

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION NOTES
AUGUST 25, 2010**

PRESENT: Chair Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Richard Luskin, Dick Peek, Julie Pettit, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Thomas Eddington, Kirsten Whetstone, Francisco Astorga, Polly Samuels McLean

Work Session Items

Rocky Mountain Power - Planning for electric services in Wasatch/Summit Counties

Planning Director Eddington stated that for the past few months a task force comprised of community leaders and key stakeholder have been working with Rocky Mountain Power to create a plan that prepares for long term growth of Summit and Wasatch Counties. The objective this evening was to update the Planning Commission on what the task force has been discussing in terms of land use and planning efforts and coordinating that with Rocky Mountain Power's electrical network.

Chad Ambrose, representing Rocky Mountain Power, stated that he is a customer community manager. He works with all of Summit County with the exception of Park City. Mr. Ambrose introduced Lori Hansen, the RMP representative who works with Park City.

Mr. Ambrose remarked that this has been a new process for Rocky Mountain Power. He thanked Director Eddington, Matt Cassel, Liza Simpson, Diane Foster, Sara Brennan and Jacquy Mauer for their involvement in this effort. Having Park City so well represented made a significant difference in the process.

Mr. Ambrose reported that in 1970 the population in Summit County was 6,000. By 2008 that number had grown to 36,000 for all of Summit County. Mountain Lands projects that 83,000 people will be living in Summit County in the year 2030. From the utilities perspective of being able to deliver reliable power, the capacity will more than double in many of these locations.

To address the issue of capacity to service the need, Rocky Mountain Power visited Idaho Power, who has been successful working with their community on permitting new substations and transmission lines to serve rapid growth. Idaho Power began by developing a community task force and that concept was brought back to Utah. Mr. Ambrose stated that Summit, Wasatch and Salt Lake Counties are the first three counties that Rocky Mountain Power started to work with to put together a task force. Working with the task force allows RMP to work hand in hand with the community to determine the necessary improvements.

Mr. Ambrose explained how the task force was formed. Eight meetings were held a years time. During that time Rocky Mountain Power helped the task force members understand how a regulated utility operates and the basic designs of substations, transmission structures, distribution poles, and spacing requirements. From there, the task force had the opportunity to develop siting criteria, which is key to developing a good plan for where a substation and transmission lines should be located and the impacts.

Mr. Ambrose remarked that the first criteria is to expand existing facilities before building new ones.

The criteria lists several reasons why that is important and why it is a priority. He pointed out that the process developed a significant number of criteria that Rocky Mountain Power needs to consider before coming to the Planning Commission and siting a new facility. He believed this was a major step in the right direction in terms of progress for the communities and the power company.

Mr. Ambrose stated that the next step in the process was to develop the map. The task force looked at all of Summit and Wasatch County to determine the best location for substations and transmission lines as a starting point for discussion. Mr. Ambrose emphasized that it was only a starting point and not fixed locations. He stated that the map, the siting criteria, and a final documented plan is currently in process. He anticipated that it would be completed and ready for final review by the task force on September 28th.

Mr. Ambrose stated that Rocky Mountain Power hired a third party facilitator to work with the task force. Rocky Mountain was available for technical support and background, but for the most part they were hands off in the process. The intent was to make sure the meetings were for the task force and not Rocky Mountain Power. Mr. Ambrose believed that Rocky Mountain Power was on the path of working hand and hand with the communities on preparing infrastructure out to the year 2030. Working together will create improvement in inter-jurisdictional coordination among the communities because their lines cross all boundaries.

Mr. Ambrose stated that once the plan is complete, the task force members will have the opportunity to come before the Planning Commission and the City Council to review the plan and hear feedback. The goal is for Park City to consider it as part of their plan because it will help the citizens and Rocky Mountain customers.

City Council Member, Liza Simpson, stated that in one of the earlier meetings the task force made it clear that having all the planning and zoning maps would help with the process. If they were going to project growth geographically or where they would not want something built, having that zoning information was critical. Council Member Simpson remarked that the process went well and she applauded Rocky Mountain Power for trying to do a collaborative process.

