

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
MAY 24, 2017

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair Adam Strachan, Melissa Band, Preston Campbell, Steve Joyce, John Phillips, Laura Suesser, Doug Thimm

EX OFFICIO:

Planning Director, Bruce Erickson; Kirsten Whetstone, Planner; Ashley Scarff, Planner; Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney; Matt Cassel, City Engineer

=====

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

Chair Strachan called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m. and noted that all Commissioners were present except Commissioners Thimm who was expected to arrive.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

NOTE: The Commissioners approved the Minutes at the end of the meeting since Commissioner Thimm needed to be present to form a quorum of Commissioners who were present on April 12th.

April 12, 2017

Commissioner Thimm referred to page 58, and noted that the Minutes reflected a comment by Planner Astorga saying, "...and it's quite difficult on other municipalities..." He recalled that Planner Astorga had actually said it was "**quite typical in other municipalities...**" Commissioner Thimm had confirmed this change with Planner Astorga and corrected the minutes to say, "**...quite typical...**"

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to APPROVE the Minutes of April 12, 2017 as amended. Commissioner Suesser seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed.

May 10, 2017

Commissioner Band moved to APPROVE the minutes of May 10, 2017. Commissioner Thimm seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Commissioner Joyce abstained.

PUBLIC INPUT

Tom Hurd commented on TDRs. His interest is that he and two other families own lots in TDR Sending Old Town 2. Mr. Hurd stated that on June 18, 2015 the Planning Commission forwarded a positive recommendation to the City Council a revision to the LMC, which would award one TDR for each 1,875 square feet in the Historic District, regardless of underlying zone. The current methodology is 1 TDR per the underlying density for that particular zoning. Mr. Hurd noted that the City Council sent it back to the Planning Commission for further study and it never resurfaced. After one year and 11 months ago no action has been taken. Mr. Hurd asked if anyone knows what further study the City Council wanted, and if there was any hope that the Planning Commission would readdress this LMC change regarding TDRs and re-forward it to the City Council. In general, he asked if the TDR program was still viable. Mr. Hurd stated that in the last three to five years he has had three inquiries about TDRs and whether they would be willing to sell them. His answer is yes he would be willing to sell them but no one is buying. Mr. Hurd asked if anyone has ever transferred a TDR from one sending zone to a receiving zone. He had met with Planner Whetstone and with Director Erickson to discuss TDRs and the situation, as well as the equity in changing the rules so every piece of property is treated equally. Mr. Hurd asked if it was possible to move the process forward.

Director Erickson explained that TDRs was returned back to the Planning Commission because some of the receiving zones were no longer appropriate. The intent was to transfer density to the resort bases and to Bonanza Park; however, those are not appropriate locations at this point. The City is also concerned about how the asset is valued. The current Code does not allow the asset to be valued until the City Council determines the value of the asset being transferred. The zoning regulation has to be applied. There is no asset value until the City approved the transfer.

Director Erickson noted that TDRs were on the list of priorities that the Planning Commission went through several months ago, but they have been distracted by other issues such as net zero, historic preservation, storefront preservation, etc. He thinks TDRs have a lot of merit in Mr. Hurd's neighborhood, and he would like to find a way to make it work. However, he first needs to find a receiving zone.

Chair Strachan stated that because the current zoning and many of the would-be receiving zones are already dense there are no buyers. He understood that there were willing

sellers, but until they have willing buyers the program does not work. Chair Strachan stated that his solution was to downzone and make the densities less, but that was not received well and it did not progress. The current zoning exists, and unless they are willing to change the fundamental starting point, it is not a viable program.

Commissioner Band had researched TDRs when the issue was first raised. There are only about ten TDR programs in the entire Country that actually work. Her research found that downzoning is a huge part where the communities downzone the zones in order for people to buy the 2,000 additional square feet. Commissioner Band pointed out that it is a complicated process and Park City was not the only City who was still trying to figure it out. She also found that cities with TDRs programs do not function well because there are not buyers or sellers or a bank. Commissioner Band did not believe anyone had bought or sold a TDR in Park City.

Mr. Hurd clarified that he was primarily looking for clarity. He understood from their comments that TDRs was still on the list but it does not work.

STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Erickson reported that the discussion regarding conventional retail on Main Street was coming back to the Planning Commission. He anticipated that it would be scheduled on the agenda in July.

Director Erickson stated that they were still on track to talk about Treasure Hill and related traffic on June 10th.

Commissioner Joyce asked when the Planning Commission could expect the Kimball to come back. Director Erickson replied that the Kimball remand would probably be in July.

Commissioner Phillips stated that he would be attending the City Council meeting and he intended to make comments as a private citizen, and not representing the Planning Commission. Chair Strachan asked Commissioner Phillips to provide an update for the Planning Commission at the next meeting.

Commissioner Band disclosed that she would be recusing herself from 7195 Little Belle Court because she had sold a condo and that she had been there yesterday.

Commissioner Suesser announced that she would be unable to attend the June 28th Planning Commission meeting.

CONTINUATIONS – public hearing and continue to date specified

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

Dan Maus, an owner of the Struggler condominium adjacent to 1450 and 1460 Park Avenue. He understood that the parking would be increased, and he wanted to know how far the parking would be extended, and what the configuration would look like. He also asked if there would be paved parking, or whether there would be structured involved.

Chair Strachan stated that the Planning Commission had no additional information. He encouraged him to attend the meeting on June 29th and to read the Staff report because it may answer some of his questions.

Community Development Director, Anne Laurent, pointed out that there was not a Staff report on this item because it was not scheduled on the agenda this evening; however, as a Staff person she offered to step outside with Mr. Maus and try to answer his questions to the best of her ability.

Director Erickson clarified that the parking would not be increased over the zone density for parking, and they were not parking the two historic homes.

