

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION MINUTES
DECEMBER 12, 2012**

PRESENT: Jack Thomas, Brooke Hontz, Stewart Gross, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Thomas Eddington, Kirsten Whetstone, Francisco Astorga, Matthew Evans, Polly Samuels McLean

The Planning Commission held site visits prior to the work session at Lot 17, 18 and 19 of the Echo Spur Development and 30 Sampson Avenue.

WORK SESSION ITEMS

30 Sampson Avenue – Steep Slope CUP (Application PL-12-01487)

Planner Matthew Evans reviewed the application for a Steep Slope CUP for 30 Sampson Avenue. The property is located in the HRL zone which requires that any development over 1,000 square feet be reviewed as a Steep Slope conditional use permit. Planner Evans remarked that the Staff report contained several numbers related to house size, plat notes and decisions that allow a larger house than what was noted on the plat. He noted that the Staff and applicant were in agreement on the numbers outlined.

Planner Evans reported that the lot was a result of a plat amendment. It was a combination of Millsite designation lots that were combined into one larger lot approximately 7,000 square feet, and it is part of a subdivision that was approved in 1995 as Lots 30, 40 and 50 Sampson Avenue. The Staff reviewed the Staff report from the original subdivision and found that the City Council made findings for the approval of that subdivision based on the purpose statement of the HRL zone.

Planner Evans stated that this application was for a single-family dwelling unit, which is an allowed use. The conditional use is based on the fact that it is a steep slope property and must be reviewed by the Planning Commission under specific criteria. The Staff report contained the list of criteria. The Staff analysis found unmitigated impacts on Criteria 8 – dwelling volume and Criteria 9 – Building height. The Staff requested that the Planning Commission discuss the current design and provide direction to the applicant on the two unmitigated issues. The Staff found no other unmitigated impacts in the proposal submitted by the applicant.

Planner Evans reported on public input he received from the adjacent property owner, Ms. Schneckloft, regarding the snow shed easement. Planner Evans clarified that a snow shed easement is not reviewed at this point in the process; however, it would be addressed at a later time by the Building Official. When this application is further reviewed for a motion, he believed Ms. Schneckloft would offer recommendations for conditions of approval.

Commissioner Wintzer referred to the comparison of existing houses on page 61 of the Staff report and suggested that the Staff also include the proposed project to the table to make it easier to compare. Based on the purpose statement of the zones, Commissioner Wintzer could not find that the proposed structure was compatible with historic structures in the neighborhood. He acknowledged that larger structures were built before his time on the Planning Commission; however, the structure as proposed does not meet the purpose to preserve the character of historic structures. Commissioner Wintzer had additional concerns with the project, but the inability to meet the purpose statement was his primary concern regarding compatibility.

Jonathan DeGray, the project architect, asked Commissioner Wintzer for more specifics on where he believed the structure failed on incompatibility. Commissioner Wintzer replied that it was the height and mass compared to the historic structures. He was not looking at compatibility with the new structures in the neighborhood. He did not believe the City had done a good job enforcing the purpose statements in the past. In his opinion, they first need to look at compliance with the General Plan and the purpose statements of the zone before addressing setbacks and other elements. Commissioner Wintzer did not believe the proposed structure was even close to being compatible to historic structures in the neighborhood.

Mr. DeGray asked if Commissioner Wintzer was suggesting that the analysis should be geared towards historic structures and not as broad as the structures compared in the Staff report. Commissioner Wintzer answered yes because historic compatibility is identified in the purpose statements.

Commissioner Hontz concurred with Commissioner Wintzer in terms of height, scale and massing. She referred to page 57 of the Staff report and the Code definition for basements at the time of the plat. Commissioner Hontz stated that when the plat was written and the 3,000 square foot limitation was placed on the plat, her interpretation was that the basement as currently designed would not have been considered a basement, and therefore, would be have been counted in the square footage. She understood that 400 square feet for the garage is not counted as part of the square footage as established by the former Planning Director. Commissioner Hontz struggled with the detachment of the two structures, the elevator and the patio in between. She did not believe it was a realistic design for Park City's climate to have people go up an elevator and walk outside to reach their homes. She was concerned that at some point in the future someone would try to attach the two structures and take apart what was created to get around the story limitation. Commissioner Hontz was uncomfortable creating new problems for enforcement and more issues for neighbors and Staff, which she believed could occur if someone tried to enclose the structures. Commissioner Hontz also had concerns with the stabilization of the snow shed and keeping it within the property, and making sure the retaining walls maintain the sides. She found the driveway to be perplexing and requested a drawing to scale to show how the driveway would work.

