

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
March 23, 2011

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

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

EX OFFICIO:

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington; Kirsten Whetstone Planner; Polly Samuels McLean,  
Assistant City Attorney

=====

REGULAR MEETING

**ROLL CALL**

Chair Wintzer called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present except Commissioners Pettit who was excused.

**PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

There was no comment.

**ADOPTION OF MINUTES - March 9, 2011**

Commissioner Savage referred to page 60 of the Staff report, page 8 of the minutes, which reflected a question he had asked as to whether the traffic mitigation issues in the original CUP had been appropriately considered with the application. The answer from Planner Whetstone was that she believed that would be addressed in the traffic study this Fall.

Commissioner Savage wanted to know when questions of that nature are asked during a meeting, if the Planner confirms that the issues have been or would be addressed. He wanted to know if asking the question was sufficient, or whether it should be turned into specific direction to the Staff.

Commissioner Savage clarified that he was looking for an explanation on matters in general and not specific to the question asked about the St. Regis in the minutes.

Director Eddington stated that during the discussion, the Planners take notes. They also and review the minutes and keep a ticker file on a project matrix sheet to make sure the issues are addressed.

Chair Wintzer stated that when the Planning Commission asks a question they would like to have verified, they need to make that known and request that the Planner report back at the next meeting. Commissioner Savage thought it was the Staff's responsibility to determine which questions or concerns need to be followed up and to provide an update to the Planning Commission in an appropriate form. The Planning Commission should not have to raise the question again after reviewing the minutes.

Commissioner Hontz made corrections to the work session. She referred to Page 44, first paragraph, and noted that an "s" should be added to Army Corp. to correctly read Army **Corps**. Also on Page 44, fourth paragraph, Commissioner Hontz corrected the second sentence to read, Summer **or** Fall. In the same paragraph, fourth line, she corrected the sentence "The study would help to further verify the threatened and endangered consensus..." to correctly read "endangered **species**..."

Commissioner Hontz referred Page 49 of the work session and the discussion on the fire protection report. She recalled that she had outlined a list of five or six items that should be included in the report. She was not able to find the list in the minutes and felt it was important to have them referenced. Commissioner Hontz requested that someone listen to the recording to see if those items could be identified for inclusion before the Planning Commission approved the work session. Commissioner Hontz was comfortable approving the minutes of the regular meeting.

MOTION: Commissioner Strachan made a motion to APPROVE the minutes of March 9, 2011 as written. Commissioner Luskin seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of the Work Session Notes was tabled for further verification.

## **PUBLIC INPUT**

There were no comments.

## **STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES**

Director Eddington requested that the Commissioners log on to Google.com and select a preferred date for the joint meeting with the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission. They are having difficulty finding a date that works for both Commissions and he hoped to schedule a meeting in April. Commissioner Peek requested a starting time earlier than 6:00 p.m. if possible.

Commissioner Luskin thanked the Planning Staff for putting the maps back in the Staff report.

Commissioner Strachan disclosed that his firm represents Deer Valley Resort, however, his representation is unrelated to the application this evening and it would not affect his analysis of the application in any way.

Commissioner Strachan announced that a Planning Commission/Planning Staff party would be held at his house at 5:30 p.m. on Friday and everyone was invited.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

2. 335 Woodside Avenue - Plat Amendment  
(Application #PL-11-01201)

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

MOTION: Commissioner Strachan moved to forward a Positive Recommendation to the City Council for the 335 Woodside Avenue plat amendment, according to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report.

Commissioner Savage understood that the plat amendment was necessary in order to obtain a building permit for the modifications of the existing structures on the lot. He asked if approval of the modification of the structures was through the Historic Preservation Board.

Director Eddington clarified that Historic Preservation Design Review is done through Staff. It does not go to the HPB unless there is an appeal. Commissioner Savage wanted to know if it was appropriate for the Planning Commission to require that the remodel be pre-approved prior to the time the plat amendment goes into effect. Commissioner Savage was concerned that approving a plat amendment entitles the applicant to do something above and beyond what is already proposed on a lot. He preferred a mechanism that would require the applicant to come back if changes are made and suggested making that a condition of approval.

Chair Wintzer stated that the applicant could request a plat amendment to have lot lines removed without any intention of building something on the lot. Commissioner Savage clarified that the intention was not relevant to the Planning Commission's obligation to review and approve. Commissioner Strachan pointed out that the Planning Commission does not always know the intention when approving a plat amendment.

Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean, noted that this was a common question with plat amendments. She explained that creating subdivisions or lots of record is independent of development plans. In many cases the development spurs someone to go through the process, but that applicant may end up selling the property to someone with a different idea. In order to address the issue of creating a buildable lot, the City recently implemented LMC amendments that provide further criteria to evaluate plat amendments. Ms. McLean pointed out that development on the property is a separate issue. If it is not an allowed use, it would go through the appropriate review process.

Commissioner Savage asked if a plat amendment, in any case, could create an individual lot that would allow a use significantly different from what could have existed on the lot before the plat amendment. If so, could the Planning Commission consider that difference as it relates to the allowance they are being asked to make.

Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that the LMC talks about good cause, compatibility and other related issues, and those are the ones that the Planning Commission can consider in their review. It should be tied to what is allowable on the lot and not a specific design or intent, because that could change. A plat amendment cannot be conditioned on a specific type of development.

Commissioner Strachan pointed out that the allowed uses would not change because the zone remains the same. Commissioner Savage replied that the size of development could change significantly as a consequence of a plat amendment. Ms. McLean remarked that a plat amendment can also change the density. Combining two lots allows a larger footprint and larger

building mass, versus more density if the lots were not combined. Commissioner Savage wanted to know whether the Planning Commission should be more sensitive to that particular question in considering approval, whether the Staff would provide their opinion, or if it should just be ignored.