1. 1450-1460 Park Avenue – A plat amendment requesting to combine Lots 1 and 2 of the Retreat at the Park Subdivision at 1450-1460 Park Avenue into one lot of record. (Application PL-17-03501)

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing. There were no comments. Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to Continue 1450-1460 Park Avenue plat amendment to June 28, 2017. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

2. 1450-1460 Park Avenue - Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application for the construction of a Parking Area of five (5) or more than spaces at 1450-1460 Park Avenue. Applicant is proposing to construct nine (9) parking spaces along Sullivan Road. (Application PL-17-03502)

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to CONTINUE the 1450-1460 Park Avenue CUP to June 28, 2017. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

3. 1450-1460 Park Avenue- Request for Approval of a Condominium Plat for the combined Lots of the Retreat at the Park Subdivision for eight (8) residential units. (Application PL-17-03503)

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to CONTINUE 1450-1460 Park Avenue Condominium Plat for eight residential units to June 28, 2017. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

4. 4001 Kearns Boulevard – First Amendment to the Park City Film Studios Subdivision, a plat amendment to divide Lot 1 into three platted lots of record. The property consists of approximately 30 acres. (Application PL-15-03005)

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing. There were no comments. Chair Strachan closed the public.

MOTION: Commissioner Joyce moved to CONTINUE 4001 Kearns Boulevard First Amendment to the Park City Film Studios Subdivision to June 14, 2017. Commissioner Phillips seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA - DISCUSSION/PUBLIC HEARINGS/ POSSIBLE ACTION

1. **Yearly report given to Planning Commission regarding the Capital Improvement Projects approved by City Council.**

City Engineer, Matt Cassel, stated that during the budget season he presents the CIP list to the Planning Commission that was prepared by the City Staff. The Planning Commission is requested to review the list to make sure that it is consistent with the General Plan. Mr. Cassel noted that it is also a requirement of the State Code. Public uses are to conform to the General Plan, and that includes building, roadwork, general or public utilities, and infrastructure.

Mr. Cassel had highlighted the projects that he believed the Planning Commission would have a higher sense of focus. He understood it was a lot of information, and he was prepared to answer questions.

Commissioner Joyce asked if the Planning Commission was supposed to approve the CIP or whether it was just an FYI. If they were to approve it, he was unsure how they could do that with limited information and no details. Using the park and ride on SR248 and US40, he could not understand how the Planning Commission would be able to determine whether it is consistent with the General Plan without some level of detail.

Mr. Cassel replied that he and Director Erickson had spoken earlier in the day about how they could make sure that each project on the CIP lists is reviewed administratively before it moves forward. He clarified that the goal this evening was not to have the Planning Commission approval the list, but rather whether they see items that may not be consistent with the General Plan.

Director Erickson remarked that there was no approval action by the Planning Commission. The intent was for the Commissioners to provide input that the Staff could take to the City Council as part of the budget process.

Commissioner Suesser was confused about some projects being identified as proposed projects. Mr. Cassel explained that the list was proposed to the City Council, but the Council had not yet approved it. However, some items were approved from years prior. He agreed that the goal was for the Planning Commission raise questions for the City Council to consider before taking a final vote on the projects.

Commissioner Joyce commented on the item for Swede Sidewalks, which said, "Construct sidewalks on Swede Alley and other parking and pedestrian enhancement concept design". He recalled previous discussions regarding storefronts and whether Swede Alley should change its role. There was also discussion about having retail built in a City owner building that could provide low interest retail rental. Commissioner Joyce believed that walkability along Swede Alley should be part of an overall Swede Alley plan.

Mr. Cassel stated that the City has had conversations about Swede Alley. The 1998 Swede Alley Master Plan is outdated and it needs to be updated. There are varying positions on whether Swede Alley should continue to be a back of house alley or whether they should make it more of a storefront. The concept is to make Swede Alley more walkable, but they still need to look at those ideas and update the plan, and then move forward from that updated plan.

Commissioner Joyce stated that trying to figure out what Swede Alley should become is a hard discussion, and he would not favor spending any money at this point unless there were issues related to health and safety. He thought it was unwise to spend money on a concept without knowing the end project.

Commissioner Suesser commented on the Old Town stairs. She was happy to see the proposal for three sets of stairs on 9th Street and one on 10th Street. A lot of building was occurring on those blocks and there are no sidewalks. She believed the community could use the additional stairs. Commissioner Suesser stated that when this discussion has come up in the past, there has been discussion on whether the right-of-way for those stairs was still available because there are encroachments into the rights-of-way.

Mr. Cassel stated that on 9th Street they have continued to reserve space to put the stairs in. He noted that 9th Street is paved and he believed there were stairs from Empire down to Woodside, but not from Empire to Lowell. Commissioner Suesser asked if stairs were proposed from Empire to Lowell. Mr. Cassel replied that it was proposed, but he was unsure how it could be accomplished because there are currently utilities in that right-of-way.

2. **1900 Park Avenue – Conditional Use Permit (CUP) for the construction of a second outdoor dining patio and exterior entryway, as well as the expansion of an existing restroom area within the Frontage Protection Zone (FPZ) for Squatters Pub. (Application PL-17-03528)**

Director Erickson noted that Ashley Scarff was the project planner and he would present the application in her absence.

Director Erickson reviewed the application to remodel 1,000 square feet of an existing deck at Squatters inside the Frontage Protection Zone; to add a 500 square feet deck; and to improve the bathrooms for ADA access and provide additional restroom space.

The application had been reviewed by the Planning Department and the City Engineer. The City Engineer had provided commentary respect to the drainage on the back of the property in terms of making sure that the stream water quality remains clean. That mitigation was addressed in a condition of approval. Another condition of approval states that because this was a pre-existing metes and bounds parcel, the applicant must submit an application to record one lot of record.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and approve the conditional use permit based on the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval found in the Staff report.

Commissioner Suesser asked about the right turn only coming out of the parking lot and asked if that applied to both sides. Director Erickson replied that for now it was only on the southeast side.