Commissioner Pettit asked if the process would come before the Planning Commission when the time comes for siting either a substation or transmission line within the Park City boundaries. Lori Hansen replied that it would be a conditional use permit process. Commissioner Pettit commended Rocky Mountain Power for taking the steps to involve the community and working with the task force. She believed it was the right approach in terms of understanding the full lay of the land from a planning and zoning perspective. Commissioner Pettit stated that if the process comes before the Planning Commission as a CUP, she wanted to make sure their hands would not be tied in terms of the ultimate application and the merits and criteria that must be applied. She understood that it was an effort by Rocky Mountain Power to take the best step forward in the process, but the Planning Commission should still have the ability to apply the normal criteria.

Mr. Ambrose remarked that growth is a real thing and they all need electricity. The primary objective was to get everyone together to improve the predictability of when RMP would come before the City through the conditional use process to request a permit to build a new facility. Forming the task force allows everyone to be on the same page to begin discussing a likely

location. A second objective is to improve inter-jurisdictional planning and coordination with the utility company.

Commissioner Pettit asked if the growth projection to 2030 was based to meet the load demand in the current geographical area or if they were talking about transmission lines and substations that would serve broader power needs. Mr. Ambrose replied that they were only focusing on Summit and Wasatch Counties. He stated that RMP is looking at a regional substation as part of the Evanston to Silver Creek Transmission Project, which would eventually add great benefit to Morgan County. However, the objective of this task force is to focus on assets and infrastructure that can benefit and serve the residents of Summit and Wasatch County.

Ms. Hansen stated that Rocky Mountain Power would need to let the citizens know what type of facilities are needed to adequately serve them and the best place to locate the facilities to provide that service.

Commissioner Pettit stated that given it is a 2030 plan and there is a push towards the integration of more distributed generation type resources, she asked if there was some prediction about where customers within the region might be headed, given the current net metering and interconnection regulations. She pointed out that Park City has been moving forward in energy efficiency.

Council Member Simpson noted that Diane Foster was on the task force and they did have a good discussion on energy efficiency. She remarked that another benefit from the task force process is that Rocky Mountain Power will have gained local knowledge throughout both counties and within each of the communities to help them understand the importance of that issue. They also talked about conservation and whether the projections actually take into consideration what they see as more efficient technologies in the future and better use of the kilowatts used.

Commissioner Hontz commented on the products and hoped they could expect language in the General Plan. She asked if there was a time line on when that would be available. Director Eddington remarked that it was fortunate that the task force process was simultaneous to the General Plan. He believed the Rocky Mountain Power Plan would be done first so they could incorporate it into the General Plan.

Commissioner Savage asked about the relationship between the LMC and the zoning, and the applicability of the zones for a conditional use permit relative to what some of the projects may look like.

Director Eddington stated that in Park City specifically they would not be looking at many new substations. He anticipated expanding or improving the existing substations. In looking at the CUP permitting process for a substation, currently utilities are located in open space zoning. A substation is currently located at the Ontario Mine and in the General Commercial zone in Bonanza Park. Director Eddington noted that utilities are often a conditional use permit in commercial zones.

Commissioner Savage stated that as the Bonanza Park plan begins to materialize, he thought the substation location would be an issue. Director Eddington replied that Bonanza Park was a lively

discussion with the task force. Rocky Mountain Power has pointed out a future need for expansion in the Bonanza Park area. The task force discussed whether or not that would be an appropriate location and whether it could be covered or hidden; or whether there was a better and more concealed location within a quarter-mile radius that would maintain the network. Director Eddington pointed out that costs and benefits are associated with all the decisions.

Commissioner Savage clarified that the initial plan that would be presented to the Planning Commission would incorporate the current development recommendations as it relates to that particular substation. Director Eddington replied that the plan would be more general than what Commissioner Savage was asking; however it would have the basis for that recommendation. Council Member Simpson believed this was a perfect example of the tension in the process. She remarked that Rocky Mountain Power has an obligation to the rate payers to be financially responsible. On the other side is the community's desire for aesthetics. Both issues contributed to lively discussions during the task force meetings. Council Member Simpson pointed out that the task force also discussed the efficiency of underground lines and found that underground lines lose far more electricity than above ground lines.

Training Overview with Legal

Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean, reported that the Planning Commission had done Open Public Meeting Act training in January, which is required annually. She had received feedback from the Commissioner for additional legal training on different issues. The training this evening would focus on the standards for subdivisions and plat amendments, as well as the role of the Planning Commission. Ms. McLean intended to do legal training three to four times a year and encouraged the Commissioners to contact her with specific topics.

Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that the Planning Commission had previously asked about the standard of review for subdivisions. She remarked that there is a real distinction and the Code is very explicit in terms of outlining major and minor subdivisions. However, for a plat amendments, the only language they have to rely on is the State Code. Ms. McLean explained that these types of decisions are administrative and must be based on substantial evidence. They cannot be arbitrary or capricious. The Planning Commission is required to keep their review within the criteria, even though the criteria is not very explicit.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the Code classifies subdivisions as major and minor. She acknowledged that the Staff needs to be more explicit in informing the Planning Commission on what is a major subdivision or a minor subdivision. The criteria for the two types of subdivisions is different in terms of the steps taken in the process. Some of the requirements for a major subdivision can be waived, which is often done. By definition, a major subdivision is four or more lots or a new street.

Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that the Planning Commission sees more plat amendments and she understands that they struggle with not knowing the criteria for determining whether a plat amendment should occur. The LMC does not talk about plat amendments other than to say that they can be done. The State Code says there must be good cause for the amendments, which

raises the issue of what is good cause. Ms. McLean pointed out that there is not a definition for “good cause” in the LMC and she believes the Staff should define “good cause” in the next list of LMC amendments. A good definition would provide a consistent level and understanding of good cause when reviewing plat amendments.

Commissioner Pettit felt it was important to understand that “detrimental effects” is the flip side of “good cause”. She noted that detrimental effects is also a loose term, since the “detrimental effects” of who and how far it should extend is unclear. Commissioner Pettit believed they have seen detrimental effects and impacts in some of the reasons supporting good cause. Assistant City Attorney McLean thought it would be helpful to have language that talks about the factors that can be considered for good cause. Assistant City Attorney McLean understood that the Planning Commission would support a change to the LMC to make those terms more specific.

Chair Wintzer stated that his biggest problem with plat amendments and lot line adjustments is that the Planning Commission is asked to consider moving lot lines without knowing the end result of what could be built. When the Planning Commission expresses that concern, they are told by Staff that it should not be a consideration until the CUP process. Chair Wintzer did not believe that was good planning. The Planning Commission should know the cause and effect of moving around lot lines before deciding on a plat amendment.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that with the plat amendment process, the Planning Commission knows the location of the building envelope because the zone will determine the setbacks and the allowed footprint. Commissioner Savage remarked that the Planning Commission should just assume that someone will build to the maximum permitted once the plat amendment has been approved. Ms. McLean stated that one of the struggles she has seen with the Planning Commission is trying to balance the idea of density and more houses with the tension of less density, but a much larger house. She asked the Planning Commission to be ready to discuss that balance when the Staff comes back with proposed language for “good cause”, because it is allowed by Code.

Director Eddington stated that if the Planning Commission found it hard to make a decision on a subdivision because they could not see the design, if there is good cause, he believed the Planning Commission could request an analysis of surrounding building footprints and possibly reduce the footprint on the lot to something comparable. He understood the concern that it is hard to make a decision without knowing what the applicant plans to do.

Assistant City Attorney McLean distributed a handout and referred to sub (c) Subdivision Standard. She pointed out that State Codes says that if the plat amendment meets the City ordinance it must be approved. However, the LMC places explicit restrictions that address ridgeline development, clustering, character of the land, fire sprinkling. The LMC addresses general lot design requirements that talks about lot arrangement and building sites and square footage. Ms. McLean remarked that the language deals more with big subdivisions as opposed to a plat amendment, but she felt the same concepts would apply and the Planning Commission could use the basis of the subdivision language when doing a plat amendment.

Commissioner Savage asked if the Planning Commission reviewed a four-lot subdivision, if they could request additional drainage and landscaping or other items prior to approving the subdivision.

Ms. McLean stated that the Planning Commission could make those requests for consideration. The problem is that with a plat amendment, many times there are existing buildings. In her handout she cited preservation of natural features and amenities, which talks about preserving existing features which add value to the community. Buildings shall be cited in a manner that preserves significant views. Ridges should be protected from development visible from the skyline from prominent areas in Park City.