Chair Wintzer explained that the Planning Commission should look at an existing building on the property and take into consideration that a remodel cannot be done if a lot line runs through it. They also need to consider whether a plat amendment would keep the lots in character with the adjacent lots down the street. Commissioner Savage replied that character and compatibility were his concerns. He would like the Staff's analysis and opinion on whether or not a plat amendment could create something that could be more significant. He felt that was important information to have when reviewing and approving plat amendments. Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that the Staff reports contains that information.

Chair Wintzer shared Commissioner Savage's concern. He has asked the same questions in the past about approving something without knowing the risks of development.

Director Eddington referred to pages in the Staff report for this particular lot that would address some of the concerns. He noted that the building at 335 Woodside is bifurcated by a lot line and the building cannot be altered without a plat amendment. Using the example of three lots with a building on one or two lots where the structure did not cross over the internal lot lines, he noted that the Staff would look closer at that situation and the impacts that could be created by a plat amendment. Commissioner Savage assumed that if a plat amendment approval would significantly change what is allowed in the zone, the Staff would bring those concerns to the Planning Commission. Assistant City Attorney McLean replied that the Staff reports usually include tables, Staff discussion on good cause, and purpose statements to help the Planning Commission focus their discussion.

Commissioner Savage clarified that his question was simple. He only wanted to know if a plat amendment approval would create issues related to an allowed use within the zone that the Planning Commission would need to understand as it relates to providing a condition of approval or a change to the lot line. He did not think he should have to read 20 or 30 pages to ascertain that on his own. He preferred to have the Staff provide the necessary information and an opinion on whether or not there would be consequences.

Director Eddington noted that the Staff presents that opinion when they recommend a positive recommendation after doing the appropriate analysis.

Commissioner Savage commented on a contentious development on Empire Avenue that resulted from a lot combination, and how a much larger development created impacts to the neighbors without their knowledge of what could be allowed. He was concerned about making sure that would not happen again in the future. Director Eddington understood the concern, however, he noted for the record that those neighbors had been notified.

Director Eddington stated that in addition to the typical Staff analysis, the plat amendment for 335 Woodside had also gone through a Historic District Design Review.

Chair Wintzer called for a second on the motion.

Commissioner Savage seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

3. 109 Woodside Avenue - Plat Amendment  
(Application #PL-11-01190)

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

MOTION: Commissioner Strachan moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the plat amendment on 109 Woodside Avenue, according to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Commissioner Hontz seconded the motion.

Commissioner Luskin requested clarification on the dedicated right-of-way. Director Eddington explained that the Staff was proposing that the prescriptive easement be dedicated to the City and that the setbacks and all other applicable zone criteria be based upon the newly created lot.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Wintzer thought the Staff reports for both lot combinations made it easier for the Planning Commission to evaluate the plat amendment in the context of being able to see a portion of the neighborhood. He encouraged the Staff to do the same for every lot combination application.

Findings of Fact - 335 Woodside Avenue

1. The property is located at 335 Woodside Avenue.
2. The property is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) District.
3. The proposed lot is 3,750 square feet in size.
4. The minimum lot size within the HR-1 District is 1,875 square feet.
5. The lot width of the proposed lot is fifty feet (50').
6. The minimum lot width within the HR-1 District is twenty-five feet (25').
7. The existing footprint of the structure is 781.75 square feet.
8. The maximum footprint for a lot this size is 1,519 square feet.
9. There are no other violations or non-compliance found on the site.
10. The current use of the property is a single family dwelling.
11. There is a historic structure on the site.
12. No remnant parcels of land are created with this plat amendment.
13. All Findings within the Analysis section and the recitals above are incorporated herein as findings of fact.

Conclusions of Law - 335 Woodside Avenue

1. There is good cause for this plat amendment in that the combined low will remove the lot line going through the historic structure.

2. The plat amendment is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding lot combinations.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed plat amendment.
4. Approval the plat amendment, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval - 335 Woodside Avenue

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat amendment for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant will record the plat amendment at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year's time, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.
3. A 10' (ten foot) snow storage easement shall be dedicated to Park City across the property's frontage on Woodside Avenue.

Findings of Fact - 109 Woodside Avenue

1. The property is located at 109 Woodside Avenue.
2. The property is located in the Historic Residential (HR-1) District.
3. The recommended lot is 4,376 square feet in size.
4. The minimum lot size within the HR-1 District is 1,875 sq. ft.
5. The lot width of the recommended lot is fifty-two feet (52').
6. The minimum lot width within the HR-1 District is twenty-five feet (25').
7. The existing building footprint found on site is 754.5 square feet.
8. The maximum footprint for a lot this size is 1,711 square feet.
9. There are no other violations or non-compliances found on the site.
10. The current use of the property is a single family dwelling.
11. There are two historic structures on the site, a main building and an accessory building.
12. No remnant parcels of land are created with this plat amendment.
13. All findings within the Analysis section and the recitals above are incorporated herein as findings of fact.

Conclusions of Law - 109 Woodside Avenue

1. There is good cause for this plat amendment in that the plat amendment will remove the lot lines going through both historic structures, provide an opportunity for an improvement to

the accessory structure, dedicate the portion of privately owned King Road to the City as a right-of-way, and eliminate remnant parcels.

2. The plat amendment is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding lot combinations.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed plat amendment.
4. Approval of the plat amendment, subject to the conditions stated below, does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval - 109 Woodside Avenue

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat amendment for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant will record the plat amendment at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year's time, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.
3. A 10' (ten foot) snow storage easement shall be dedicated to Park City across the property's frontage.
4. The area identified on the submitted proposed plat (and survey) as the King Road easement shall be dedicated to the City as a public right-of-way. This area is approximately 2,052 square feet.

**REGULAR AGENDA - DISCUSSION/PUBLIC HEARINGS/ POSSIBLE ACTION**

5. Deer Valley - 11<sup>th</sup> Amended Master Planned Development  
**(Application PL-11-01150)**

Planner Kirsten Whetstone reviewed the request to amend the Deer Valley Master Planned Development to align the as-built density of the Silver Baron Lodge property, which is the Snow Park area, to the density permitted by the Deer Valley Master Plan Development. The request was to transfer one unit equivalent of density from the unit equivalents for the undeveloped Snow Park Village, to the existing Silver Baron Lodge. The transferred unit equivalent would be 2,000 square feet. Planner Whetstone noted that Silver Baron Lodge is located directly across from the lower parking areas at Deer Valley Resort.