Commissioner Joyce commented on past discussions about adding landscaping as part of the last update. He noted that a series of large trees that line the end of the existing deck would have to be removed. He liked how the trees form a natural buffer for the Frontage Protection Zone. Commissioner Joyce noted that trees were drawn on the new plan, but he could not find a new landscaping plan or what the trees would be replaced with. He asked if there was a commitment from the applicant in terms of what would replace the removed trees since it is right on the road.

Director Erickson noted that page 154 of the Staff report had a landscape plan but it did not list the plant materials. He stated that Planner Scarff had added condition of approval #8 requiring replacement in-kind; however, he was unsure how they could replace a 12" caliper Aspen. Director Erickson believed they could enhance the landscaping.

Chair Strachan agreed that Condition #8 was not strong enough. He thought they should say that the trees indicated on the site plan on pages 152, 153, and 154 should be required.

Commissioner Thimm asked if the approval could be condition to require a 2-1/2" caliper. Director Erickson replied that the Staff would consider a 2" or 3" caliper on the west and south façade of the deck. Commissioner Phillips asked if that would be required regardless of the condition. Director Erickson remarked that if significant vegetation is removed, there is a requirement inside the Code for replacement, which is the language Planner Scarff used to draft the condition.

Director Erickson was willing to revise condition of approval #8 stating that the trees on the west end of the deck and the north end of the deck be replaced with 3" minimum caliper. Chair Strachan asked if the number of trees should be taken from the site plan on page 154. Director Erickson answered yes.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

Ralph Nagasawa, the project architect for Squatters, stated that he was present to answer questions. He thought Planner Scarff had done a good job on the Staff report. Mr. Nagasawa noted that the applicant met with the Planning Department and the City Engineer on several occasion to work through the issues. He was not opposed to a

condition of approval requiring that they put in additional trees, because the applicant had already spoken with Planner Scarff about replacing with 2" to 3" caliper trees.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

Director Erickson drafted Condition of Approval #8 to read, "All Significant vegetation that is moved as part of construction shall be replaced as shown on page 154 of the Staff report, which is not less than 3" caliper diameter at breast height". The Commissioners were comfortable with the language.

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to APPROVE the conditional use permit for 1900 Park Avenue based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Condition of Approval, as amended per the discussion this evening to revise Condition #8. Commissioner Band seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1900 Park Avenue

1. On April 17, 2017, the Planning Department received an application for a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow the Salt Lake Brewing Company to make improvements within the Frontage Protection Zone (FPZ) at Squatters Pub located at 1900 Park Avenue. The applicant also wishes to amend the site's existing Outdoor Dining CUP so that it covers the proposed second dining patio. The application was considered complete on April 21, 2017.
2. The subject property is a metes and bounds parcel that falls within the General Commercial (GC) District and Sensitive Land Overlay (SLO) Zone.
3. The project scope will only affect previously developed areas and will not affect nearby sensitive lands, as conditioned.
4. The entire parcel falls within the FPZ, making all proposed improvements subject to a Conditional Use review.
5. The Land Management Code (LMC) states that, within the FPZ, all construction activity, including permanent signs, within the setback area between thirty feet (30') and one hundred feet (100') from the nearest right-of-way line requires a CUP.
6. The site currently contains one (1) outdoor dining patio area that measures 1,019 square feet in area. The current property owner procured a CUP on June 27, 1990 for

outdoor dining on a proposed 1,026 sf patio within the FPZ. Building plans for the referenced deck are stamped approved August 28, 1990.

7. The existing outdoor deck was present when Salt Lake Brewing Company applied for a CUP to convert the building into Squatters Pub from the Mt. Air Café on April 12, 2006.

8. The applicant is proposing to renovate the existing patio and add a second outdoor dining patio that measures 528 square feet, as well as a new covered entryway that will add 51.9 square feet.

9. The new patio will be oriented at an angle, but the corner closest to the right-of-way (SR-224) is proposed to be located 45 feet, 2 ½ inches (45', 2.5") from the right-of-way line. All other improvements are located further back from the right-of-way line, and no construction is proposed to take place within the first 30 feet of the property.

10. The new entryway will be covered with a roof form designed to mimic the main structure's clock tower feature. The two (2) patio areas will be lined with poles that will support shade sails, which are temporary in nature.

11. The applicant is also proposing to expand the area of an existing restroom, which will incorporate 25.6 square feet of space that currently falls within the footprint of the existing patio, reducing the existing patio's area to 993.3 square feet. This will require the bathroom's roof to be extended to the west by approximately 6 feet (6') from the existing gable end.

12. No usable open space area will be affected with this project. The applicant proposes to maintain a landscaped island surrounding the patio areas, similar to the landscaped island currently on-site, as well as the currently landscaped buffer area that runs adjacent to Park Avenue.

13. The site plan shows 63 existing off-street parking spaces, which exceeds the off-street parking requirement for a restaurant and bar at a ratio of 1 space per 100 square feet of net leasable floor area.

14. The parking spaces adjacent to the SR-224 right-of-way are legal non-complying, as they fall within an area 30 feet in width that the FPZ stipulates shall be a landscaped buffer area. The existing landscaped buffer area abutting SR-224 is also legal noncomplying as it is not 30 feet in width, but was added through past approvals.

15. The proposed additions shall not affect vehicular and pedestrian circulation of the site,

or utilize currently usable open space, as they will not occupy any area that is not already developed.

16.The proposal meets all setback, height, and design requirements of the GC District and FPZ sections of the LMC.

17.On May 10, 2017, the property was posted and notice was mailed to affected property owners within 300 feet. Legal notice was also published in the Park Record on May 10th.

18.The Findings in the Analysis Section are incorporated herein.

19.This application has been reviewed under LMC §15-1-10(E) for Conditional Use Permits, as well as LMC §15-2.18-10(B)(1) Outdoor Dining.

