There are special circumstances attached to the property that do not generally apply to other properties in the same Zoning District.
c. Granting the Variance is essential to the enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same Zoning District.
d. The Variance will not substantially affect the General Plan and will not be contrary to the public interest.
e. The spirit of the LMC is observed, and substantial justice is done.
12. LMC § $15-10-8(\mathrm{E})$ requires the Applicant to bear the burden of proving that all of the conditions justifying a Variance have been met.
13. The general purposes of the LMC are:
a. To promote the general health, safety, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants, businesses, and visitors of the City
b. To protect and enhance the vitality of the City's resort-based economy, the overall quality of life, the historic character, and unique mountain town community
c. To protect and preserve peace and good order, comfort, convenience, and aesthetics of the City
d. To protect the tax base and to secure economy in governmental expenditures
e. To allow development in a manner that encourages the preservation of environmentally sensitive lands, historic structures, the integrity of historic districts, and the unique urban scale of original Park City
f. To provide for well-planned commercial and residential centers, safe and efficient traffic and pedestrian circulation, preservation of night skies, and efficient delivery of municipal services
g. To prevent development that adds to existing geologic hazards, erosion, flooding, degradation of air quality, wildfire danger or other conditions that create potential dangers to life and safety in the community or that detracts from the quality of life in the community
h. To protect and ensure access to sunlight for solar energy systems
i. To protect or promote moderate income housing
14. The Board agrees with the Applicant's assertion that "that the exceeded height has no detriment to public health, safety or welfare. Given the existing structure
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has been in operation since the 1980's with a similar height above grade, considerations should be given for a variance."
15. Additional building height consolidates density to preserve open space. The Board further adopts the Applicant's assertions in the analysis section of the staff report regarding the limiting site conditions and the desire by the PCSD and community to preserve open area around the PCSD Campus.
16. A building height Variance allows for consistent building design consistent with the General Plan. The existing Eccles Theater in the Park City High School is 67 feet in height; the 2008 addition that fronts Kearns Boulevard is 45 feet high. The Board agrees and finds " $[\mathrm{t}]$ his new addition height cohesively connects to the existing conditions while being extremely sensitive to the aesthetics associated with tying into an existing structure . . . . [and] the height of the new building addition is necessary to achieve a cohesive appearance (avoid the look of an addition) for the school campus."
17. The Park City High School addition is not in the Sensitive Land Overlay or Frontage Protection Zone. While some portions of the PCSD Campus are within the Sensitive Land Overlay (Treasure Mountain Junior High), the Park City High School is not. The front portion of the Park City High School parcel along Kearns Boulevard is within the Frontage Protection Zone, which requires additional setbacks and landscape buffers between development and highway uses. However, the proposed addition is to the rear of the Park City High School and will not require construction within the Frontage Protection Zone.
18. Development of schools in Utah is subject to state regulations and limited municipal regulations. Utah Code § 10-9a-305(1)(a) requires a school district to conform to local land use regulations. However, Utah Code § 10-9a-305(3) prohibits municipalities from applying certain land use regulations to school districts, including:
a. landscaping
b. fencing
c. aesthetic considerations
d. construction methods or materials