The Staff had reviewed the request per the Land Management Code and the criteria of the MPD for compliance with the requirements. If this request is approved, Exhibit 1 of the Deer Valley Master Plan would be amended to reflect the 11<sup>th</sup> Amendment. The 11<sup>th</sup> Amended and Restated Master Planned Development would be finalized and recorded.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing, discuss the amendment and consider approving the 11<sup>th</sup> Amended and Restated Deer Valley Master Plan, according to the findings of fact, conclusions of law outlined in the Staff report.

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing.

There was no comment.

Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Strachan stated that typically after-the-fact changes to reflect as-built conditions are done because a wall is off by a few feet or for other minor corrections. This is an entire unit and he felt that was a completely different situation. Chair Wintzer explained that this was a field change that the Building Department approved without bringing it back to the Planning Commission. He understood that they were transferring a unit, but only because of the square footage. Chair Wintzer stated that they filled in square footage above it, which gave the unit equivalent another unit. The Building Department gave approval for that second level and it was discovered after-the-fact by the Planning Department. He felt comfortable that the process works, because one party checked on another party to find the discrepancy. Chair Wintzer clarified that this amendment fills in the inside space but it does not change the overall shape of the building.

Planner Whetstone replied that Chair Wintzer was correct. His explanation related to the next item on the agenda, which was the plat amendment for the Silver Baron Lodge. Planner Whetstone further explained that a unit had a locked area. That locked area became a unit above, and the unit below lost that space. The space next to the unit resulting from the locked space was on the condominium plat and listed as convertible space. That space was never part of any UEs and the 1200 square feet was later incorporated. Planner Whetstone noted that the allowed density was 50 units, but the original plat had 49 units. However, because they were only allowed a certain square footage and specific number of unit equivalents, the as-built did not comply with either the plat or the Deer Valley Master Plan.

Commissioner Strachan asked if the new unit was plumbed and serviced with sewage. Planner Whetstone answered yes, which is why another UE was needed from Snow Park.

Commissioner Peek understood that the units were not built in compliance with the approved set of plans and the plans were amended once that fact was discovered. Planner Whetstone was unsure of the sequence of events. When it went for a certificate of occupancy, the Planning Staff discovered that the product in the field did not match the condominium plat. Chair Wintzer understood that the applicants went to the Building Department and requested an amendment to fill in the building space, at which time the Building Department re-issued another building permit without checking with the Planning Department. Director Eddington agreed that there was mis-

communication between the Building Department and the Planning Department. He explained the review process and how the discrepancy was discovered.

MOTION: Commissioner Strachan moved to APPROVE the Amended and Restated Deer Valley Master Planned Development, according to the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law outlined in the Staff report. Commissioner Hontz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact - 11<sup>th</sup> Amended and Restated Deer Valley MPD

1. The Deer Valley Master Planned Development was last amended by the Planning Commission on August 12, 2009 as the 10<sup>th</sup> amended and Restated Deer Valley MPD.
2. The existing unallocated, undeveloped residential density at Snow Park Village is 210.75 UE. The proposed transfer of one (1) UE from Snow Park Village to Silver Baron Lodge does not increase or decrease the net residential density of the Deer Valley Community of the Deer Valley MPD.
3. The allowed residential density for Silver Baron Lodge is fifty (50) condominium units as 51.75 residential UEs. Fifty (50) condominium units as 42.75 UEs were constructed at Silver Baron Lodge based on a revised building permit set of plans approved by the Building Department. The as-built conditions exceeded the permitted 411.75 UEs for Silver Baron Lodge by one (1) UE.
4. The Planning Commission and City Council approved the Silver Baron record of survey plat in two phases. Phase I was approved by the City Council on April 7<sup>th</sup> of 2005 and recorded on May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2005. Phase II was approved by the City Council on September 14, 2006 and recorded at Summit County on June 1, 2007. The total number of condominium units reflected on these existing two plats is 49 units.
5. The applicant concurrently submitted a record of survey plat amendment to correctly identify unit #6439 as a separate condominium unit and to plat correctly existing interior private and limited common space for Units 6339 and 6443.
6. The additional UE resulted from reconfiguring and converting to private area, attic space, loft area, and a 44 sf convertible space area located on Levels 4 and 5 that were not previously included in the UE calculations. These areas are located at the south end of Building B Unit 6439 (2000 sf) was created from the reconfiguration of these existing interior spaces. Unit 6443 was reconfigured from 2,027 sf to 2,460 sf. Unit 6339 was reconfigured from 2,000 sf to 1,470 sf.
7. If the plat amendment is approved and the units are re-configured, Silver Baron Lodge condominiums will consist of 50 condominium units and will have a total residential density of 42.75 UE. The undeveloped Snow Park Village parcel would be reduced in density from

210.75 UEs to 209.75 UEs. The Deer Valley MPD requires that development on the Snow Park Village parcel utilize the UE formula and does not specify a total number of dwelling units.

8. The proposed reconfiguration of units consists of built space consisting of platted common and limited common area as well as convertible space within the existing building footprint and envelope. No new density is created and no new building area is created.
9. The proposed 11<sup>th</sup> Amended and Restated Deer Valley MPD consists of amendments to Exhibits 1 and 2 of the MPD and amendments to the text to correctly refer to this MPD as the 11<sup>th</sup> Amendment.
10. The transfer of density is within the Deer Valley Community (at Lower Deer Valley) and is not a transfer from Snow Park to Silver Lake or North Silver Lake.
11. No additional utility or parking demand is created by the amendment. There are 75 parking spaces for the 50 units in compliance with the MPD approval that allowed a parking ratio of 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit. All parking is within the underground parking structure. The total number of dwelling units is not greater than the total units approved through the MPD.
12. The transfer of density is into an existing multi-family structure and the existing building footprint and the existing envelope is not increased. There are no changes to the building setbacks or building height and there is no decrease in open space or landscaped area.