Commissioner Peek noted that Ron Ivie was able to get 100% compliance with fire sprinkling all the buildings on Main Street. If there is a benefit to fire sprinkling historic structures, he asked if it was appropriate to place a condition of approval on the subdivision stating that any building permit shall include fire sprinkling. Ms. McLean stated that nearly every plat she sees has a note requiring 13D sprinklers for new construction. She noted that the Building Department can make that same requirement on existing structures for health, safety and welfare. She was unsure what the Building Code requires.

Commissioner Pettit felt sprinkling was also important for historic structures, coupled with parts of town that bump up against the wildfire areas or areas accessed by substandard roads. Commissioner Peek thought it would be helpful to see an analysis of what is or is not sprinkled and what areas are at risk.

Assistant City Attorney McLean referred to the last page of the handout, which was a checklist for subdivision approvals by Planning Commissions. Commissioner Pettit had obtained this information from the League of Cities and Towns training.

Chair Wintzer stated that the new Code has requirements for bringing grade back to within 4 feet, as well as height requirements. When subdividing land, it is possible for the Planning Commission to unintentionally create an unbuildable lot based on meeting those requirements. If that occurs, the lot would automatically go to the Board of Adjustment and probably be approved as a hardship. He wanted to know how the Planning Commission could avoid creating unbuildable lots. Ms. McLean replied that it should be part of the Staff analysis. Creating a lot that would automatically violate the Code would not be good cause and it would be non-compliant. Chair Wintzer pointed out that doing that analysis would be difficult without a set of plans. Ms. McLean noted that the Staff has topos and visit the site as part of their analysis. Chair Wintzer and Ms. McLean both agreed that to their knowledge a subdivision had not created an unbuildable lot. However, Chair Wintzer believed the steeper lots would be harder to build on and there was the potential for that to happen.

Commissioner Hontz supported Chair Wintzer's comment. She referred to one subdivision that was approved in the City where the lots were buildable as approved. However, many architects have not wanted to follow the restrictions within that building sensitive area and have tried to apply for hardship. Commissioner Hontz stated that all the land left would be hard to build on, and she felt the Planning Commission should be very careful in their review and analysis and make sure the record is clear. Chair Wintzer clarified that his primary concern was to make sure the Planning Commission was not creating a hardship by giving someone two lots when they originally had one. Assistant City Attorney McLean appreciated the concern and stated that she would emphasize that point with Staff when those application come forward. Ms. McLean stated that ideally that would be the key for the Staff analysis in finding good cause or detrimental impacts.

Chair Wintzer asked if the Planning Commission could make an applicant prove that they could build a house on the lot that would be created by the subdivision. Ms. McLean stated that if the Planning Commission had legitimate questions tied to the criteria about whether or not something could be built, they could make that request of the applicant. She reiterated that their concerns should be addressed in the Staff analysis. Chair Wintzer thought it would be difficult for the Staff to do that analysis without a set of plans specific to that lot. Ms. McLean clarified that under Utah law the Planning Commission could not require an applicant to submit even a rough sketch of plans, because it goes beyond what is required.

Commissioner Savage asked if there was a definition of buildable. Chair Wintzer replied that it is a structure that meets Code. Commissioner Savage asked if it would be possible to request a simplistic rendering of a structure that would satisfy Chair Wintzer's concern. Ms. McLean stated that the Planning Commission could amend the Code to include that, but she was cautious about doing so and preferred that the Planning Commission talk to Staff if they have questions regarding the ability to build on the lot. However, she believed that could also become onerous because a plat amendment application is approval of the lot and not a specific house.

Chair Wintzer clarified that he was not suggesting that applicants submit a set of plans with every subdivision application. He only wanted to know what tools the Planning Commission had to make an applicant prove the lot would be buildable. He believed it could be done with little effort on the part of the applicant. Without that tool, Chair Wintzer was certain they would end up creating unbuildable lots that would require an exception.

Assistant City Attorney believed that most of the challenging lots were existing Old Town lots. She pointed out that with Old Town lots, most often the request for a plat amendment is to remove a lot line to make the lot easier to build on. In their review, the Planning Commission would need to determine whether adjusting the lot lines would create additional challenges or make the lot more buildable. Ms. McLean remarked that their tool box is the Land Management Code.