e. additional building inspections
f. municipal building codes
g. building use for educational purposes
h. placement or use of temporary classroom facilities on school property
19. While the City is limited in aesthetic considerations, building height that exceeds the Recreation Open Space Zoning District regulations allows for an addition that
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consolidates density to protect open space and results in consistent design with the existing High School. The Eccles Theater within the High School is 67 feet in height; the 2008 addition that fronts Kearns Boulevard is 45 feet high.
20. In 1985, PCSD applied to annex what was then the Treasure Mountain Middle School into Park City (PL-85-00026). On October 3, 1985, the City Council enacted Ordinance No. 85-11, annexing the PCSD property and zoning the property ROS.
21. The purposes of the ROS Zoning District are to:
a. Establish and preserve districts for land uses requiring substantial areas of open land covered with vegetation and substantially free from structures, streets, and parking lots
b. Permit recreational uses and preserve recreational open space
c. Encourage parks, golf courses, trails and other compatible public or private recreational uses
d. Preserve and enhance environmentally sensitive lands, such as wetlands, steep slopes, ridge lines, meadows, stream corridors, and forests
e. Encourage sustainability, conservation, and renewable energy
22. The LMC anticipates development of schools in the ROS Zoning District and establishes schools as a CUP with review and approval by the Planning Commission.
23. When the Planning Commission considers CUP applications, the Commission evaluates 16 criteria, including building mass, bulk, and orientation, and the location of buildings on the site, including orientation to buildings on adjoining lots.
24. Additionally, the Planning Commission reviews the physical design and compatibility with surrounding structures in mass, scale, style, design, and architectural detailing. The Planning Commission is scheduled to review these factors on October 26, 2022.
25. The PCSD Campus is in the Park Meadows Neighborhood of the General Plan and the General Plan identifies the PCSD Campus as a neighborhood icon.
26. According to the General Plan, the Park Meadows Neighborhood has mostly primary residents and the PCSD Campus serves as a community amenity.
27. The proposed Park City High School addition allows for clustered density to serve Park City students in an area of the community in which many primary residents live.
28. Goal 4 of the General Plan is to conserve a connected, healthy network of open space for continued access to and respect for the natural setting.
29. Objective 4B is to buffer entry corridors from development and protect mountain vistas to enhance the natural setting, quality of life, and visitor experience.
30. The PCSD Campus that fronts Kearns Boulevard is within the Frontage Protection Zone, which extends beyond Kearns into the property 100 feet.
31. The proposed High School addition is in the rear of the property and will not increase the presence of the High School within the Frontage Protection Zone.
32. Community Planning Strategy 5.8 is to encourage energy efficiencies in construction including: infill, preservation, adaptive reuse, and redevelopment.
33. The Board agrees with the Applicant submittal and finds the proposed building mass "is arranged to preserve open space around the building and provide a thermally efficient structure. The result of this stacked design allows the new building to achieve a targeted EUI (energy usage intensity) of 35 whereas the current facility has a calculated EUI of 84 . This system will not only save the District operating costs but is also a more sustainable approach which aligns with the city's energy goals. The building orientation and height is also anticipated to aid in the eventual installation of PV panels on the roof."
34. The proposal preserves open space, consolidates density, protects the Frontage Protection Zone, allows for an expansion consistent with existing height, and creates a more efficient building performance.