#### Conclusions of Law - 11<sup>th</sup> Amended and Restated Deer Valley MPD

1. The 11<sup>th</sup> Amended and Restated Deer Valley MPD and Exhibits comply with previous approvals and actions.
2. The MPD, as amended, complies with all the requirements of the Land Management Code.
3. The MPD, as amended, meets the minimum requirements of Section 15-6-5 of this Code.
4. The MPD, as amended, is consistent with the Park City General Plan.
5. The MPD, as amended, does not impact provision of the highest value of open space, as determined by the Planning Commission.
6. The MPD as amended, strengthens and enhances the resort character of Park City.
7. The MPD, as amended, compliments the natural features on the Site and preserves significant features or vegetation to the extent possible.

8. The MPD, as amended, is Compatible in use, scale and mass with adjacent properties, and promotes neighborhood compatibility.
9. The MPD provides amenities to the community so that there is no net loss of community amenities.
10. The MPD, as amended, is consistent with the employee Affordable Housing requirements as adopted by the City Council at the time the application was filed.
11. The MPD, as amended, meets the provisions of the Sensitive Lands Provisions of the Land Management Code. The project has been designed to place Development on the most Developable Land and least visually obtrusive portions of the site.
12. The MPD, as amended, promotes the use of non-vehicular forms of transportation through design and by providing trail connections. The Silver Baron Lodge utilizes a shuttle system and is located on the Park City bus route.
13. The MPD has been noticed and public hearings held in accordance with this Code.

#### Conditions of Approval

There are no conditions of approval for these proposed amendments to the 10<sup>th</sup> Amended and Restated Valley MPD.

2. 2800 Deer Valley Drive, Silver Baron Lodge - Amendment to Record of Survey  
**(Application #PL-11-01151)**

Planner Whetstone reviewed the request for the amendment to the record of survey, to allow the as-built conditions at the Silver Baron Lodge to be reflected on the condominium plat. Amending the plat would allow the units to be issued a certificate of occupancy.

The Staff had done the appropriate analysis and recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and consider forwarding a positive recommendation to the City Council, according to the findings of fact, conclusions of law and conditions of approval found in the ordinance.

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing.

There was no comment.

Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Strachan moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation on the 1<sup>st</sup> Amendment to the Silver Baron Lodge at Deer Valley, Phase II, record of survey plat, according to

the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval outlined in the draft ordinance. Commissioner Peek seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact - 2800 Deer Valley Drive

1. On January 4, 2011, the City received a complete application for an amendment to the Deer Valley master Planned Development (MPD) (the 11<sup>th</sup> Amended MPD).
2. On January 10, 2011, the City received a complete application for an amendment to the Silver Baron Lodge at Deer Valley Phase II record of survey plat.
3. The Silver Baron Lodge is located at 2800 Deer Valley Drive within the RD-MPD zone, subject to the Deer Valley Master Planned Development, as amended.
4. The application for the Deer Valley MPD 11<sup>th</sup> Amendment is being reviewed concurrently with this application.
5. On April 15, 2005, the Planning Commission amended the 1996 The Lodges CUP, separating out the two Silver Baron Lodge buildings as a separate Silver Baron Lodge CUP.
6. On November 9, 2005, the Planning Commission amended the Silver Baron Lodge CUP combining the density from The Lodges buildings A and F with 7 UEs from unbuilt Courchevel Building A, allowing a total density of 50 units.
7. The amended Silver Baron Lodge CUP approval also included 81.55% open space, 75 parking spaces, 6,884 sf of support meeting space (3,488 sf exist) and 6,884 sf of support commercial spa and exercise area (4,991 sf exist). Parking was allowed at 1.5 spaces per condominium unit and a building height of 35' plus an additional 5' for a pitched roof was approved consistent with the Deer Valley MPD.
8. The City Council approved the Silver Baron Lodge at Deer Valley record of survey plat in two phases. Phase I was approved by the City Council on April 7<sup>th</sup> of 2005 and recorded on May 26<sup>th</sup>, 2005. Phase II was approved by the City Council on September 14, 2006 and recorded on June 1, 2007.
9. The total number of condominium units platted with Phases I and II was 49 units with a unit equivalent density of 41.404 UEs.
10. The Deer Valley MPD (10<sup>th</sup> Amended) allows a density of 41.75 UE and specifies a total of 50 dwelling units for the Silver Baron Lodge parcel.

11. The existing Silver Baron Lodge buildings, as constructed, are consistent with the silver Baron Lodge CUP in terms of uses, density, required setbacks, open space, building height, and parking.
12. Construction of Silver Baron Lodge Phase II is nearly complete. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for the units, a final condominium record of survey plat documenting the "as built" conditions is required.
13. This plat amendment application is a request to document the as-built conditions for the Silver Baron Lodge. Phase II (Building B of Silver Baron Lodge) by platting Unit #6439 as it was constructed, platting existing interior private and limited common space for Units 6339 and 6443 as they were constructed, and by platting roof deck area as limited common for Units 6324, 6437, 6439, and 6443.
14. Construction of these units was based on a revised building permit set of plans approved by the Building Department
15. As constructed the Silver Baron Lodge Condominiums (Phases I and II) consist of 50 condominium units with a total residential density of 42.75 UE. The additional UE resulted from reconfiguring and converting to private area, common and limited common attic space and loft area, as well as 400 sf of convertible space located on Level 4 and 5 that were not previously included in the UE calculations.
16. These units are located at the south end of Building B. Unit 6439 (2000sf) was created from the reconfiguration of these existing interior spaces. Unit 6443 was reconfigured from 2,027 sf to 2,460 sf. Unit 6339 was reconfigured from 2,000 sf to 1,470 sf.
17. The as-built plat is required as a condition precedent to issuance of certificates of occupancy for Silver Baron units 6339, 6443 and 6439.
18. No new density in terms of number of units is proposed as the CUP and MPD allow 50 dwelling units. One UE of density in terms of unit equivalents is proposed as the MPD allows 41.75 UE and 42.75 UE were constructed.
19. Deer Valley has agreed to transfer one (1) UE from Snow Park Village to the Silver Baron Lodge in order to bring Silver Baron Lodge into compliance with the MPD.
20. The MPD amendment would increase the UE density for the Silver Baron Lodge parcel from 41.74 UE to 42.75 UE and would decrease the UE density of the Snow Park Village parcel from 210.75 UEs to 209.75 UEs.
21. The Deer Valley MPD requires that development on the Snow Park Village parcel utilize the UE formula and does not specify a total number of dwelling units.