Conclusions of Law – 1900 Park Avenue

1. The application satisfies all Conditional Use Permit review criteria as established by the LMC's Conditional Use Review process (§15-1-10(E), Criteria 1-16), as well as LMC §15-2.18-10(B) Outdoor Dining;
2. The Use, as conditioned, is compatible with surrounding structures in use, scale, mass, and circulation;
3. The Application complies with all requirements of the LMC; and
4. The effects of any differences in use or scale have been mitigated through careful planning.

Conditions of Approval for the Proposed Improvements – 1900 Park Avenue

1. The scope of this approval includes the renovation of the existing outdoor patio that measures 1,019 square feet in area, as well as the construction of a second patio measuring 528 square feet, and a new covered entryway measuring 51.9 square feet. An existing restroom will also be expanded, enclosing 25.6 sf of the existing outdoor patio area.
2. The second patio area, which is proposed to be oriented at an angle, shall be setback a minimum of 45 feet, 2 ½ inches (45', 2.5") from the SR-224 right-of-way line.
3. All other improvements shall comply with the minimum front, side, and rear yard setback requirements found in LMC §15-2.18.3, GC District Lot and Site Requirements.

4. The proposed covered entryway and roof extension over the restroom addition shall comply with the maximum building height for the GC District of 35 feet, measured from existing grade.
5. No existing parking spaces shall be altered or removed as part of this project.
6. Per LMC §15-3, all parking shall take place on hard-surfaced areas. The applicant shall either formalize the parking to the rear of the building currently utilized by employees, or have employees park in already-established parking areas.
7. The existing curb cut/entry point to the southeast of the building shall be signed as “right turn only” due to its close proximity to the SR-224/SR-248 intersection.
8. All Significant vegetation that is moved as part of construction shall be replaced as shown on page 154 of the Staff report, which is not less than 3” caliper diameter at breast height”.
9. The applicant must take measures to mitigate storm water runoff into the adjacent creek that originates from the unpaved area to the rear of the building often used for parking. This shall be required as part of the building permit application.
10. The applicant must apply for and procure a Building Permit from the Building Department prior to construction of the approved improvements, and plans shall be consistent with the plans reviewed by the Planning Commission on May 24, 2017.
11. The applicant shall not receive a Certificate of Occupancy for the improvement areas described above unless a plat amendment application to create a one-lot subdivision from the current metes and bounds parcel has been received by the Planning Department and deemed to be a complete application.
12. The final plat amendment shall be recorded with Summit County within one (1) year on this CUP approval.

Conditions of Approval for Outdoor Dining – 1900 Park Avenue

1. The proposed seating area shall be entirely located on private property and shall not diminish existing parking or landscaping.

2. The proposed seating area shall not impede pedestrian circulation.
3. The proposed seating area shall not impede emergency access or circulation.
4. The proposed furniture shall be compatible with the streetscape.
5. No music or noise in excess of the City Noise Ordinance, Title 6, is permitted.
6. Outdoor Dining shall not take place after 10 p.m.

3. **158 Main Street – A plat amendment requesting to combine two existing lots located at 158 Main Street into one lot of record. (Application PL-17-03523)**

Director Erickson noted that Tippe Morlan was the project planner. He would be presenting the application in her absence.

Director Erickson reviewed the application for a lot combination on the south end of Main Street at 158 Main Street.

The Planning Department found no issues other than a number of encroachments on the creek side on to City property and the neighboring properties. Planner Morlan had added conditions of approval to clean up all the encroachments. A flood plain study would be required as addressed in Condition of Approval #8. Director Erickson stated that the flood zone mapping would be obtained, but because it is in the flood zone there will be occupancy issues on the first floor, which is similar to everything else along that creek.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the plat amendment at 158 Main Street in accordance with the findings of fact, conclusions of law and condition of approval in the draft ordinance.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

Ed Drohicke stated that he and his wife own this property and they live in the home full time. Thanks to Planner Morlan, this was the first time they had seen all the historic related to their property. He and his wife intend to live in this house as long as they are able. He pointed out that they were the only owners of a home on Main Street that actually live there full-time. They would like to talk other owners on Main Street into living in their homes full time rather than renting to other people.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the plat amendment at 158 Main Street based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval as found in the draft ordinance. Commissioner Thimm seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 158 Main Street

1. The property is located at 158 Main Street.
2. The property consists of Lot 1 of the Saldarini Replat and a remnant parcel of Lot 6 of Block 20 of the Park City Survey.
3. The property is in the Historic Residential (HR-2) District Sub-Zone B.
4. The home on this site is listed on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) as a significant structure.
5. The Plat Amendment removes one interior lot line which bisects the existing home.
6. The proposed Plat Amendment combines the property into one (1) lot measuring 3,688 square feet.
7. A single-family dwelling is an allowed use in the District.
8. A utility easement with the Snyderville Sewer Improvement District exists on the rear portion of the property as reflected on the plat.
9. The minimum lot area for a single-family dwelling is 1,875 square feet in the HR-2 zone. The proposed lot meets the minimum lot area for single-family dwellings. The proposed lot area does not meet the minimum lot area for a duplex.
10. The proposed lot width is width is approximately 42.8 feet along Main Street.
11. The minimum lot width required is twenty-five feet (25'). The proposed lot meets the minimum lot width requirement.
12. The existing historic house extends to the south property line with no side yard setback and has a 3 feet side setback from the north property line. The front setback is 10 feet and the rear setback is 20 feet.

13. Historic structures that do not comply with Building Setbacks, Building Footprint, Building Height, Off-Street parking, and driveway location standards are valid Non-Complying Structures as per requirements for Existing Historic Structures in the HR-2 zone.

14. A snowshed easement for this property has been granted as a part of the original Saldarini Replat approval.

15. The deck, wood steel fence, and stone retaining wall at the rear of the house encroach onto Park City property to the east by approximately 1 foot.