Commissioner Gross agreed with Commissioner Hontz. He had concerns about the 20 foot access during the winter and he asked if the proposal included radiant heat from the patio to the front door. Mr. DeGray stated that there would be a waterproof deck above that provides a cover over to the elevator. The plan is also for a heated slab. Mr. DeGray noted that page 83 of the Staff report showed the elevator and the walkway underneath. He pointed out that the elevator also goes to the main floor. In inclement weather the house could be accessed from the lower level. Mr. DeGray stated that the idea of detached structures is encouraged in the Code for the H zones in terms of detached garages and separate structures to break down the mass. He felt the comments from the Commissioners conflicted with the direction encouraged in the Code.

Commissioner Gross understood the concerns regarding historic compatibility; however, he was more concerned about how it would all tie in together.

Commissioner Strachan echoed Commissioners Wintzer and Hontz. However, he agreed with Mr. DeGray that per the Code the structures must be stepped with the grade and broken into a series of

individual smaller components that are compatible with the District. The garage must be subordinate in design of the main building. Commissioner Strachan believed the language encourages having a separated garage. It would be hard to predict whether or not someone would try to enclose it eventually. Commissioner Strachan felt that overall the dwelling mass and volume was incompatible with the surrounding houses, with the exception of 205 Norfolk which should not be a basis for compatibility analysis. He views the analysis as a bell curve and the proposed project should be near the middle to be considered even close to compatible.

Mr. DeGray asked if the compatibility issue was the size of the building or the mass above grade. Mr. Strachan replied that it was mass of the building above grade. Mr. DeGray pointed out that the average for the area came in at 3700 square feet. The proposed project is larger at 4500 square foot gross, but they are comparable to the other structures at 60 Sampson, 50 Sampson and the recently approved projects at 16 Sampson and 201 Sampson. Commissioner Strachan remarked that the smaller structures such as the one at 41 Sampson are the ones that need to be taken into account. He clarified that in addition to the size above grade, it is also the size of the entire living space. Commissioner Strachan pointed out that the purpose statements in the Code do not differentiate between above grade and below grade. His primary concern was the massing above grade; however, the CUP process analysis will also look at the total area.

Commissioner Savage thought the applicant was in the zone they needed to be in as it relates to the comparables in that particular part of the neighborhood. The house looks nice and interesting and it appears to adapt to an extremely challenging lot situation. Commissioner Savage suggested that the applicant look at changing the façade of the home to make it look and feel more historic in terms of presentation. From his perspective, the design and configuration as proposed was not inconsistent with what exists in the neighborhood. He felt it was difficult to be consistent with a hodgepodge of structures.

Commissioner Hontz noted that page 73 of the Staff report showed the size of surface parking and asked for the dimensions. Mr. DeGray replied that it was 9' x 18'.

Vice-Chair Thomas agreed that it was a difficult argument to fit within the purpose statements and the burden was on the applicant to demonstrate compatibility with the historic fabric of the community in terms of mass, scale and height, and how it is consistent with the purpose statements. He noted that the Planning Commission has the purview to reduce height on a Steep Slope CUP and he would prefer to see the height reduced. Vice-Chair Thomas struggled with the drawings presented and questioned how it was not one house based on the design. The roof is connected to the elevator and the elevator is connected to the garage, which makes it one structure exceeding three stories. Vice-Chair Thomas felt the argument was whether or not this was one house.

Mr. DeGray stated that the deck and patio are required to meet setback requirements, which treats them like a structure. Having a deck or patio connect from an accessory structure to a main structure does not technically connect buildings. Vice-Chair Thomas understood the point Mr. DeGray was making, however, he wanted to see that defined in the drawings to prove his point. Planner Evans remarked that it would definitely be an issued if the foundation was connected. Mr. DeGray noted that the deck touches the elevator shaft, but it is an open air connection.

Lot 17, 18 and 19 Echo Spur Development – Plat Amendment

(Application PL-12-01629)

Planner Francisco Astorga noted that on September 12, 2012 the Planning Commission requested a site visit and work session for the Echo Spur Development Replat. The applicant also submitted additional information that was requested, including preliminary plans of the site. Planner Astorga noted that the plans were more specific than preliminary and the Staff was still working on reviewing the plans.

Planner Astorga reviewed the application for a plat amendment on platted McHenry. As previously noted, the City Engineer would eventually change the name of the road once it is fully dedicated to the City.