22. The proposed transfer of one (1) UE from Snow Park Village to Silver Baron Lodge does not increase or decrease the net residential density of the Deer Valley Community of the Deer Valley MPD because both Silver Baron Lodge and Snow Park Village are within the Deer Valley Community area.

Conclusion of Law - 2800 Deer Valley Drive

1. The First Amendment to the Silver Baron Lodge at Deer Valley Phase II record of survey plat is consistent with the proposed 11<sup>th</sup> Amended Deer Valley MPD and the November 9, 2005 amended Silver Baron CUP.
2. There is good cause for this record of survey plat amendment in that the amendments reflect the as-built conditions within the existing building envelope.
3. The plat amendment is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code, the General Plan, and applicable State law regarding condominium plats.
4. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed plat amendment.
5. Approval of the plat amendment, subject to the conditions state below, does not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval - 2800 Deer Valley Drive

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant will record the plat at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year's time, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.
3. All conditions of approval of the Amended Deer Valley master Planned Development and the November 9, 2005 amended Silver Baron Conditional Use Permit continue to apply to this property.
4. If the 11<sup>th</sup> Amendment to the Deer Valley MPD is not approved by the Planning Commission, then this plat amendment application may not proceed as drafted and an amended application would need to be submitted that is consistent with the Deer Valley MPD, as amended.
3. Modification to Emergency Plan for Empire Pass - Amendment to Technical Report (Application #PL-11-01151)

Director Eddington reviewed the application for the adoption of the revised Technical Report #7, The Emergency Response Plan for the Empire Pass/Flagstaff MPD. He noted that 15 technical reports were required as part of the Flagstaff MPD, and one was the emergency response plan. Director Eddington stated that over the years amendments and revisions have become necessary and the Staff has worked with the applicant to make those revisions.

Director Eddington stated that in 2008 concerns were raised regarding the emergency access route from the Montage down into the City. The original plan showed an emergency route between the Montage down to Daly Avenue, and there were slope concerns with that route in terms of vehicle access. In addition, the people on Daly Avenue were opposed to having the emergency access through their street.

Director Eddington referred to a map on page 150 of the Staff report, and noted that a new emergency route was worked out between the applicant, Ron Ivie, the City Engineer and the Planning Department. Director Eddington reviewed the map and indicated the newly proposed emergency route, which utilizes a portion of the vacated State Road 224 and connects to Royal Street just west of the intersection of Royal Street and Stein Way. It is a safer path and the slope is acceptable to the City Engineer and the Building Official. Director Eddington noted that the new route also services a few other areas and makes emergency access easier. He stated that the routes are not accessible by the public, except in emergency situations. The route is not plowed in the winter, but it is plowable and can be plowed to accommodate emergency access. He explained that the route is not plowed because it crosses several Deer Valley ski runs.

Director Eddington reported that Deer Valley supports the revised emergency access. He reiterated that the City worked with the applicant and the City recommends the revised route.

Commissioner Hontz referred to a misspelling of Daly Avenue and suggested that Director Eddington do a search for other misspellings.

Commissioner Hontz noted that the emergency response plan was fairly short and she was unsure why they were not using this as an opportunity to further update the report. As an example, the fire station locations are now different, as well as many other items identified in the 2004 report. Commissioner Hontz wanted to know the reasoning for only updating the map.

Director Eddington explained that the map was the outstanding issue that had not been previously updated. The Staff would work with the applicant to update the text, however, the intent this evening was to obtain approval from the Planning Commission regarding the emergency route.

Commissioner Hontz pointed out that the report did not match the map. She noted that page 4 of the emergency response plan talks about access and different routes, including Daly Avenue. She felt it was important for the verbiage to be updated. Commissioner Hontz stated that the new route was not accurately represented on page 150 of the Staff report. She referred to the dotted blue line on the map that represented the connection that would be unpaved and plowable over and around into Empire Canyon to Daly, and noted that where it turns to yellow on the map is not a

primary paved road. The pavement ends past the pump station. She would not approve paving that portion of the road if it was part of the update. Commissioner Hontz indicated the yellow lines on the map that should be changed to blue to accurately reflect the road.

Chair Wintzer asked if there was a pending deadline to update the report, or if it was only a matter of correcting discrepancies. Director Eddington replied that they were trying to clean up the discrepancies, but they would like to have the emergency route approved as soon as possible. Chair Wintzer stated that if time was not an issue, he preferred that they re-do the map and update the technical report before the Planning Commission votes for approval. It would be better for the Planning Commission to approve the actual updated technical report, as opposed to just approving the concept.

Director Eddington stated that the amendments would be easily made. Commissioner Savage asked if anything else hinged on approval of this particular revised technical report. Director Eddington replied that it was important to have approval by mid-April because they are trying to address all the issues relative to the Montage for a final certificate of occupancy. Director Eddington noted that the April 13<sup>th</sup> meeting would probably be cancelled and the Planning Commission would not meet again until April 27<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Hontz remarked that it is not the Staff's responsibility to update an applicant's emergency response plan. She would like to be able to approve it, but it was incorrect.

Commissioner Strachan was unsure why the Planning Commission was reviewing the report when it was an administrative exercise. Director Eddington stated that the Staff actually discussed whether or not to have the Planning Commission formally approve it. Since it was a change to a technical report, they thought it was best to have Planning Commission approval.