## Conclusions of Law

1. Literal enforcement of the LMC would cause an unreasonable hardship for the Applicant that is not necessary to carry out the general purpose of the LMC
2. There are special circumstances attached to the property that do not generally apply to other properties in the same Zoning District
3. Granting the Variance is essential to the enjoyment of a substantial property right possessed by other property in the same Zoning District
4. The Variance will not substantially affect the General Plan and will not be contrary to the public interest
5. The spirit of the LMC is observed, and substantial justice is done

## Conditions of Approval

1. All standard project conditions apply as outlined by Utah Code.
2. A Conditional Use Permit approval from the Planning Commission is required prior to project construction.
3. This Variance is limited to the plans dated August 2, 2022 and attached as Exhibit F and shall not apply to the entire property.

If you have questions or concerns regarding this Final Action Letter, please call (435) 615-5060 or email planning@parkcity.org.

Sincerely,

# PARK CITY 

1884
Planning Department

Board of Adjustment Chair

Please refer to the information below in regard to the requested heigh variance for the Park City High School Addition project. A couple of items should be considered:

- The existing Park City High School has operated in its current location since the early 1980's. A major addition/renovation was completed in 2008 that addressed additional classroom needs and reworked the street frontage of the building.
- The goal of the current project is to add additional capacity at the school to bring in an additional 400 students and support faculty/staff currently housed at Treasure Mountain Middle School. Given the limiting site conditions and the desire by the District/community to preserve as much open area around the building, the most economic and aesthetically consistent location for the expansion was to the west of the existing building.
- The western portion of the existing building is to be demolished to provide space for the new 3 story addition. This location eliminated the need to relocate Kearns field and limited impact to the north/south of the property. Care was given to understand how the new structures could tie into the existing building to create a seamless, aesthetically pleasing design for the entire building. Materials used for the addition compliment and match the existing conditions where possible to create a unified building.
- The proposed building addition has a max height above grade of 47-6". The additional height above the allowable $28^{\prime}$ outlined in the article 15-2.7.4 for Recreation and Open Space District allows for a third level to be added to the addition and maximizes land use on a very tight site. From a land use standpoint this reduced the need to add additional program space to the south and north, which limits the impact to the existing visual feel along Kearns and Luck John.
- It is important to note that the original 1980 structure has a maximum overall height of 67' for the fly loft portion of the Eccles Theater and a max height of 45' at the 2008 classroom wings that front Kearns Boulevard. This new addition height cohesively connects to the existing conditions while being extremely sensitive to the aesthetics associated with tying into an existing structure. It is the design teams belief that the height of the new building addition is necessary to achieve a cohesive appearance (avoid the look of an addition) for the school campus.
- The mass of the building is arranged to preserve open space around the building and provide a thermally efficient structure. The result of this stacked design allows the new building to achieve a targeted EUI (energy usage intensity) of 35 whereas the current facility has a calculated EUI of 84. This system will not only save the District operating costs but is also a more sustainable approach which aligns with the city's energy goals. The building orientation and height is also anticipated to aid in the eventual installation of PV panels on the roof.
- All setbacks for the existing and new structures align with indicated code values (25' per 152.7.3). The proposed addition would sit 349' off the south property line (currently 395') and 110' of the north property line (currently 196')
- It is the opinion of the architect of record that the exceeded height has no detriment to public health, safety or welfare. Given the existing structure has been in operation since the 1980's with a similar height above grade, consideration should be given for a variance.

Ordinance No. 85-11

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE
OFFICIAL PARK CITY ZONING MAP AND REGARDING THE ZONING OF THE TREASURE MOUNTAIN MIDDLE SCHOOL PROPERTY

WHEREAS, the Board of Education of the Park City School District has petitioned for the annexation of the Treasure Mountain Middle School parcel containing forty acres into Park City, and the City has agreed to the annexation; and

WHEREAS, in the annexation agreement between these parties the zoning was agreed to, and

WHEREAS, public hearings on the zoning were held concurrently with the public hearings on the annexation, and a zoning ordinance needs to be adopted now that the property has been annexed,

NOW, THEREFORE, be it ordained by the City Council of Park City, Utah as follows:

SECTION 1. The Official Zoning Map of Park City should be and is hereby amended to include the forty acre Treasure Mountain Middle School property within the City limits and to zone the property as follows:

ROS Land - except as noted below, all of the forty acre parcel shall be zoned ROS.

Beginning at the Southwest corner of Section 3, Township 2 South, Range 4 East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian, and running thence North $0^{\circ} 18^{\prime} 38^{\prime \prime}$ East along the Section line 2094.98 feet; thence South $89^{\circ} 41^{\prime} 22^{\prime \prime}$ East 322.59 feet; thence South $30^{\circ} 06^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ East 135.50
feet; thence South $7^{\circ} 39^{\prime} 03^{\prime \prime}$ East 239.50 feet; thence South $29^{\circ} 20^{\prime} 53^{\prime \prime}$ East 701.07 feet; thence South $28^{\circ} 55^{\prime} 47^{\prime \prime}$ East 842.01 feet; thence South 52 $2^{\circ} 48^{\prime} 40^{\prime \prime}$ East 181.41 feet; thence South 219.86 feet to a point on the Northerly right of way line of State Highway U-248; thence along said Northerly right of way line South $84^{\circ} 16^{\prime} 00^{\prime \prime}$ West 1336.0 feet to a point East, Salt Lake Base and Meridian; thence North $0^{\circ} 04^{\prime} 58^{\prime \prime}$ East along said Section line 72.40 feet to the point of beginning. Contains 40.0 acres.