16. There is a stone retaining wall which encroaches onto Park City property to the east of the property by 3 to 5 feet along the rear property line.

17. The cinder block retaining wall at the north of this property encroaches onto 166 Main Street by approximately 3 feet.

18. A remnant of Lot 6 which is not being incorporated into this lot belongs to owners of adjacent 150 Main Street which accommodates the Landmark Historic home which sits on the original lot line between Lots 6 and 7 of Block 20 of the Park City Survey.

19. The remnant parcel on the south side of Lot 6 of Block 20 of the Park City Survey is a part of 150 Main Street and shall be incorporated into that lot with a plat amendment if the property owners of 150 Main Street choose to alter the lot or the historic home in any way.

20. This property lies in FEMA Flood Plain A.

21. This plat amendment does not change any exterior lot lines of this parcel.

22. This plat amendment does not change any setback, lot size, or other requirements for this zone as applied to this parcel and the existing single family dwelling. All new construction shall meet requirements of the Land Management Code in effect at the time of submittal of any changes.

23. All findings within the Analysis section and the recitals above are incorporated herein as findings of fact.

Conclusions of Law – 158 Main Street

1. There is good cause for this Plat Amendment.

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 – 158 Main Street

1. The City Planner, 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 (1) years' 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. An encroachment agreement for the cedar block retaining wall is required with the neighbor at 166 Main Street on the north side of this property as the retaining wall crosses that property line.
4. An encroachment agreement for the concrete retaining wall to the west and front of the property is required with the City where it sits on City Property and in the public Right of Way.
5. The property owner shall resolve the encroachment of the deck with the wood steel fence and stone retaining wall over the east property line into the adjacent City owned property to the rear of the house by removing the portion of the structures which encroaches onto City property.
6. The property owner shall remove the encroaching retaining wall to the rear of the home.
7. The encroachments shall be resolved to the satisfaction of the City Engineer prior to recordation of the final plat mylar.
8. A Hydraulic and Hydrology study is required before the applicant may submit for a building permit because the property is in a FEMA flood zone. If the flood zone changes by more than 1 foot, a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) will also be required to be submitted to FEMA.

4. 7195 Little Belle Court – A condominium plat amendment requesting to convert private area to limited common area within Unit 5.
(Application PL-17-03540)

Commissioner Band recused herself and left the room

Director Erickson stated that Tippe Morlan was the project planner and he would be presenting the application in her absence.

Director Erickson reviewed the application for a plat amendment to convert 45 square feet of common space to private space to enclose a deck. He noted that deck enclosures have occurred a number of times in the past as evidenced in the Staff report.

The Staff found no issues with the request and recommended forwarding a positive recommendation to the City Council for the plat amendment at 7195 Little Belle Court in accordance with the findings of fact, conclusions of law and conditions of approval found in the draft ordinance.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Joyce remarked that in her short time in the Planning Department Planner Morlan does great work writing the Staff reports. They are easy to read and he appreciated her efforts.

MOTION: Commissioner Suesser moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the Sixth Amendment to the Little Bell condominium plat amending Unit 5, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the draft ordinance. Commissioner Campbell seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 7195 Little Belle Court

1. The property is located at 7195 Little Belle Court.
2. The Little Belle Condominiums plat was approved by the City Council on December

17, 1981 and recorded at Summit County on December 21, 1981.

3. The Little Belle Condominiums plat recorded 20 residential condominium units 8 parking spaces.

4. In August of 2000, an amended plat was approved to expand the private areas for Units 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Little Belle Condominiums.

5. The first amended plat for the Little Belle Condominiums recorded in August of 2000 only shows expanded private space for Unit 7.

6. In August of 2001, a second plat amendment was recorded. This second amendment converted the limited common deck areas to private areas and expanded the private living areas to the furthest extensions of the exterior walls of the end units for Units 2, 9, and 10.

7. In April of 2004, a third plat amendment was recorded. This third amendment converted limited common deck area to private area for Unit 20.

8. In June of 2006, a fourth plat amendment was recorded. This fourth amendment converted all limited common deck and solarium areas to private areas for Units 1, 3, 4, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20.

9. In June of 2011, a fifth plat amendment was recorded. This fifth amendment added 425 square feet of private space to Unit 3.

10. Currently there are 20 condominium units and 31 underground parking spaces.

11. The property is subject to requirements and restrictions of the Deer Valley Resort 12th Amended and Restated Large Scale MPD.

12. The MPD originally allowed 20 condominium units for the Little Belle development.

13. On April 20, 2017, the City received a completed application for a Sixth Amendment to the Little Belle Condominiums plat requesting conversion of 46 square feet of private area to limited common area in Unit 5 for the purpose of expanding an existing deck into an area of the unit that is private.

14. On April 5, 2017, the Little Belle Homeowner's Association voted unanimously (with more than 2/3rds of members voting) to approve the conversion of limited common area to private area for Unit 5.

15. There are no exterior changes proposed.
16. The proposed amendment is consistent with the purpose statements of the district.
17. Unit 5 would decrease by 46 square feet from 3,216 square feet to 3,170 square feet.
18. All construction is proposed within the existing building envelope.
19. Each unit has a two car garage meeting parking requirements of the parking code.
20. 8 additional guest parking spaces have been provided in this development since the units were originally constructed.

Conclusions of Law – 7195 Little Belle Court

1. There is good cause for this amendment to the plat.
2. The amended plat is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding condominium plats.
3. The amended plat is consistent with the 12th Amended and Restated Deer Valley Master Planned Development.
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 of approval, will not adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval – 7195 Little Belle Court

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the amended 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 complete application requesting 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 Deer Valley Resort 12th Amended and Restated Large Scale MPD and the amended Courchevel Condominiums at Deer Valley plats

shall continue to apply.

4. No building permit may be granted until after this plat amendment has been recorded. Once the deck area is recorded as limited common area, both the unit owner and the HOA must be the applicant for any building permit pulled for the deck area.