Commissioner Peek wanted to know how long it would take to make the emergency access accessible in the winter.

Mark, representing Talisker, stated that the road is plowed and functional today. It is plowed because of the number of cat walks. This spring, when the weather permits, they will re-grade some of the areas for drainage. Commissioner Peek pointed out that the access crosses ski runs. In the event of an emergency, he wanted to know how long it would take to make the road accessible. Mark replied that it would take several hours.

Commissioner Savage acknowledged that he was not involved with the history of the Montage, but he understood that reference to a "new road" implies that it would be a new road that does not currently exist. Mark replied that the road already exists. It is called "new" because there was an older version that required approval from Deer Valley. The term "new" was based on 2008 meetings with Deer Valley and a "new version", not the road itself.

Commissioner Savage asked if the revised plan would impact any of the existing or planned mountain biking trails. Mark stated that they used an overlay to identify the trails and found trails that Deer Valley maintain and the HOA maintains. Trails crisscross in some circumstances.

Commissioner Hontz was pleased with the update, but she preferred to see it all completed as one package.

MOTION: Commissioner Hontz moved to CONTINUE the adoption of the revised and updated Technical Report #7, the Emergency Response Plan to a date uncertain, to further amend, revise and update the technical report per the comments made this evening, and to address police and fire protection locations and access. Commissioner Peek seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### 4. Park City Heights - Master Planned Development

Planner Whetstone reviewed the application for 239 units on 239 acres, located west of US40 and South of Richard Flat Road, in the CT zone. The parcel was part of the May 27, 2010, the Park City Heights Annexation Agreement. Planner Whetstone noted that the Planning Commission has previously reviewed this application at several meetings and work sessions.

The purpose of the meeting this evening was to review the proposed MPD and to summarize the Planning Commission discussions, concern, and issues. The Staff had provided an analysis of the General Plan, the CT zone, and Master Planned Development criteria that was used to analyze the project for compliance.

Planner Whetstone noted that the Planning Commission had been provided with information regarding the fire hazard severity and the visuals that were requested for the current site plan. The cut sections that were requested at the last meeting were also provided.

The Staff requested that the Planning Commission review the discussion items in the Staff report, as well as the draft findings, conclusions and conditions, and continue the item to April 27<sup>th</sup> to allow the Staff and the applicant time to address any remaining issues.

Chair Wintzer stated that since the Planning Commission had received new information this evening, the applicant should not expect comments until the Commissioners had the opportunity to review the material.

Commissioner Luskin recalled from the last meeting that the Planning Commission was concerned that the last wildlife report was conducted in 2002, and the wildlife mitigation plan for this project had some deficiencies. He could not recall from the discussion whether or not the Planning Commission wanted another wildlife report, but he was certain that they were looking for more than just conditions. Commissioner Hontz stated that the Planning Commission asked for another wildlife report and it would be required as a condition of approval.

Based on animals he has personally seen in the area, Commissioner Luskin disagreed with some of the findings in the wildlife study and comments made by the wildlife biologist at the last meeting.

He was frustrated that every time they asked a question about this specific area, they were told about the animals at Jordanelle.

Spencer White, representing the applicant, stated that after the last meeting the wildlife biologist group added additional language to the study. He noted that the site visits mentioned in the study were conducted in December 2010. He agreed that the biologist had referenced the last study that was done in 2002. The problem is that nothing was done between 2002 and 2010, which is why the conclusion was for another study. Mr. White remarked that the findings in the revised language specifically talks about another site visit in the May to June months and updating the study. Mr. White stated that the biologist also added recommendations, based on his best opinion as a biologist.

Commissioner Luskin was comfortable with the revisions and the recommendations. He pointed out that the fact that this was done after the last meeting was not reflected in the Staff report.

Commissioner Savage recalled that the matrix provided this evening came from a request at the last meeting that the Staff prepare a matrix that listing all the topics discussed to make sure all the issues were properly referenced and reviewed. The matrix could be used as a vehicle to consolidate their concerns and communicate to Staff accordingly. The fact that the Planning Commission took exception to some of the points in the study was part of the exercise they needed to go through.

Planner Whetstone clarified that the last column that indicated "resolved" was only a recommendation from Staff as one way to resolve the issue as a condition of approval. Commissioner Luskin thought it was putting the cart before the horse. He did not think they could have a condition of approval until they have information to address. Planner Whetstone stated that the Staff had conducted an analysis of the biologist report and the information provided and found it to be accurate.

Mr. White clarified that the applicant had asked the biologist group to add to their findings and to add additional language to the report they had already done. The applicant understood from the last meeting that in addition to making the corrections and other recommendations, as part of the condition of approval of the MPD the biologist would come back in May and/or June to do additional studies.

Commissioner Savage understood that the additional studies would make a determination as to whether or not additional wildlife mitigation would be necessary above and beyond the initial recommendations. Requiring the May/June study as a condition of approval would not delay approval of the MPD. Mr. White replied that this was correct.

Mr. White stated that like the Planning Commission, he had not seen the matrix provided by Staff until this meeting. He noted that the next item on the matrix was fire protection and wildland interface, and he was prepared to have that discussion.

Commissioner Hontz remarked that the information provided this evening was an excellent tool. She noted that additional information had been provided during the week, including hazard severity and other exhibits. While the information was very helpful, she was not prepared to discuss the issues without the opportunity to review the minutes and the questions she asked, and compare the volumes of material that have been provided, to see if there are lingering issues. Commissioner Hontz stated that she could not go through the list and recall from memory whether everything had been addressed. Now that she has all the materials she could go back and review her questions and make all the connections.

Commissioner Savage felt the point of the matrix was to provide a template by which the process could take place and the discussions on specific items could occur to see if they could be finalized as a step towards final conditions of approval. He agreed that they were not prepared to begin those discussions this evening.