Planner Astorga reported that the applicant had submitted an application for a plat amendment to combine lots 17, 18 and 19. He presented slides to orient the Planning Commission to what they had seen during the site visit. He also presented the County Plat showing the ownership of the property. On September 12, 2012 the Planning Commission discussed vantage points per the Land Management Code. Planner Astorga noted that the LMC does not have a defined vantage point from where the development would be visible. However, the LMC identifies cross-canyon view as a vantage point. The applicant had submitted a total of six vantage points; three on Deer Valley Drive by the access to Main, one by the entrance at the Summit Watch, one at the roundabout, and another closer to the property. Planner Astorga reviewed slides from the stated vantage points.

Commissioner Savage concluded from the photographs that the development was basically invisible. Commissioner Gross concurred. Commissioner Hontz stated that she personally stood at each of the vantage points and concluded that the development would be visible, particularly the retaining wall. Commissioner Strachan remarked that the brown house behind the retaining wall was also visible. He pointed out that photographs are not entirely reflective of what the human eye would actually see.

Scott Jaffa, the project architect stated that the intent was never to make the house invisible. The existing scrub oak is 12 feet high and the house would sit approximately 12 feet above. It is surrounded by houses at the bottom on Ontario, as well as houses above it. The house is nestled in its surrounding environment.

Planner Astorga reviewed the elevations. He noted that the site is zoned HR-1 which has a 27' foot height limitation and a required 10 feet setback on the downhill façade. Planner Astorga stated that at the last meeting the Planning Commission discussed the 2007 settlement agreement. He had verified with Jack Fenton that the disputes with the settlement agreement had been resolved and both parties were satisfied with the outcome. Planner Astorga had done a more specific analysis of the Ontario neighborhood as shown on page 9 of the Staff report. The analysis concluded that the average width is approximately 36 feet and the average lot area is approximately 2800 square feet for those lots.

Planner Astorga referred to an Exhibit showing the outskirts of the Park City survey. He commented on the Gateway Estates subdivision. Because of the orientation of the houses and access off of Deer Valley Loop Road, it provided a better way to transition Old Town to what is called the Deer Valley entry area. In terms of house size the two houses that were originally platted for Gateway

Estates were planned to be much larger than the Old Town historic character.

Planner Astorga requested that the Planning Commission discuss whether this Echo Spur neighborhood provides an appropriate area for transitioning between the larger lots of record versus the Ontario neighborhood, which tends to follow a different pattern than the standard 25' x 75' configuration. Since September the Staff has held several meetings with the owner to review the current definition of gross residential floor area and how that applies. The Staff recommendation was to limit the gross residential floor area to 3600 square feet. The Staff reviewed the preliminary plans submitted and found that the proposal would comply with the Staff recommendation of limiting the gross residential floor area.

Commissioner Wintzer remarked that the three lots are contiguous to a neighborhood of historic platted lots of 25' x 75'. That is the neighborhood they need to look at rather than the homes above or below. Planner Astorga pointed out that after the General Plan update is completed the next task is to do an analysis of the zoning districts to see how that can be improved.

Vice-Chair Thomas stated that he was on the Planning Commission when the Deer Valley Loop Road lots were approved, and there was a dramatic effort to minimize the massing and to make the units fit into the hillside. He pointed out that the grading on those three lots was dramatically different than the grading on the three Echo Spur lots. Vice-Chair Thomas believed that would have to be highly considered in this process. Planner Astorga noted that only one house was actually built and the other two houses lost their approval because they did not move forward on the building permit.

Planner Astorga recalled that another discussion point in September was what would happen in the neighborhood. Since the September meeting the Staff met with Mike Green, the owner of Lot 20. Mr. Green plans to build a single family dwelling and is currently working on an application. The other twelve lots are owned by Sean Kelleher, who submitted a complete application yesterday. The Planning Commission would review Mr. Kelleher's application during a work session in January. He proposes to build seven single family units through a condominium plat on his 12 lots of record. Vice-Chair Thomas stated that he would be recusing himself from the Kelleher discussion and he was uncomfortable talking about that proposal this evening.

Planner Astorga stated that ridgeline development was another issue carried over from the September meeting. He noted that Lot combinations in the HR-1 zone require an overall setback of 18 feet, with a minimum of 5 feet. The Staff request that the setback on the northern side be increased to 15 feet to aid with drainage issues and slope mitigation issues. Planner Astorga asked for input from the Planning Commission regarding the Staff analysis.