Assistant City Attorney commented on the Planning Commission authority balanced with what they can request from the applicant and the entitlement of the applicants. In her handout, she had outlined general land use authority taken from the State Code, which is their purpose as a Planning Commission. Commissioner Pettit referred to the language in the State Code, "To protect and insure access to sunlight for solar energy". She did not think the City had carried that over to the LMC. Ms. McLean recalled that the LMC had been amended to include solar energy. She offered to research it to make sure. Commissioner Pettit felt solar energy should be actively pursued since it is supported by Utah Code. Director Eddington stated that solar energy was added to the Historic District Design Guidelines, but he did not believe it was carried over to the LMC.

Commissioner Pettit remarked that an interesting question, particularly with regard to building on steep lots in Old Town, is the impact to the downhill neighbors in terms of blocking access to sunlight for solar energy. She was pleased to see solar energy addressed in the State Code as an issue that falls within their purview.

Chair Wintzer asked if State Code takes precedence over the LMC or if they were conjoined. Ms. McLean replied that in the case of conflicts, State Code would take precedence over the LMC.

However, if the LMC is more restrictive than State Code, the LMC would apply.

Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that the handout included language from the LMC outlining the functions within the scope of the Planning Commission authority. The Planning Commission should recognize that their scope review is limited to those twelve points of authority. Ms. McLean noted that page 4 of the handout listed the scope of information the Planning Commission could require from applicants. Once they go outside that scope, the applicants have the ability to challenge the requirements as arbitrary because it is not linked to the criteria.

Commissioner Pettit presented the scenario of a subdivision application in an area in Old Town that had former mining operations, hazardous mine tailings, etc. She assumed it would be appropriate to request reports or studies that delve into safety issues that fall under restrictions due to character of the land, since it is tied to a review of the criteria. Ms. McLean felt that was an interesting example because the Code is not as clear as it should be on that issue. She and Director Eddington plan to draft language for the statute to be more explicit about it being a requirement for mine hazards.

Using the example of creating an unbuildable lot by granting a subdivision, Commissioner Pettit wanted to know how much they could request from the applicant in terms of trying to determine whether or not the lot would be buildable. Ms. McLean advised that the Planning Commission should always refer to the Code to make sure the basis of anything they request is Code related. She asked the Planning Commission to understand that the Staff also has limited resources and any request they make of Staff should also be related to the LMC criteria.

Commissioner Savage asked Ms. McLean to explain the relationship between the LMC and the General Plan in terms of their responsibilities as a Planning Commission. Ms. McLean suggested a training session on the General Plan prior to the next General Plan session. She explained that the specifics of the LMC are the most controlling. The General Plan purpose statements are more of a guideline, whereas the actual ordinance and specifics are mandatory. Ms. McLean stated that if there is a conflict, the mandatory would usurp the advisory.

Commissioner Pettit felt it was important to understand that the LMC theoretically flows from the General Plan. Therefore, the tools to implement the goals and the objectives of the General Plan come from the LMC. When there is a disconnect in terms of day to day review of applications between the intent of the General Plan and the requirements of the LMC, a change to the LMC may be appropriate to better meet the intent of the General Plan. Commissioner Savage stated that his question came from the discussion at the last meeting related to the Park City Heights Pre-MPD approval process and the comments by Commissioner Strachan. In looking at the General Plan, Commissioner Savage felt that was a good example of a catch-22 and he was unsure how to reconcile that.

Commissioner Strachan clarified that there is a catch 22 because the pre-MPD section of the Land Management Code says that in order to get a pre-MPD the proposal must comply with the General Plan. Therefore, the LMC requires that there be General Plan compliance. He pointed out that in any other analysis, the General Plan is a guideline for guiding the principles, but it is not required. Commissioner Strachan stated that his preference would be to eliminate the pre-MPD process and

just have it be a work session item, because it is impossible to comply with every section of the General Plan.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the Staff would be bringing forth some LMC amendments and the pre-MPD process may be something to consider.

Commissioner Wintzer remarked that the Planning Commission needs to have a conversation about the General Plan. Based on the definition of compliance, a proposal does not have to comply with all the elements in the General Plan to be considered compliant. The General Plan looks at the big picture and sometimes that can be vague.

Director Eddington stated that Chair Wintzer's comment was an important issue as they move forward with the General Plan. In writing the new General Plan, he believed there was an opportunity to make it more specific and provide guidance to support their decisions. Chair Wintzer pointed out that in every case, two Commissioners can be on opposite sides and both believe they are right in interpreting the General Plan as currently written.