Mr. White stated that if the Planning Commission wanted to address some of the items discussed at the last meeting, he would be able to identify where they were inserted into the design guidelines. The Planning Commission could then take that information and provide feedback prior to the meeting on April 27<sup>th</sup>. If they could submit their comments in writing, the applicant would have responses for the April meeting.

Chair Wintzer thought it was unfair to ask the Planning Commission to make comments on any of the issues this evening based on the amount of new information provided. Mr. White offered to provide page references in the design guidelines to make it easier for the Commissioners when they do their review.

Commissioner Strachan asked of the materials received this evening was the last of what they would receive, or if more information would be coming. Mr. White replied that everything provided was final information, unless the Planning Commission requested something additional. Planner Whetstone reviewed the list of submittal documents on page 199 of the Staff report. She noted that some documents were contained in the annexation file. The Planning Commission did not have the wetlands delineation report nor the environmental study that was done on the entire property as part of the annexation. Planner Whetstone had both documents available. The physical model was still in the Planning Department and Mr. White had the computer model.

Planner Whetstone reported that all the Park City Heights minutes were available online. The Staff had reviewed the minutes and tried to summarize items where there was consensus among the Planning Commission.

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing.

Sally Fuegi from Morningstar Estates wanted to make sure that there were no plans to access Park City Heights through their fire roads. She requested that it be written into the conditions to make that assurance.

Planner Whetstone read Condition of Approval #36, which prohibits access through the Deer Valley MPD subdivisions. Mr. White noted that it was also part of the annexation agreement.

Mr. White stated that the applicant tried to do everything they were asked to do and it was incorporated into the design guidelines. The applicant believed that most of the comments were positive for the project. Mr. White looked forward to additional comments that would help clearly define the guidelines and move towards action.

Commissioner Savage stated that he was unaware until this evening that the April 13<sup>th</sup> meeting would be cancelled. Director Eddington explained that a number of the Staff would be out of town at a planning conference on April 13<sup>th</sup>, and because the agenda was light, those items were moved to the April 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Commissioner Savage stated that the Planning Commission meetings are a planned commitment, and he would prefer earlier notice if meetings are cancelled. Secondly, people believe that the General Plan is important and having the opportunity to get the Planning Commission together for two or three hours to talk about the General Plan from a comprehensive point of view is a very value opportunity. He suggested that the Staff reconsider whether attending the planning conference is a higher purpose than focusing on the General Plan in a constructive fashion. Commissioner Savage felt the matter warranted discussion rather than just making a decision to cancel the April 13<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Director Eddington stated that the Staff has wanted to schedule a General Plan meeting. The last few months have been very busy with a number of projects and MPDs coming in. The Staff has been looking at ways to find more resources to dedicate towards the General Plan. Commissioner Savage remarked that they had resources dedicated from the Planning Commission on April 13<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Wintzer requested that the Planning Commission finish the Park City Heights discussion and then comment on the General Plan as an internal discussion.

Director Eddington stated that typically for MPDs or large scale projects, the Staff tries to encourage two or three Commissioners to come into the Planning Department and meet with the Staff to address specific issues. One on one meetings helps the Staff better understands their concerns relative to the project.

Chair Wintzer believed the biological report was a good step in the right direction. He requested that the Staff come back with conditions of approval that reflect what is contained in the biological report. Chair Wintzer understood that there were new points on grading and retaining walls to be reviewed. He would like the design guidelines to address maximum wall height and related issues.

Chair Wintzer asked if the conditions of approval addressed a limits of disturbance for doing the roads. He wanted to make sure they would not end up with a 200 foot LOD if a road is 60 feet wide. He suggested language that specifies a number that the limit of disturbance cannot exceed when building a road. Mr. White asked if Chair Wintzer wanted that number in addition to what the City Engineer requires. Chair Wintzer clarified that he wanted the LOD spelled out.

Chair Wintzer referred to the sheet showing the typical street sections and suggested that they include a drawing in the design guidelines showing the maximum dimensions of the street retaining wall.

Commissioner Peek requested that the applicant go through the street sections and add dimensions where they are missing. Commissioner Peek recommended a condition of approval for on-site construction recycling, as well as a staging area on-site for the spoils of excavation that could be taken back up to individual jobs for backfill. Commissioner Peek referred to the trail improvements in Finding of Fact #11, and suggested adding a condition of approval that requires items 1 and 2 in finding #11 to be installed prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy. Planner Whetstone believed the condition of approval specifies a three year time line for the park and the trails from the date of issuance of the first building permit.

Planner Whetstone thought they should begin to talk about phasing the amenities. Commissioner Savage asked Planner Whetstone to provide an outline that shows the phasing of amenities. A spreadsheet would give a sense of the time line for implementation. Commissioner Peek stated that when the units are occupied, there would be immediate benefit from having the trail connection across the highway, particularly for IHC.

Commissioner Peek asked for clarification on Condition #17. Planner Whetstone stated that the condition addresses some of the issues that came up with Snow Creek, such as location of utility boxes. Director Eddington noted Rocky Mountain Power is always a challenge. The intent is to prevent certain issues from occurring and to work more with Rocky Mountain Power rather than against them.

Commissioner Peek noted that Condition #23 talks about complying with the recommendations of the Fire Protection Report; however, he could not find recommendations in the Fire Protection Report.

Mr. White explained that typically recommendations are not provided. As an example, the report might say there needs to be hydrant space within 500 feet and every home shall be sprinkled. Based on that explanation, Commissioner Peek pointed out that the condition did not make sense, and suggested revising the language to indicate that construction permits shall not increase the fire hazards severity. Planner Whetstone offered to work with the Building Department to draft an appropriate condition of approval. Mr. White felt it would be better to ask Scott Adams to write a letter with regard to the fire hazards. Chair Wintzer pointed out that if questions arise in the future, it would be easy to go back to the conditions of approval. He thought a condition of approval was the better option.