Planner Hontz referred to the minutes from the September 12, 2012 meeting on page 15 of the Staff report, fifth paragraph, and revisited a number of issues that were still pertinent. The first was that the road is still not dedicated to the City. In speaking with Matt Cassel during the site visit she understood that some conditions have not been fulfilled and issues still remain. Commissioner Hontz was not comfortable with the safety of the road related to the gate, the vegetation that needs to be replaced and enhanced, the retaining wall and other issues. She thought there could be possible pressure from the applicant to whoever was responsible for fulfilling the conditions if it was a requirement to move forward with this application. Since the City Engineer had decided to place

the road under the City's road system, they should do nothing until they know for sure that the road is acceptable to the City. A second point is that Third Street, which is located to the north of Lot 17, is currently a platted dedicated right-of-way. Because it was a right-of-way, someone decided to dig it up and put in a road. If this application moves forward, Commissioner Hontz wanted to make sure that no access would ever be provided to any lots in any area off of that existing right-of-way. A third point was that lots 17, 18 and 19 had to be combined in order to have access. In looking at the plat, lot 19 is the only lot that has access off of Echo Spur. Commissioner Hontz thought it was unrealistic to say that Lots 17 and 18 would be developed off of the current configuration of Echo Spur Drive. Standing at the gate and looking over a 40 foot drop, the amount of retaining required to get to the lots makes them unbuildable. Commissioner Hontz remarked that in reality this was one lot.

Commissioner Hontz referred to page 15 of the Staff report regarding the settlement area. She appreciated that the Staff took the extra step to confirm that an agreement was reached. However, she would like to see how the land was deeded. According to the publicly available agreement, the land would change hands and there would be different lot configurations for the lots adjacent to this property further north that could possibly have an effect.

Commissioner Hontz referred to Item 5 on page 15 and reiterated that the property and the road are part of a ridgeline. They cannot change the definition of a ridgeline because of what has happened around it. She thought they may be able to say that due to setbacks, the structure is placed far enough off of the ridgeline, but regardless, the property is part of the ridgeline and the setbacks should be closely scrutinized. Commissioner Hontz commented on LMC 15-7.3-1(D) and noted that this is a very sensitive area and there are impacts related to the ridgeline.

Commissioner Hontz referred to Items 6 and 7, additional limitations on maximum square footage and visibility from the roundabout. She felt it was a unique strategy to separate these lots from what was previously reviewed as a subdivision, because they now have to look at it as a new application. If this application moves forward, the applicant would have to maximize the number of lots on this particular substandard road, which can only be reached by other substandard Old Town streets. Based on traffic impact models, Commissioner Hontz understood that one house would generate approximately 12 vehicle trips per day. Assuming build-out on the nine lots, the per day vehicle trips would exceed 108 per day on this substandard street. She thought it was ludicrous to create that much additional traffic into that neighborhood on substandard streets. Commissioner Hontz pointed out that it was not just one home. They need to consider the compound impacts of all the lots.

Commissioner Gross asked about the cars backing out of the driveway and how they would get up the street. In his opinion it looked very tight and he was unsure how a car would get out. He requested a diagram showing how it would work. Commissioner Gross had spoken with City Engineer Matt Cassel about the fire safety issues and there is a turnaround below for fire trucks. He assumed that once the street is accepted by the City it would provide the proper access for people to build.

Planner Astorga asked if the Planning Commission would feel comfortable approving the propose development once the road is accepted by Matt Cassel, particularly regarding the road compliance issue raised by Commissioner Hontz. Planner Astorga noted that LMC 15-7.3 indicates that these

types of development must be approved by the Planning Commission and that upon recommendation of a qualified engineer these items can be mitigated. The burden is on the applicant to hire a qualified engineer to determine whether the issues are mitigated. Planner Astorga clarified that the LMC implies that the applicant is allowed to find appropriate mitigation for these types of unforeseen development conditions on the land.

Commissioner Wintzer pointed out that the applicant has that ability with everything except the ridgeline. He read language in the same Chapter of the LMC that states, "For other features including ridgelines." Commissioner Hontz remarked that per the LMC the impact mitigation is formulated by the developer and approved by the Planning Commission. The applicant can propose a solution but the Planning Commission has the purview to determine whether the solution is suitable to mitigate the problem. Planner Astorga agreed. However, his interpretation of the LMC language is that the burden of mitigation is on the applicant, which also includes the ridgeline. He wanted to make sure the Planning Commission shared his interpretation. Commissioner Wintzer agreed with the interpretation with regards to geological hazards. His reading of the LMC language did not include the ridgeline. Commissioner Wintzer recalled that this same paragraph was read to the previous owner five years ago and at that time the Planning Commission had the same concerns that combining these three lots would encourage development to move down the hill further on the ridgeline. They faced the same issue with this application and he could see no way around it.