Commissioner Luskin was not uncomfortable with the General Plan as written. Referencing a legal term, "spirit of the law", he felt the same thing applied to the General Plan. Commissioner Luskin stated that he gets the "spirit" of things from the General Plan and the specifics from the LMC. He does not have a problem reconciling the two.

Commissioner Strachan believed the General Plan should be more general than it is now and the Land Management Code should have the specificity. He thought it was pointless to put specificity in the General Plan because it is not mandatory to follow it.

Chair Wintzer thought the General Plan should identify the vision for specific areas or neighborhoods in terms of uses, transportation, traffic, etc. He agreed that it should be general, but it needs to provide some direction.

Commissioner Luskin stated that regardless of how words are used or how specifically defined they are, everyone interprets it differently and through their own lens. He did not think the General Plan should be specific.

Commissioner Savage used the analogy of Disneyland as a place where everything flows together but each area, such as Tomorrow Land, Fantasy Land, etc, all have a separate purpose and identity. He views the General Plan in the same way. Park City is Disneyland and Bonanza Park, Old Town, etc. are the separate areas that have their own identity but relate to Park City as a whole.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that State Code is very explicit on what can be in the General Plan and she would schedule a training on that issue. She noted that page 7 of her handout contained the general requirements for the General Plan based on State Code. Ms. McLean pointed out that the language states that the General Plan is an advisory guide unless otherwise provided in local ordinance. She suggested that the Planning Commission continue this discussion at a future training.

Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that her handout also included a General Land Use

Administration document regarding legal justifications of Land Use Controls and General Land Use Administration. This was a harsh analysis of the Planning Commission role and explains the role of the Planning Commission and how it is tied to the criteria and the administration. Ms. McLean clarified that most of what the Planning Commission does is administrative. They are not elected and they do not have representatives. Their role is only to apply the criteria, which can be very frustrating with certain applications. Ms. McLean stated that if an application meets all the criteria of the Code, the Planning Commission must approve it based on State Code. State Code also states that the applicants have a right for reasonable diligence for review. Ms. McLean believed the Planning Commission was diligent in trying to move projects forward and she has seen a marked improvement in their efforts to not continue an item several times.

Chair Wintzer remarked that when the Planning Commission continues an item, they need to provide enough direction so the Staff and the applicant clearly understand what the Planning Commission wants. If an item is continued, they need to make sure it is with good cause.

Commissioner Pettit commented on lengthy agendas and items that they do not begin to discuss until late in the evening. In those situations, she asked if it would be appropriate to continue an item to the next meeting when the Commissioners are less tired and could give the application the proper scrutiny and discussion. Ms. McLean answered yes. She pointed out that many times the item is discussed and the Planning Commission continues it anyway, because they cannot focus on a decision due to the late hour. Ms. McLean stated that the Staff is trying to do better calendar management to avoid long agendas and late meetings.

Chair Wintzer was not opposed to continuing items because of the late hour, but it is difficult to continue a project when applicants or their representatives come from out of town to attend that specific meeting. He requested that the Staff be aware of applicants who come in from out-of-state and try to schedule them early on the agenda.

Commissioner Savage recalled that at the last meeting he had asked for deadlines and time lines regarding Park City Heights. Ms. McLean had told him that the Planning Commission should not be concerned with deadlines. He believed the deadlines and time lines relate to the process of due process in general and he wanted to understand the expected schedules and time lines the Planning Commission should adhere to in terms of working through Park City Heights.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that she does not like to use pending applications as examples in general discussion, however, her comment at the last meeting was that every applicant has a due process right to move forward. Many times for many reasons, an applicant will request that the Planning Commission take a vote rather than continue to another meeting. Part of the process is the applicant working with Staff to make sure times are adequately scheduled on the agenda. The City is very concerned about timing and how long applications are sit in various City Departments. A system is in place that measures the progress and many times they find projects that are within the City departments for a long time. Sometimes it is because the City is waiting for additional information from the applicant. Ms. McLean remarked that the Staff is making an effort to move things along at a quicker pace.

Commissioner Savage asked if it was reasonable for someone to provide the Planning Commission

Work Session Notes
August 25, 2010
Page 11

with a time line of what they should expect to come before them. At this point he has no idea what will be on the agenda from one meeting to another.

Chair Wintzer stated that his most valuable learning tool has been meeting with the Staff on his own time when he has questions on projects. He encouraged the other Commissioners to do the same.