Commissioner Peek read from Condition #24, Limits of Disturbance, "Silt fencing is required during construction in areas where run-off and construction may impact adjacent wetlands and water ways". He preferred to expand the language to include undisturbed areas as determined by the Building Department. Planner Whetstone clarified that the silt fencing is additional fencing required near wetlands. The orange fencing is the construction disturbance fencing. Commissioner Peek pointed out that if a hillside is disturbed due to a road cut, there is a good chance that runoff could

occur in potentially undisturbed areas. Planner Whetstone offered to revise the language in Condition #24 to address the concern. Commissioner Peek clarified that he was only referring to the silt fencing.

Commissioner Peek noted that underground utilities were mentioned in the report, but not in the conditions of approval. He requested that Planner Whetstone draft a condition requiring the utilities to be placed underground. He understood that the big power line would still be above ground.

Commissioner Strachan reserved his comments until he had the opportunity to digest all the information provided. However, he felt that many of the conditions of approval should be findings of fact, and many of the findings were redundant. For example, Finding #1(k) was redefined in Finding #11.

Commissioner Peek suggested that they obtain an official statement from UDOT on how a neighborhood could get a sound wall. Planner Whetstone offered to research the process for sound walls. Director Eddington stated that typically the neighbors would petition for a sound wall, but he was unsure if that was the procedure in Utah.

Commissioner Hontz reserved her comments until she could read through the materials provided. After her review, she would provide the applicant with a thorough list of items and issues.

Commissioner Luskin read Condition #25, "Trail easements for all proposed trails in the MPD shall be platted on the final recorded subdivision plats. All trails shall be constructed consistent with the Park City Trails Master Plan". He has never seen previous references or documents showing where the trail easements are located. Mr. White replied that there is a map of the trails with a trails legend. Mr. White explained that within the plat itself, there would be platted easements. Outside of the recorded plats, there would be trail easements. He noted that the developer can only deed the parcels within their ownership. The City would deed the rest to itself. Mr. Spencer stated that they would coordinate the trails that tie into other trails on adjacent properties so the easements line up.

Commissioner Savage wanted to know how the trails would be maintained subsequent to completion of the development. Mr. White noted that they would be public trails, which are typically maintained by Snyderville Basin Recreation District and Mountain Trails Foundation. Commissioner Savage suggested adding a condition that specifically states how the trails would be maintained in conjunction with the other public trails systems in the future.

Commissioner Luskin clarified his first question regarding trails. The trails map shows the trail easements within the subdivision. He was looking for easements on trails outside of the subdivision that should be taken into consideration. He was concerned about visual impacts this project would have for mountain bikers.

Commissioner Savage noted that the Park City Heights plan shows all the existing points of interaction with the existing trails that are in place on the trails map. Commissioner Luskin stated that the impacts on the trails were more than just the trails that run through the subdivision. He was

talking about trails where you could see the subdivision and the visual impacts that would be created. The issue has not been addressed and he felt they should be aware of it. Commissioner Luskin suggested doing the same type of analysis from trails that was done from the highway. Director Eddington asked if a map showing the existing City trails surrounding Park City Heights and connecting to their trails would be helpful. Commissioner Luskin answered yes.

Commissioner Peek asked if it was possible to put all the submittal documents listed on page 199 of the Staff report on the website.

As they read through the documents, Chair Wintzer asked if it was appropriate for the Commissioners to email questions to Planner Whetstone or Director Eddington, and have the response emailed to all the Commissioners. Director Eddington recommended that they direct their questions to Planner Whetstone. He also requested that each Commissioner meet with the Planner Whetstone one on one, prior to April 7<sup>th</sup>. At that point, Planner Whetstone could forward any outstanding questions and concerns to the applicant to be addressed in a final report for the April 27<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Chair Wintzer asked if it was possible for the Planning Commission to receive the Staff report prior to 5:00 p.m. on the Friday before the meeting, to allow additional time to review it. Director Eddington replied that the Staff would do their best.

MOTION: Commissioner Strachan moved to CONTINUE the Park City Heights - MPD application to April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2011. Commissioner Hontz seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

The Planning Commission continued with their comments regarding the General Plan.

Chair Wintzer agreed with Commissioner Savage on the importance of scheduling a General Plan meeting. He understood that the planning conference came up for the Staff, but he thought it was important to have a General Plan update before applications begin to come in this summer. Director Eddington stated that previously the Planning Department tried to schedule at least one General Plan meeting every month. However, that has become difficult because applications are coming in heavily.

Commissioner Savage stated that he has been on the Planning Commission for almost a year, and he could only recall one serious meeting about the General Plan in that time. Director Eddington stated that the Staff could look at moving the schedule around beginning in May, and to have one meeting heavy with applications and the second meeting for the General Plan. Chair Wintzer thought they should schedule a General Plan meeting and make the applicants wait, since the Planning Commission had already waited a year.

Commissioner Savage noticed on the agenda for the Development Review Committee that an application was submitted for Bonanza Park. He was upset when he saw that a pre-MPD had

between submitted, because the Planning Commission has not had the opportunity to talk about Bonanza Park from a General Plan point of view, and to discuss concepts and ideas.

Director Eddington stated that preliminary planning has been done for Bonanza Park, but Commissioner Savage was right in saying that there is not a final plan for that area. Commissioner Savage remarked that Bonanza Park would end up a hodge podge if they do not act quickly and get ahead of the curve. He believed the Planning Commission has the obligation to do whatever is possible to negate the impacts of the hodge podge. He implored the Planning Department to make that a priority ahead of the other things that keep them too busy.

Director Eddington stated that submitted applications have a time limit for being reviewed and sent to the Planning Commission. Commissioner Savage suggested that the Planning Commission find a forum where they can speak with others in Park City Government to make sure they understand that the Staff has resource issues that need to be resolved.

Chair Wintzer assumed that City Council Member Butwinski had heard their discussion and would relate their frustration to the City Council regarding the Staff's lack of time to work on the General Plan. Council Member Butwinski stated that he would relay it as the Planning Commission's perception of the case. Commissioner Strachan remarked that it was not the perception of all the Commissioners.

Commissioner Savage reiterated that it was time to resolve the problem. Director Eddington concurred.

The Park City Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: \_\_\_\_\_