

**PARK CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION NOTES  
OCTOBER 28, 2009**

PRESENT: Charlie Wintzer, Julia Pettit, Dick Peek, Evan Russack, Adam Strachan, Jack Thomas, Thomas Eddington, Katie Cattan, Francisco Astorga, Kayla Sintz  
Commissioner Brooke Hontz was excused

**WORK SESSION ITEMS**

**Treasure Hill Site Visit**

Due to the weather, the Treasure Hill Site visit was cancelled. The Commissioners concurred that there was a need to visit the site and rescheduled the site visit for Thursday, November 5<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 a.m. Everyone should meet at the Town Bridge. The public would be noticed for the November 5<sup>th</sup> site visit.

Planner Cattan reported that the applicants have commissioned an architect to prepare a model of the project that will be presented at the December 9<sup>th</sup> meeting. She understood that the model would show how the structure fits within the landscape. Planner Cattan noted that the purpose of the site visit was to calculate the height for a better perception and she thought the model could provide that information.

Chair Wintzer remarked that there were two issues; the height and the height in relationship to other buildings in close proximity. Commissioner Thomas stated that they were also interested in the existing natural grade versus finished grade. Commissioner Peek pointed out that the section drawings showed existing grade but not the final grade.

Pat Sweeney, the applicant, distributed information packets for Treasure Hill to each Commissioner.

**1150 Deer Valley Drive, Snow Country - Amendment to Record of Survey  
(Application # PL-09-00768)**

Planner Francisco Astorga reported that this was a work session discussion for the amendment to the record of survey for the Snow Country Condominiums located at 1150 Deer Valley Drive in the General Commercial (GC) District. He explained that the purpose for the request is to create a privately owned dwelling unit from an area that was platted as common. As indicated in the Staff report, Unit 1070 is the unit being discussed. The main issue is that the complex is legal non-complying. In 1976 each unit was required to provide one parking space. Since that time, the parking regulations in the Land Management Code have changed and the parameters are different.

A table in the Staff report outlined the number of units and corresponding floor area and the number of required parking spaces.

Planner Astorga reported that currently there are 71 units and 81 parking spaces. Under the current Land Management the required parking would be 89 spaces, resulting in a shortfall of 8 spaces. If the Planning Commission moved forward with the plat amendment, the number of dwelling units would increase to 72 and the parking requirement would be 90 spaces.

The Staff finds that the requested plat amendment would increase the level of non-compliance from negative eight to negative nine parking spaces. He requested input from the Planning Commission as to whether or not they concur with the Staff's finding.