

Planning Commission May 5, 2026

Meeting Minutes

May 5, 2026, 1:00 PM

A. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the Brian Head Planning Commission was called to order on Tuesday, May 5, 2026, at 1:00 PM at Brian Head Town Hall, 56 North Highway 143, Brian Head, Utah.

A quorum was present.

Present: Chair/Presiding Officer not clearly identified in the transcript; Commissioner Carrie Dever; Commissioner Roger ____; Greg Sant, Building and Planning Administrator. Additional participation occurred from Bret ____ and John Quiddickland during discussion.

Absent: Not stated.

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by the chair.

C. DISCLOSURES

Disclosures were stated to be on file. No additional disclosure issues were raised by the commissioners.

D. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Planning Commission Meeting April 21, 2026

The Commission reviewed the minutes of the April 21, 2026 Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Carrie Dever noted two corrections, stating that on page 2, line 76, and page 3, line 129, the minutes incorrectly identified her as approving the motion when the reference should have been to Commissioner Lee. The commission asked whether there were any further corrections, and none were raised.

Motion to approve the minutes of the April 21, 2026 Planning Commission meeting, as corrected, was made by Commissioner Roger ____ and seconded by Commissioner Carrie Dever. The motion carried unanimously.

E. PUBLIC INPUT/ REPORTS (Limited to three (3) minutes) Non-Agenda Items

During reports, Greg Sant stated he had no report. Commissioner Carrie Dever noted that a cleanup day was coming up and clarified that the date was May 14. The chair asked whether anyone was attending online; none were present for public comment. Public input was then closed.

F. AGENDA ITEMS:

1. ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION: 123 Ponderosa Retaining Wall Review– Greg Sant, Planning and Building Administrator. Proposed retaining wall design and colors. Applicant – John Stark

Greg Sant presented the retaining wall review for 123 Ponderosa. He explained that the code had been changed approximately one year earlier so that Planning Commission review is required when a retaining wall exceeds 12 feet in height, when tiered walls collectively exceed 12 feet, or when a wall exceeds 100 feet in length. He stated that,

although only a small portion of the proposed wall exceeded 12 feet in height, the wall required review because of its length.

Greg said the applicant had submitted the materials staff would expect for this type of review, including a site plan showing the locations of the three wall segments, an elevation drawing showing wall heights, and a depiction of the proposed block material and stain color. He said staff had reviewed the applicable standards and found that the proposal met them.

In discussing the site, Greg noted that lots on Ponderosa are generally steeply sloped and that the design challenge was whether the lot could reasonably be developed without excessive grading and scarring. He stated that staff believed the wall was a practical solution for the site and recommended approval.

Commissioner Lee asked clarifying questions regarding the wall length, which wall segments would be visible, and where the portions exceeding 12 feet were located. Greg explained that the longest wall was approximately 183 feet and that only a limited portion exceeded 12 feet in height. He further explained that visibility would vary by segment, with some portions largely backfilled or screened by driveway grade and others more exposed.

No further questions were raised.

Motion to approve the retaining wall design, materials, and color for 123 Ponderosa as proposed, based on the findings of staff, was made by Commissioner Carrie Dever and seconded by Commissioner _____. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Discussion: Mixed-Use Zone Discussion – Greg Sant, Planning and Building Administrator. Discussion on a possible Mixed-Use Zone designation.

Greg Sant introduced a discussion regarding whether and how the Town should allow mixed-use development. He explained that, in researching other resort and mountain communities such as Sun Valley, Park City, and Sundance, he found that many do not

create a standalone mixed-use zone. Instead, they often allow mixtures of residential and commercial uses by modifying existing zones. He identified three possible approaches for Brian Head:

1. amending existing zones to allow additional mixed-use elements
2. creating a new standalone mixed-use zone
3. or creating an overlay zone that would apply additional allowances or restrictions on top of an underlying zone.

Greg said that, as he continued his research, he became interested in the overlay approach after reviewing an example from Kaysville. He explained that under an overlay, the base zoning district would remain in place and continue to govern many development standards such as height, setbacks, and similar dimensional requirements, while the overlay could add specified mixed-use permissions. He said another important consideration was location. He referenced the Highway 143 corridor study, which identified three primary commercial nodes in town, and suggested those areas might be logical places to evaluate for mixed-use opportunities. He also noted that some communities place small-scale mixed-use elements inside residential areas to create neighborhood-serving destinations such as corner markets within walking distance of housing.

Pro Tem Chair Morgan asked how any future regulations should preserve Brian Head's "rustic mountain town feeling." In response to the commissioners question about which regulatory option would best support that character, Greg said that architectural design and massing would be more important than the zoning mechanism alone. He stated that Chapter 12 of the land management code already addresses design standards intended to preserve that character, and that if mixed-use regulations were developed, additional standards for multiuse buildings would likely need to be added there as well.

The discussion then turned to the distinction between vertical and horizontal mixed-use design. The focus of conversation was discussing the concept of either combining residential and commercial uses within the same building or arranging them in separate but coordinated buildings across a development. Commissioner Dever stated that, from a visual standpoint, more horizontally arranged forms may better support the town's

rustic character, whereas larger vertical buildings could begin to feel too large for the community.