Planner Astorga remarked that the Staff interpretation was that ridgeline impacts could be mitigated if adequate methods are formulated. Due to the discrepancy in interpretation, he believed further discussion was necessary. He asked if the Staff was interpreting the Code incorrectly. The Commissioners answered yes.

Commissioner Strachan questioned whether the applicant could even find adequate methods. In addition, language in LMC 15-17.3-2(D) prohibits ridgeline development. There was no qualifier in the language to indicate that it would be allowed with adequate mitigation methods. Commissioner Strachan felt the LMC was clear that ridgeline development would not be allowed in any circumstance. In his opinion, this was still a ridgeline, even though the previous owner tried to eliminate that fact by digging a road through the property.

Planner Astorga understood that the Planning Commission would be prepared to make findings that this is a ridgeline and construction is prohibited on a ridgeline. Commissioner Savage stated that the Planning Commission was looking at a set of platted lots that also included other lots along that same ridgeline, and there were property rights associated with those particular lots. He understood the ridgeline issue; however, the fact that the lots were platted and exist as platted lots entitles the owners of those lots to some level of development rights independent of the ridgeline.

Assistant City Attorney McLean agreed that City cannot take away all rights to the use of a property; however, there are restrictions in the Code that prohibit structures on ridgelines. Therefore, those two issues need to be balanced. Commissioner Savage asked if the contextual precedence in that particular area has any influence on how the Planning Commission should view ridgeline development. In looking at the topography, it is clear that a ridgeline runs along the road and through the middle of the lots. He pointed out that existing homes above those lots on the ridgeline have already compromised the ridgeline in that area. He asked if that should have any impact on how these applications are reviewed. Commissioner Savage asked if the applicant would have the

ability to say that within the constraints of this particular development site, as well as the existing homes, this is the ridgeline visual impact with the proposed home versus not building at all. Ms. McLean replied that the Planning Commission could have that discussion. Commissioner Savage wanted the applicant to pursue that direction unless it would be a waste of time because it is a ridgeline and development would be denied.

Mr. Jaffa pointed out that this was a new subdivision that was still in the process of dedicating the road to the City. He questioned why the subdivision would have been approved with platted lots if the lots could not be built on. Commissioner Wintzer noted that the previous subdivision application never came before the Planning Commission and it was never approved. Planner Astorga explained that it was a historic part of the Park City survey that was historically platted a hundred years ago.

Commissioner Strachan asked Assistant City Attorney McLean for her interpretation of LMC 15-7.3-1(D) as opposed to 15-7.3-2(D). Ms. McLean stated that when there are competing ordinances in the Code, they look at the plain meaning of the language. She noted that when language is added to address restrictions due to the character of the land, they try to have the statutes comport. Ms. McLean thought that should be balanced with making sure property rights are not being taken away from an existing lot. She believed that sub (D) in 15-7.3-1 also goes to health and safety issues; whereas, in 15-7.3-2(D), ridgeline development, the issue is more aesthetic.

Commissioner Strachan recalled that when the LMC provisions conflict the policy is to follow the one that is most specific. He considered the language in 15-7.3-1 to be more general than the language in 15-7.3-2.

Commissioner Savage asked to look at the topo map. Commissioner Wintzer pointed out the top of the ridge on the map to identify the exact ridgeline. Assistant City Attorney McLean read the definition of ridgeline area in the LMC. "The top ridge or crest of hill or slope, plus the land located within a 150 feet on both sides of the top crest or ridge." Commissioner Hontz pointed out that Lot 19 was different than in the previous proposal. Commissioner Wintzer personally believed it was a ridgeline and combining the lots would allow the applicant to move further down the ridgeline. He has walked the property and drawn the ridgeline on the topo. Commissioner Wintzer could see no way of getting around that fact. It is an important issue and the General Plan and the LMC address ridgelines in several places. Commissioner Hontz did not believe the Planning Commission should compromise on ridgeline development.

Vice-Chair Thomas remarked that the reason for being sensitive to ridgelines is based on the observation from the community of what appears to be a ridgeline and the problems created when the ridgeline is broken. The type of ridge is irrelevant. this is a ridgeline with regard to a large percentage of the community. Commissioner Savage did not disagree that this was a ridgeline. He was only pointing out that there are many ridgelines in that area and some of those ridgelines had been compromised.