5. **Request for a four lot subdivision plat, known as Village at Empire Pass North Subdivision, located at the intersection of Village Way and Marsac Avenue east of the Silver Strike chair lift, to create 3 development lots for the Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development and one lot for ski area related uses. (Application PL-16-03293)**

Doug Ogilvy, presenting the property owner, Redus Park City, was available to answer questions.

Planner Kirsten Whetstone stated that this was one of the last subdivisions in the areas that are allowed to have units or unit equivalents that had not been platted. Each of the lots will require a conditional use permit and a condominium plat. All of the square footage is documented and recorded in the County.

Planner Whetstone stated that the parcel is approximately 9-1/2 acres. The request is for a three-lot development. Lots 2 and 3 are part of the Village Master Plan Development and they were identified for lodge buildings. In this case the applicant also has a development covenant with the perspective buyer on 24.5 unit equivalents; and requested that it be referenced on the plat. She noted that the plat note has been added since the last meeting.

Planner Whetstone remarked that Lot 1 was for the townhouse units attached in a configuration to be approved by the Planning Commission as a conditional use permit before moving forward.

Planner Whetstone referred to Exhibit K, which was the chart she presented at the last meeting with modifications based on the Commissioners comments at the last meeting. She had removed the Employee Housing Units (EHUs) for the ones that had not yet been built. She explained that the Staff likes to keep track of the number of actual units as opposed to just the Affordable Unit Equivalents.

Planner Whetstone recalled that prior to the meeting on May 10th there was an issue with a skier easement and having the correct documentation. The item was continued to this meeting to give the Staff the opportunity to verify the documentation.

Chair Strachan asked Planner Whetstone to point to the location of the Silver Strike lift to help orient the Commissioners. Chair Strachan asked if Doug Clyde's question was how to get skiers on to Lot 2 from the base of Silver Strike. Planner Whetstone replied that Doug Clyde's question related to the parcel to the north of Lot 2, which is the Marsac Mine claim parcel. There is a one-foot detection strip and the recorded document says that in this master plan they needed to provide the skier easements to these lifts within the Village at Empire Pass. That recordation was included in the Staff report. The person Mr. Clyde was representing felt that he should have access to it. Planner Whetstone remarked that even without the protection strip, Mr. Clyde's client would not have access to the easement unless he negotiates access with Lot 2.

Chair Strachan asked for the purpose of the protection strip. Planner Whetstone assumed that if someone wanted to access the Marsac Claim they would need to negotiate with that property owner. She had asked the applicant if they could take it to the property line so it would show on the plat, but if someone wanted to renegotiate and have a recorded document to say that the mine claim can access the easement, then the easement would be there. Planner Whetstone stated that she had done the research with the City Attorney. She had also provided the history on the Marsac Claim because Mr. Clyde had said that it was a recreation parcel and should have access to the ski lift. Planner Whetstone thought it was clear from the 2004 Minutes that it was not part of this master plan. Even though it was annexed and part of it was zoned in the RD zone, it was not part of the master planned development that allowed the skiing access.

Director Erickson explained that approval of this plat as proposed with the findings of fact, conclusions of law in the ordinance would not affect the development rights in this parcel. He noted that page 337 of the Staff report showed the mine claim. The Staff believed that the idea was to do the annexation and to bring in all the mine claims and all the issues at one time. However, since this particular claim did not want to be party to the development agreement, they would have to negotiate their access rights and development rights independent of the Empire Pass Development Agreement. The Staff came to that conclusion based on Planner Whetstone's research.

Planner Whetstone reviewed Exhibit K and noted that the first column were the units that were approved or proposed, which showed 509 units, including the 21 units identified for Lot 2, and including the 70 units for B-2 East. They are only allowed 550 individual units, so there were only 41 units remaining. Planner Whetstone reviewed the column of UEs and noted that 785 UEs were allowed in this master plan, not including the single family in Pod D. She noted that 738.2 UEs have either been approved or proposed with either a condominium or a subdivision; leaving 46.8 UEs remaining to be identified.

Director Erickson noted that the table in Exhibit K would help track the next round of approvals. He explained that the way the Development Agreement was written, it was a combination of Unit Equivalents and total number of units. There are slightly more unit equivalents because they wanted a mechanism where units could become larger.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission conduct a public hearing and consider forwarding a positive recommendation to the City Council for the four lot subdivision plat in accordance with the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the draft ordinance.

Commissioner Campbell wanted to know how much weight Exhibit K will hold in the future. He assumed that the applicant stipulated that the numbers were correct, but there was no way to confirm them. He recognized the hours of work that Planner Whetstone had put into preparing the table. Commissioner Campbell asked if in the future they should look to Exhibit K rather than looking back at the original plat.

Assistant City Attorney McLean remarked that Exhibit K was a reflection of all the documents, but it was not a formally approved document and there could be errors. It was only a reflection of what has been platted.

Mr. Ogilvy stated that there is documentation that cross checks back to the other documents. There would have to be a compelling reason for someone to think that there was an error in the table. Ms. McLean remarked that the underlying documents really control. The table is useful but only because it reflects the documents.

Planner Whetstone stated that something similar was done for the Deer Valley MPD that was approved by the Planning Commission. It identifies every parcel in Deer Valley, what was allocated, and what was built. She clarified that Exhibit K was prepared from all of the ordinances, the recorded plats, the Minutes showing the number of units approved, and the plat showing what was actually platted.

Chair Strachan opened the public hearing.

There were no comments.