RD Parcel - That portion of the Middle School property located north of the center line of the proposed Meadows Drive extension, which is described in that Special Warranty Deed from the Park City School District Board of Education to Park City Municipal Corporation dated September 30, 1985 and recorded in the office of the Summit County Recorder October 1, 1985, as shown on the attached copy of the deed.

SECTION 2. This Ordinance shall take effect upon publication.

Dated this 3rd. of October, 1985.


Attest:
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Conditional Use Permit- High School Remodel
Kirsten A. Whetstone, AICP
April 23, 2008
Administrative- Conditional Use Permit

PLANNING
DEPARTMENT

## Summary Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and considers granting a Conditional Use Permit for the High School remodel, according to the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval stated in this staff report.

## Description

Applicant: Location:
Zoning:
Adjacent Land Uses:
Reasons for Review: A Conditional Use Permit requires Planning Commission review and approval.

## Background

On August 23, 2007, the City received an application for a Conditional Use Permit for a remodel of the Park City High School. (Exhibit A) Additional information was provided on October 16, 2007, January 15, 2008, and February 28, 2008 (Exhibit B). The project is located within the Recreation Open Space (ROS) zoning district, where schools require a Conditional Use Permit. The request is for a remodel and upgrade to the Park City High School building to make it more functional, energy efficient, and modern on the interior and more attractive on the exterior. Amendments to the parking lots and pedestrian circulation areas are part of the remodel. The remodel also includes upgrades to Dozer field.

A Conditional Use Permit is required for school uses located within the ROS zone. In 1997 various additions to the school were constructed, including the Eccles Center for the Performing Arts. The school is considered a legal non-conforming use. In the past, the City and the District have agreed to disagree over permit requirements under prior state law. Recent amendments to state law clarified that the district needs a CUP and the District agreed to submit a CUP under a reservation of rights.

According to Utah State Code, one of the items that a school district must provide to the local municipal or county building official is "evidence that the local municipality or county has reviewed and approved the project within parameters set in statute 10-9a305 Utah Code for municipalities." Other required items include: plan review by a
certified plans examiner, structural peer review of the plans, energy code review, review of plans by the State Fire Marshal's office, evidence that geologic and seismic hazards have been considered at the proposed site for all new construction, a listing of all inspectors (with their certifications and license numbers) who will be providing inspections, monthly summaries of construction, and a final inspection certificate to be sent to the local municipality.

Planning Commission review of this Conditional Use Permit application satisfies the first requirement. City Building Department officials are working with the school district to address the other requirements. Under state law, building inspections are permitted to be done by inspectors other than the local building department.

Utah Code Section 10-9a-305 includes the following language:
(3) A municipality may not:
(a) impose requirements for landscaping, fencing, aesthetic considerations, construction methods or materials, additional building inspections, municipal building codes, building use for educational purposes, or the placement or use of temporary classroom facilities on school property;
(b) except as otherwise provided in this section, require a school district or charter school to participate in the cost of any roadway or sidewalk, or a study on the impact of a school on a roadway or sidewalk, that is not reasonably necessary for the safety of school children and not located on or contiguous to school property, unless the roadway or sidewalk is required to connect an otherwise isolated school site to an existing roadway;
(c) require a district or charter school to pay fees not authorized by this section;
(d) provide for inspection of school construction or assess a fee or other charges for inspection, unless the school district or charter school is unable to provide for inspection by an inspector, other than the project architect or contractor, who is qualified under criteria established by the state superintendent;
(e) require a school district or charter school to pay any impact fee for an improvement project unless the impact fee is imposed as provided in Title 11, Chapter 36, Impact Fees Act; or
(f) impose regulations upon the location of a project except as necessary to avoid unreasonable risks to health or safety.