Assistant City Attorney McLean read the language from LMC 15-7.3-2(D) - General Subdivision Requirements for Ridgeline Development. "Ridges shall be protected from development in which development would be visible on the skyline from the designated vantage points in Park City." The specific vantage points are the Osguthorpe Barn, Treasure Mountain Middle School, the intersection

of Main Street and Heber Avenue, the Park City ski area base, Snow Park Lodge, the Park City golf course clubhouse, the Park Meadows Golf Course Clubhouse, State Road 248 at the turnout one-quarter mile west from US Highway 40, State Route 224 one-half mile south of the intersection of Kilby Road, the intersection of Thaynes Canyon Drive and State Road 224 and across valley views. Commissioner Hontz stated that the cross valley view could be from any point across the valley. Vice-Chair Thomas remarked that the intersection of Main Street and Heber Avenue would be a critical vantage point in this situation.

Commissioner Savage thought an important piece of the language was the reference regarding visibility on the skyline from the designated vantage points. Vice-Chair Thomas informed Mr. Jaffa that the Planning Commission would need to see visuals from the specific vantage points mentioned. Commissioner Strachan stated that the three related vantage points were Heber Avenue, the base of PCMR and the base of the Park City golf course. Commissioner Strachan suggested that the Planning Commission could personally visit those vantage points.

Mr. Jaffa asked for clarification on across valley. The Planning Commission discussed other potential vantage points where the development might be visible. Commissioner Savage believed the analysis could be done using the topography map without a site visit to the vantage points. Commissioner Wintzer stated that in his opinion it was very clear that development would hit the ridge and penetrate the skyline. Commissioner Savage remarked that every object would penetrate the skyline from some given point. Vice-Chair Thomas agreed, but noted that there were primary valleys in the community that needed to be protected.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that height restrictions or other limitations are often placed in subdivisions to address the issues on a problematic property. She noted that the applicant has submitted a subdivision application and provided a conceptual idea of what they would like build. She suggested that the Planning Commission could discuss placing restrictions on the site to make sure it complies with all the elements of the Code. Commissioner Strachan remarked that the Planning Commission was being asked whether or not there was good cause for a plat amendment. In his opinion, there would not be good cause if the site is on a ridgeline and no structure, regardless of the height, could be built. Ms. McLean agreed, if the Planning Commission finds to that extreme. However, if as an example, if they find that a one story structure would not violate the elements of the Code, they could place those restrictions. Commissioner Strachan was unsure whether the Planning Commission would be able to make that finding. Ms. McLean stated that if the Planning Commission could not find good cause they would need to define very specific findings related to the vantage points and visibility on the skyline.

Mr. Jaffa used the color coded map to point out that while this may be a ridgeline, it was definitely not the highest element in that neighborhood. He indicated three houses that are substantially higher than the proposed structure. Commissioner Wintzer reiterated that those houses were approved in that location as a trade-off to stop development from coming further down the ridge. This is a different process and if this application is approved they would be putting one house on the ridge.

Vice-Chair Thomas requested that the Staff delineate the ridge that separates Deer Valley Drive from Main Street. If that ridge goes through this property the argument would be resolved. He directed the applicant to work with the Staff and seriously consider the comments made this

evening.

Commissioner Savage clarified that he was not arguing whether or not it was a ridgeline. He was concerned that there was not a working definition on how to make that analysis. Commissioner Wintzer pointed out that the Planning Commission can only adhere to the Code. He agreed that the Code is sometimes vague, but the Planning Commission is tasked with interpreting the Code to make their decisions.

Commissioner Gross asked if the applicant could build on any part of Lots 17, 18 and 19. Commissioner Wintzer stated that Lot 19 is a platted lot on a ridge. The applicant could build a house on Lot 19 based on the current Code. The issue is that combining the lots would require a Steep Slope analysis. Planner Astorga remarked that all three lots would require a Steep Slope CUP.

The applicant, Leeto Thlou understood the comments expressed this evening. He asked if the other landowners in that area would have the same problem. Commissioner Savage replied that it would depend on the steepness of the individual lot and whether a Steep Slope CUP would be required. It was clear that Lots 17, 18 and 19 would require a Steep Slope CUP; therefore, the ridgeline issue needs to be resolved.

Commissioner Hontz clarified that the points she identified earlier in the discussion also apply to all the lots in that same area.

The Work Session was adjourned.