Chair Strachan closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Phillips moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council regarding the Village at Empire Pass North Subdivision Plat, pursuant to the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval in the draft ordinance. Commissioner Band seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – Village at Empire Pass North Subdivision Plat

1. The property is located at Marsac Avenue and Village Way within Pod A of the Master Planned Development for the Village at Empire Pass. Addresses will be assigned prior to plat recordation.
2. The zoning is Residential Development (RD) within Flagstaff Mountain Resort Annexation and Village at Empire Pass MPD area (RD-MPD).
3. On June 24, 1999, Council adopted Ordinance 99-30 and Resolution 20-99 approving the annexation and development agreement for the Flagstaff Mountain area.
4. Resolution 20-99 granted the equivalent of a “large-scale” master planned development (MPD) and set forth the types and locations of land use, maximum densities, timing of development, development approval process, as well as development conditions and amenities for each parcel.
5. The Flagstaff Development Agreement was subsequently amended and recorded in March of 2007.
6. The Development Agreement specifies that a total of 87 acres, within three development pods (A, B1 and B2), of the 1,750 acres of annexation property may be developed for the Mountain Village.
7. The Mountain Village is further constrained to a maximum density of 785 UE configured in no more than 550 dwelling units as multi-family, hotel, or PUD units, provided the number of PUD units do not exceed 60. The Mountain Village is also allowed 16 single family home sites. At least 50% of the residential units within the Mountain Village must be clustered within the primary development pod (Pod A).
8. There are currently 588.742 UE (382 multi-family units) platted within the Village at Empire Pass (Pods A, B1 and B2).
9. With approval of 23.5 UE (up to a maximum of 23 units) on Lot 3 of the Village at Empire Pass North Subdivision, there will be 612.242 UE platted (up to 405 MF units), and 69.4% of MF units in Pods A, B1 and B2 located within Pod A. If 81 UE (70 units) are also built on Pod B2 (see request for B2 East Subdivision at this same

meeting) there will then be a total of 693.242 UE and 475 units with 59.2% of MF units located within Pod A.

10. Upon Conditional Use Permit approval of the 23.5 UE for Lot 3 and 81 UE for B2East, 91.758 UE and 75 dwelling units would remain to be allocated to remaining residential development sites in Pod A. The remaining sites include Lots 1 and 2 of this subdivision, Lodge Building 1 (Tower Residential), and Lots 1 and 2 of the Village at Empire Pass Phase 1 subdivision.

11. The applicant is not requesting allocation of any MPD Resort Support Commercial for this subdivision at this time. There exists a total of 7,287 sf of unallocated Resort Support Commercial that can be allocated within the Village MPD to Pods A, B1, and B2.

12. Accounting of the support commercial, residential accessory space, and support meeting space is finalized at the time of review of the Conditional Use Permits and memorialized with the final condominium plats.

13. On July 28, 2004, the Planning Commission approved a Master Planned Development for the Village at Empire Pass (Pod A), known as the Village Master Planned Development (VMPD) Pod A.

14. The purpose of the VMPD was to establish unit mix and density for the Village Master Plan, as well as addressing overall project infrastructure throughout the Annexation Area. The VMPD established building volumetric diagrams, including specific height exceptions, density, and development location.

15. The Village at Empire Pass West Side Subdivision plat was approved by Council in 2005 and recorded at Summit County on August 12, 2005. This subdivision platted Lots 12-18 of the VMPD (west side).

16. Village at Empire Pass Phase I Subdivision plat was approved by Council on September 30, 2004 and platted the east side lots. An amended Village at Empire Pass Phase I Subdivision plat was approved on January 6, 2011 and recorded on January 4, 2012.

17. Six lodge buildings have been built to date within Pod A namely Shooting Star, Silver Strike, Flagstaff Lodge (was Snowberry Lodge), Arrowleaf A and Arrowleaf B, and Grand Lodge. A seventh building, One Empire Pass is currently under construction. Additionally, Larkspur East and Larkspur West Townhouses (attached homes), Paintbrush and Belles PUD style homes, and six single family homes in Banner

Wood are platted within Pod A. Of these units, one Belles PUD unit and 2 Banner Wood single family units are remaining to be permitted and constructed. Additionally 4 PUD units within Nakoma in Pod B1 are remaining to be permitted and constructed.

18. Three of the large lodge buildings (Buildings 1, 3, and 4) as well as additional townhouse and PUD style units remain to be constructed within the Village MPD Pod A.

19. The proposed subdivision consists of property that is currently described by metes and bounds. The request is for a 3.0 acre Lot 1, for future townhouse and PUD units, a 1.57 acre Lot 2 for Lodge Building 4, a 0.67 acre Lot 3 for future Lodge Building 3, and a 0.10 acre Parcel A. The property consists of a total of 5.34 acres.

20. Lots 1 and 2 have frontage on Marsac Avenue, a State Highway. Lot 3 has frontage on Village Way, a private street. Lot 2 also has frontage on Village Way. Parcel A has access to Village via a proposed access easement across Lot 2.

21. Lots 2 and 3 will take access off Village Way. Location of access off Marsac Avenue requires review and approval by UDOT and the City Engineer, as Marsac Avenue is currently a state highway.

22. A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is required prior to construction of the Lodge Buildings, PUD units, and townhouses.

23. Utilities are available to the lots. SBWRD recommended conditions and plat notes to address their concerns. storm drainage, access, snow storage, etc. No changes are proposed to existing streets.

24. All existing and required easements will be recorded on the plat, including utilities, storm drainage, access, snow storage, etc. No changes are proposed to existing streets.

25. Final utility plans are required to be submitted with the Conditional Use Permit based on the proposed configuration of units and buildings. Additional off-site utility easements maybe required and will have to be recorded prior to issuance of building permits.

26. There is no minimum or maximum lot size or lot width in the RD District.

27. All applicable requirements of Land Management Code apply, unless otherwise allowed per the Flagstaff Development Agreement and the Village at Empire Pass MPD.

28. A height exception and building volumetric were approved with the Village at Empire Pass Pod A Master Planned Development for the Lodge Buildings (Lots 2 and 3).

29. The final Mylar plat is required to be approved and signed by the Snyderville Basin Water Reclamation District prior to recordation to ensure that requirements of the District are addressed.

30. Snow storage area is required along public streets and rights-of-way due to the possibility of large amounts of snowfall in this location.