The Commission asked Bret Howser, Town Manager, about the corridor study and the commercial nodes identified through that process. He explained that the study had been transportation-oriented and recognized concentrations of commercial activity in three areas: around Navajo, around Giant Steps and the village core, and a smaller node near Georg's. He further stated that the appropriate regulatory tool depended on the type of mixed-use result the Town wanted. If the Town only wanted to allow a limited additional use in an existing district, amending that district might be sufficient. If the Town wanted to broadly allow combinations of commercial and residential uses in a defined area, then a true mixed-use district might be more appropriate. He described overlays as a tool typically used where a geographic area, regardless of underlying zoning, should receive an additional allowance or restriction because of location.

Commissioners then discussed their preferences. Greg said that, based on the discussion and the initial reason the topic came forward, the simpler approach might be to amend existing zones rather than create an entirely new mixed-use district.

Commissioner Dever expressed support for expanding or loosening permitted uses within existing residential or commercial zones rather than creating a separate mixed-use district. She also raised a practical concern that financing and lending for mixed-use projects can be difficult, which could affect how such developments perform in the market even if zoning is made more flexible. At the same time, she said she appreciated the visual concept of a walkable village environment similar to examples seen in Durango and Sun Valley.

Commissioner Thomas favored the overlay concept, stating it could give the Town flexibility to allow mixed-use opportunities in targeted areas without rewriting every underlying zone. The commissioner noted that an overlay could allow the Town to respond later if a specific area seemed appropriate for a neighborhood market or other small-scale mixed-use activity, while still preserving the underlying zone structure. The Commission then discussed that an overlay would still require clear standards, clear definitions of what it permits, and a future zone amendment process to apply it to any specific property or area.

Greg read from the Kaysville example to illustrate how an overlay could keep the underlying residential zone in place while adding allowances such as offices, retail, entertainment, lodging, and a minimum ground-floor commercial component. He emphasized that this was only an example for discussion, not a recommendation that Brian Head adopt the same standards.

Commissioner Thomas questioned whether overlays would need to be mapped immediately. Greg explained that they would not. Instead, the Town could first create the regulatory framework and later consider overlay applications case by case through the zone amendment process. He added that future general plan updates could also identify areas where such an overlay might be appropriate.

Commissioner Dever emphasized the importance of carefully defining the benefits and limits of any overlay so applicants and the public would understand exactly what is and is not allowed. She said the Town often encounters situations where applicants argue that a use is permitted simply because it is not expressly prohibited, and she wanted future language to be precise enough to avoid that problem. Greg agreed, stating that specificity would be needed regardless of whether the Town chose overlays or amendments to existing zones.

Greg then asked the Commission what uses they considered the common components of mixed-use development. He listed apartments, condominiums, retail shops, offices, restaurants, and civic spaces, and asked whether single-family dwellings should be excluded. The discussion indicated general comfort with the listed uses, though one commissioner suggested the Town should not yet rule out the possibility of some small-scale single-family or townhome component in certain contexts, especially where a neighborhood-serving commercial use might fit on the same property.

The discussion broadened to possible locations and formats. Greg noted that mixed-use need not be limited to Highway 143 frontage and gave examples of areas such as Steam Engine Meadows or ski-oriented areas where a small neighborhood-serving use, such as a café or convenience function, might support residents and visitors without requiring trips to the general store. He also raised the possibility of overlaying light industrial property to allow a limited residential component in flex-space buildings used by contractors or similar businesses.

That led to discussion of 'caretaker apartments' in industrial settings. Commissioner Thomas remarked that in another community, the city specifically allowed caretaker apartments in light industrial districts rather than broadly opening industrial property to residential use. The commissioner suggested that if Brian Head considered similar concepts, a narrowly tailored caretaker-unit model might be preferable to allowing residential uses generally in industrial areas.

John _____ then addressed the Commission from the audience. He asked how current zoning handles people who operate businesses from their homes, using the example of a computer repair business. Mr. Sant explained that home occupations are allowed in residential areas, and that a conditional use permit may be required if the business involves equipment, deliveries, or a significant number of visitors. John then shared examples from Park City, Parowan, Cedar City, and Price involving mixed-use development. He said he believed the Town could benefit from regulations that better accommodate service oriented residents and small business operators who want to live and work in the same location. He also encouraged the Commission to consider caretaker-unit and work-live models as ways to support growth while preserving community character.

By the end of the discussion, the Commission generally agreed that a standalone mixed-use district was the least favored option at this time. The strongest interest was in either amending existing zones or developing an overlay approach. Several members indicated growing interest in the overlay concept, provided it is accompanied by clear, carefully drafted standards. Greg summarized that direction by stating he would remove the standalone mixed-use zone option from further consideration and return with more specific examples of the remaining two approaches for future discussion and possible recommendation to the Town Council.

No formal action was taken on this discussion item.

G. ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn the May 5, 2026 Planning Commission meeting was made by Commissioner Carrie Dever and seconded by Commissioner Carrie Dever. The

motion carried unanimously.