## Analysis

The applicant is requesting review of a CUP for remodel and reconstruction of the Park City High School. The remodel includes:

1) upgrades to the interior classrooms, common areas, lab rooms, bathrooms, and hallways;
2) increase in the total floor area by about 20,000 sf due primarily to upgrades to hallways and common areas;
3) reduction in the building foot print by about 8,000 sf due to addition of second story classrooms;
4) pedestrian circulation improvements on and off site, with relocation of the pedestrian

crossing of SR 248 and additional on-site walkways;
5) parking lot and vehicular access improvements including removing and relocating access points and the addition of 65 parking spaces;
6) increase in building setback from Kearns by 44 feet;
7) exterior architectural upgrades and building efficiency upgrades; and
8) reduction of irrigation area by 174,760 sf due to installation of a synthetic turf athletic field.

## Land Management Code

A school is a conditional use in the Recreation Open Space (ROS) zoning district. The following are the minimum lot and site requirements per the Land Management Code for development within the ROS zoning district:

$314+1$


## Conditional Use Review

Staff has reviewed the proposed Conditional Use Permit with respect to the conditional use review criteria as outlined in LMC 15-1-10 as follows:

1. Size and location of the site: No unmitigated impacts. The project is located on a 29 acre site located adjacent to Kearns Blvd, SR 248. The site is large enough to accommodate the remodel and provide 60\% landscaped/soft surface open space. The existing school is 291,987 sf and the proposed remodel will result in
$314,117 \mathrm{sf}$. The increased floor area is primarily due to improvements in the circulation and common areas/labs/special use areas. According to the School District, the actual student capacity is not increased. The building is setback beyond the 100' FPZ required setback on Kearns.
2. Traffic considerations: No unmitigated impacts. Access plans were approved by UDOT in June of 2007. The project will not contribute additional traffic as the number of students and staff is not increased. There are approximately 40 additional parking spaces which should remove some existing student traffic and parking in the Prospector neighborhood. Access to the site and vehicular circulation been redesigned to create a more efficient flow and decrease some of the conflicts currently occurring on Kearns Blvd. The School District is separately participating in Traffic Committee with UDOT and the City. An improved school drop off area has been constructed on Lucky John Drive as part of the walkability program to mitigate impacts of parent drop off and pick up activities. The Park City transit system provides free bus service to the Park City High School.
3. Utility capacity: No unmitigated impacts. According to the School District, no additional utility capacity is required for this project. Installation of synthetic turf at Dozer Field will reduce the irrigated area by 174,760 sf. As built plans should be provided to the City and District from the contractor for future reference.
4. Emergency vehicle access: No unmitigated impacts. All IBC and Fire Code access requirements are anticipated to be met prior to final inspection by the City Building Officials.
5. Location and amount of off-street parking: No unmitigated impacts. The proposed increase in parking spaces reduces existing impacts on the surrounding neighborhood for both school and Eccles Center uses. The District employs a staff and student parking plan to mitigate impacts of parking on the neighborhood.
6. Internal circulation system: No unmitigated impacts. The proposed internal circulation system has been improved to accommodate more efficient school bus drop off and flow of vehicles and pedestrians. Access points have been relocated as well. Pedestrian crossing of SR 248 has been relocated to improve pedestrian circulation.
7. Fencing, screening and landscaping to separate uses: No unmitigated impacts. Fencing is not proposed at this time. Final landscaping of the site will be provided by the School District upon completion of all construction.
8. Building mass, bulk, orientation and the location on site, including orientation to adjacent buildings or lots: No unmitigated impacts. The proposed school remodel increases the setback to Kearns Blvd, introduces pitched roofs and upgraded exterior materials and architectural character. The mass and bulk of the school is mitigated by the architectural design and orientation of buildings.
9. Usable open space: No unmitigated impacts. The High School site includes 60\% Landscaped Open Space, primarily athletic fields, with approximately 14\% of the site covered by building footprint and $26 \%$ of the site covered by other hard surface, such as parking, sidewalks, and plaza areas. The open space is highly functional and useable.
10. Signs and lighting: No unmitigated impacts. Signs for the High School will be
reviewed by the Planning Department for compliance with the Sign Code. All lighting is proposed to be shielded and down directed to mitigate impacts on the night sky and to prevent glare and trespass of light off of the site. Sports lighting at Dozer field is existing.
11. Physical design and compatibility with surrounding structures in mass, scale and style: No unmitigated impacts. Architectural design is consistent with the Park City Architectural Design Guidelines and is compatible with the surrounding structures.
12. Noise, vibration, odors, steam, or other mechanical factors that might affect people and property off-site: No unmitigated impacts. No noise, vibration, odors, steam or mechanical factors are anticipated. A construction mitigation plan was submitted to the School District by the contractor to mitigate impacts of the construction, including noise, vibration, odor, steam, or mechanical factors.
13. Control of delivery and service vehicles, loading and unloading zones, and screening: No unmitigated impacts. Deliveries are limited and are accommodated in screened loading areas or from the parking lots. Trash pickup is not changed from the existing location.
14. Expected ownership and management of the property: No unmitigated impacts. The High School is owned and managed as a public school by the Park City School District, who has been receptive to community input regarding solutions to impacts on the community due to traffic, parking, students crossing SR 248, and the proposed remodel and design of the High School. The School District held several public meetings regarding the design and construction of the High School remodel.
15. Sensitive Lands Review. No unmitigated impacts. The High School site is not located within the Sensitive Lands Overlay Zone. The Frontage Protection Zone (FPZ) along Kearns Blvd is respected by the new building. The parking within the Frontage Protection Zone is an existing situation. Additional landscaping would decrease impacts of the parking in the FPZ, however the City can not require it.