31. On site affordable housing requirements are required by the Flagstaff Development-Affordable Housing Technical Report. This plat identifies an on-site housing obligation of 1.1 AUE for Lot 3 and 2.0 AUE for Lot 2 (per requirements of the Affordable Housing Mitigation Plan) to be incorporated into MPD Lodge Buildings 3 and 4 and noted on the plat. Also 0.84 AUE are an outstanding requirement of the Tower Residences to be constructed in MPD Lodge Building 1. No AUE are planned or identified for Lot 1 of this subdivision.

32. Requirements of the Flagstaff Agreement will be reviewed and verified for compliance during the Conditional Use Permit applications reviewed for development on Lots 1, 2 and 3. This transportation, affordable housing, environmental, transfer fees, construction mitigation, and others as may apply. Some of these obligations are triggered by the number of certificates of occupancy issued.

33. All findings within the Analysis section and the recitals above are incorporated herein as findings of fact.

Conclusions of Law – Village at Empire Pass North Subdivision

1. There is good cause for this subdivision plat.
2. The subdivision plat is consistent with the Park City Land Management Code and applicable State law regarding subdivisions, the Park City General Plan, and the Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development.
3. Neither the public nor any person will be materially injured by the proposed subdivision.
4. Approval of the subdivision, subject to the conditions stated below, does not

adversely affect the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of Park City.

Conditions of Approval – Village at Empire Pass North Subdivision

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the subdivision 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 Summit 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 written request for an extension is submitted to the City prior to the expiration date and the City Council grants an extension.
3. All applicable conditions, regulations, requirements, and stipulations of the Amended and Restated Development Agreement for Flagstaff Mountain, Bonanza Flats, Richardson Flats, The 20-Acre Quinn's Junction Parcel, and Iron Mountain (recorded at Summit County on March 2, 2007), and associated Technical Reports and Agreements, continue to apply.
4. The plat will note that conditions of approval of the Village at Empire Pass Master Planned Development (Pod A) shall continue to apply.
5. Utility structures such as ground sleeves and transformers and other dry utility boxes must be located on the lots.
6. Non-exclusive public utility easements (PUE) shall be indicated on the plat prior to recordation as approved by the City Engineer and SBWRD, including drainage easements.
7. A financial security to guarantee for the installation of any required public improvements is required prior to plat recordation in a form approved by the City Attorney and in an amount approved by the City Engineer.
8. A ten foot (10') wide snow storage easement is required along the private street frontages of the lots and a ten (10') wide public snow storage easement is required along public street frontages.
9. Fire sprinklers are required for new construction per the Chief Building Official at the time of review of the building permit. A note stating this shall be on the plat.

10. Prior to building permit issuance, documentation from UDOT showing approval of access to Lot 1 off Marsac Avenue is required. If documentation does not exist, a new application shall be submitted to UDOT for approval of the curb cut location. This approval shall be submitted to the City Engineer.

11. Any proposed curb cuts for access directly to Marsac Avenue, a state highway, must be approved by the City Engineer and UDOT.

12. A Conditional Use Permit approval is required prior to issuance of building permits on Lots 1, 2 and 3.

13. A final grading and utility plan, including storm water and drainage plans, shall be submitted with the Conditional Use Permits for development on Lots 1, 2 and 3, for approval by the City Engineer and SBWRD. No building permits shall be issued until all necessary utility easements are recorded.

14. A declaration of condominium and a record of condominium plat are required prior to the sale of individual units within the development.

15. All requirements of the affordable housing mitigation plan shall be addressed with the Conditional Use Permit and condominium plat. A note shall be included on the plat indicated that the development of Lot 3 has an on-site affordable housing obligation of 1.1 AUE and Lot 2 has an on-site affordable housing requirement of 2.0 AUE, to be consistent with all requirements of the Flagstaff Affordable Housing Mitigation Plan. Lot 1 has no on-site obligation. All deed restricted units shall be identified on the final condominium plats prior to recordation of such plats.

16. Wastewater service to Village at Empire Pass North Subdivision shall be provided by the Snyderville Basin Water Reclamation District. A Line Extension Agreement with the District may be required for Lot 1. If a line extension is necessary, it shall be the responsibility of the Owner to extend the public wastewater system within Lot 1 according to the requirements of the Line Extension Agreement.

17. The property is located within a water source protection zone. All sewer construction must comply with State of Utah drinking water regulations.

18. This development is part of a common plan development and a MS4 storm water permit is required for all land disturbance activities for each separate phase of construction, prior to building permit issuance.

19. The CC&Rs shall provide notice and process for the tracking and collection of the

Real Estate Transfer Fee as required and defined by the Flagstaff Mountain Development Agreement, as amended.

20. Requirements and obligations of the Flagstaff Mountain Development Agreement, as amended and recorded at Summit County in March of 2007, as apply to this Property, shall be completed, or bonded for completion, prior to issuance of certificates of occupancy for any approved development located on Lots 1, 2, and 3, unless otherwise conditioned herein. This includes gondola payments, number of shuttles in operation, provision of affordable housing units, collection mechanism for real estate transfer fees, and all other such obligations as are outlined in the March 2007 Agreement, some of which are triggered by the number of certificates of occupancy issued.

21. A Construction Mitigation Plan shall be submitted with the Conditional Use Permit applications and in advance of issuing building permits.

NOTE: The Planning Commission approved the Minutes at the end of the meeting. Those approvals can be found under Adoption of Minutes on the first page.

Commissioner Suesser asked if there was a video of the Treasure Hill traffic study presentation at the last meeting. Chair Strachan replied that there was only an audio recording. Director Erickson noted that the video-taping only took place during the discussions of the model and the CAD presentations. He did not believe there were videos of any other presentations. Assistant City Attorney understood that the meetings with the model were videoed just to capture the visual aspect for the record.

The Park City Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 6:40 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: _____