In summary, the Planning Staff finds that the proposed Park City High School remodel complies with the Conditional Use criteria as outlined above. The building is a nonconforming building due to the existing height of the performing arts center and the gymnasium. The remodel introduces pitched roof elements that add to the architectural character of the building. The additional roof height accommodates taller ceilings and screens mechanical equipment but does not increase the floor area of the building. Staff recommends conditions of approval that no additional remodels be constructed that do not conform to the height of the zone, unless appropriately approved by the Board of Adjustment as a variance or special exception, or by the Planning Commission per LMC Section 15-6-5 (F) MPD - additional building height.

## Process

This project is currently under construction. The District is not required to obtain a building permit from the City and therefore construction has commenced. City Planning and Building Departments are requesting the Planning Commission review the
proposed CUP as required by the Land Management Code and Utah Statute 10-9a305.

## Department Review

This item was reviewed by the Planning, Building, Legal, and Engineering Departments at the interdepartmental review. Issues discussed during the review primarily related to accuracy and timing of submitted plans and coordination of access and pedestrian circulation with UDOT. These issues have been satisfactorily addressed with revised plans and/or by conditions of approval.

## Public Notice

The property was posted and notice was mailed to property owners within 300 feet. Legal notice was also published in the Park Record.

## Alternatives

- The Planning Commission may approve the CUP for the Park City High School remodel, as conditioned or amended; or
- The Planning Commission may deny the CUP and provide findings for this decision;
or
- The Planning Commission may continue the discussion and request additional information on specific items.


## Significant Impacts

There are no significant fiscal or environmental impacts from this application.

## Consequences of not taking the Suggested Recommendation

The remodel would continue as scheduled and the City would continue to address issues with the District.

Recommendation: The Planning Department requests the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and consider approving the Park City High School CUP. Staff has included findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval for the Commission's consideration as follows:

## Findings of Fact

1. The proposed Park City High School remodel is located at 1750 Kearns Boulevard.
2. The property is located within the Recreational Open Space (ROS) zoning district and the frontage along Kearns Boulevard is located within the Frontage Protection Zone (FPZ). Schools are a Conditional Use in this zone.
3. On August 23, 2007 the City Planning Department received an application for a Conditional Use Permit for the High School remodel. Additional information was received on October 16, 2007, January 15, 2008, and February 28, 2008.
4. The CUP request is for a remodel and upgrades to the Park City High School to make it more functional, energy efficient, modern, and attractive. A synthetic field is proposed to reduce the water demand.
5. The existing Park City High School is a non-conforming building in that the existing building exceeds the zone height of $28^{\prime}$ and ranges in height from $22^{\prime}$ to $65^{\prime}$. The remodel ranges in height from 17' to 45'. The areas of the building that are $45^{\prime}$ includes the two story class room wings. The additional building height is due to the height of the ceilings, pitched roof elements, and mechanical equipment screened within the roof area. These pitched roof elements add architectural interest and do not increase the floor area of the building.
6. The Park City High School is a public school managed and operated by the Park City School District, who is the applicant.
7. According to Utah State Code, the school district must provide to Park City evidence that Park City has reviewed and approved the project within parameters of State statute 10-9a-305.
8. Construction of the remodel began in 2006 and is schedule to be completed in August of 2008.
9. An access plan was approved by UDOT in June 2007, for the proposed amendments for access to State Road 248.
10. The High School remodel includes the following items, further explained in a letter submitted February 28, 2008 by the School District (Exhibit B):
a) upgrades to the interior classrooms, common areas, lab rooms, bathrooms, and hallways;
b) increase in the total floor area by about 20,000 sf due primarily to upgrades to hallways and common areas;
c) reduction in the building foot print by about 8,000 sf due to addition of second story classrooms;
d) pedestrian circulation improvements on and off site, with relocation of the pedestrian crossing of SR 248 and additional on-site walkways;
e) parking lot and vehicular access improvements including removing and relocating access points and the addition of 65 parking spaces; f) increase in building setback from Kearns by 44 feet;
g) exterior architectural upgrades and building efficiency upgrades; and
h) reduction of irrigated area by 174,760 sf due to installation of a synthetic turf athletic field.
11. The general architectural intent is consistent with the Park City Architectural Design Guidelines and is compatible with the surrounding buildings and walls.
12. The property is located within the City's soils ordinance boundary.
13. A Construction Mitigation Plan (CMP) is necessary to identify impacts and to propose reasonable mitigation of these impacts on the site, neighborhood, and community due to construction of this project. The CMP shall include information about traffic, parking, service and delivery, stock-piling of materials and staging of work, work hours, noise control, temporary lighting, trash management and recycling, mud and dust control, construction signs, temporary road and/or trail closures, limits of disturbance fencing, protection of existing vegetation, erosion control and storm water management. The CMP shall address requirements of the City's soils ordinance.
14. The discussion in the Analysis section is incorporated herein.

## Conclusions of Law

1. The proposed remodel and associated uses are compatible with surrounding structures in use, scale and mass, and circulation.
2. The proposed remodel and associated uses are consistent with the Park City General Plan and Conditional Use requirements of the LMC.
3. Any effects in difference in use or scale of the proposed remodel and associated uses have been mitigated through careful planning and/or conditions of approval.

Conditions of Approval

1. All standard project conditions shall apply, where allowed by State statute.
2. All exterior lighting shall be subdued in nature and shall conform to the City's lighting ordinance, LMC Section 15-5-5-(I) and 15-3-3(c). All new lighting shall be approved by the Planning Department prior to installation.
3. A Construction Mitigation Plan (CMP) is recommended to address construction phasing, staging, storage of materials, circulation and traffic, parking, service and delivery, re-vegetation of disturbed areas, temporary signs and construction lighting, hours of operation, dust and mud control, storm water management, and other items as may be recommended by the Building Department.
4. Disposal and treatment of all excavated material and capping of exposed soils in accordance with the City's Soils Ordinance, Title 11, Chapter 15-Park City Landscaping and Maintenance of Soil Cover is required.
5. Review of water fees shall be provided by the City Building Department.
6. No exterior signs are approved as part of this CUP. A sign permit is required prior to installation of all regulated signs.
7. The City Building Department's and Snyderville Basin Water Reclamation District's review and approval of any amendments to the approved utility plans is requested.
8. No additional remodels may be constructed that do not conform to the height of the zone, unless appropriately approved by the Board of Adjustment as a variance or special exception, or by the Planning Commission per LMC Section 15-6-5 (F) MPD - additional building height.
9. Utility as-built plans shall be submitted to the City and School District by the contractor for future reference.
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