

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
APRIL 11, 2012

COMMISSIONERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Chair Charlie Wintzer, Brooke Hontz, Mick Savage, Adam Strachan, Jack Thomas, Nann Worel

EX OFFICIO:

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington; Matt Evans Planner; Francisco Astorga, Planner; Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney

=====

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

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

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

March 28, 2012

Commissioner Savage stated that as reflected in the minutes, he had said he would not be able to attend the Planning Commission meetings on May 9th and May 23rd. He had made a mistake and the actual dates were May 9th and June 27th.

Commissioner Strachan noted that the underlined date of the minutes being approved this evening should be changed from March 14th to correctly read March 28th.

Commissioner Hontz stated that approval of the March 14th minutes was continued to this meeting pending verification with the recording. She had received that verification and requested that the following statement be added to page 20, "**Understanding that questions regarding the General Plan and annexation were outside the purview of IBI Group, Commissioner Hontz asked if a representative for the applicant was present to address those questions. She was told that no other representative was present**". Commissioner Hontz noted that the March 14th minutes were not included in the Staff report or on the agenda.

Director Eddington stated that the minutes of March 14th would be included in the next Staff report, at which time Commissioner Hontz could add her statement and the minutes could be approved.

MOTION: Commissioner Strachan moved to APPROVE the minutes of March 28, 2012 with the amendment to change the underlined date on page 5 from March 14th to correctly read March 28th, 2012. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC INPUT

There were no comments.

STAFF/COMMISSIONER COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Eddington thanked the Commissioners who were able to attend the form base code discussion last week. They were able to meet with a variety of stakeholders and it was a good turnout with good input. Director Eddington stated that additional follow-up workshops were scheduled for April 30th and May 1st, to further develop the character zones.

Director Eddington reported that a joint meeting with the Snyderville Basin Planning Commission was scheduled for Wednesday, May 30th, 2012, 6:00 p.m. at the Richins Building. Since it was the fifth Wednesday in May, no regular meetings were scheduled that week. Chair Wintzer stated that he would be out-of-town. Director Eddington would re-confirm the date with the County and notify the Commissioners.

Director Eddington stated that a joint meeting with the City Council was tentatively scheduled for May 31st, 2012. Charles Buki would present his findings and his growth study. Director Eddington believed the meeting would begin at 6:00 p.m., but he would confirm the time and notify the Commissioners.

Chair Wintzer understood that on April 14th, the University of Utah was doing a design studio. Some people in Park City were on the jury and the students were bringing people up from Salt Lake. The design studio would take place from 1:00-5:00 p.m. and an open house would follow. Chair Wintzer clarified that it was an academic exercise. The students are given a problem to solve and the design studio reflects the result. In this particular case, the students were asked to look at ways to put affordable housing on top of existing buildings.

Director Eddington noted that weeks earlier the Planning Commission had denied the request for nightly rental at 60 Sampson Avenue due to unmitigated impacts. He reported that their decision was appealed by a neighbor. The City Council heard the appeal de novo and upheld the appeal. Therefore, 60 Sampson was being approved for nightly rental.

Director Eddington reported that the recommendation to extend the condition use permit for North Silver Lake was also appealed to the City Council and the appeal was denied. Therefore the extension stands.

Assistant City Attorney McLean clarified that the findings for 60 Sampson had not yet been ratified. Director Eddington stated that the City Council took into account the concerns expressed by the Planning Commission and requested additional mitigating endeavors. Those findings would come back for ratification.

Commissioner Strachan asked if the City Council found that parking at the Sandridge lot was a viable mitigation factor. Ms. McLean answered no. She explained that the applicant had proposed two on-site parking spaces for renters, which would be part of the rental agreement. The City Council restricted the parking to those two spaces. Director Eddington clarified that two cars could park on the site given the scale of the driveway, and the applicant agreed to limit the rental units to two spaces.

Commissioner Strachan asked if there was any discussion among the City Council regarding enforcement. Director Eddington replied that enforcement was not a primary discussion; however, the City Council recognizes that any enforcement is a challenge with regard to parking. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the vote was split 3-2. Council members Simpson and Peek supported the Planning Commission.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. 80 Daly Avenue – Plat Amendment (Application #PL-12-01488)

Planner Francisco Astorga reviewed the application for a plat amendment at 80 Daly Avenue. The request was to combine part of Lot 9, all of Lot 10, and part of Lot 11 and the vacated right-of-way to the rear, into two lots of record in the HR-1 zone.

Planner Astorga identified several improvements on the existing structure at 68 Daly Avenue that encroaches on to the property at 80 Daly Avenue. He noted that the owner of 68 Daly Avenue could either work with the adjacent property owner to obtain an encroachment agreement, or remove the improvements from the lot.

Planner Astorga stated that a temporary construction easement exists over what was identified as Lot B for the benefit of the King Ridge Estates at 158, 162 and 166 Ridge Avenue. If approved, the drafted findings of fact acknowledge that a temporary easement exists, but that it would not be affected or changed by this plat amendment.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council based on the findings of fact, conclusions of law and conditions of approval.

Chair Wintzer noted that the size of the lot would be considerably larger than other lots in the area. He asked if there were any restrictions on the house size that would be allowed on this property. Planner Astorga replied that there were no restrictions in the HR-1 District, other than the maximum footprint allowed by Code, which is based on the footprint formula. Chair Wintzer understood that the Planning Commission could restrict the size as a condition of the plat amendment. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that they would have that ability based what they have done with previous applications and the analysis of house sizes on Daly.

Commissioner Hontz stated that one of her multiple concerns was that the square footage for the lot includes vacated Anchor Avenue. She asked what her fellow Commissioners thought about being

able to include that vacated portion to allow for a bigger footprint. She personally did not support it. Commissioner Hontz noted that in this particular situation that portion of the lot was very steep.

Commissioner Worel asked about the historic structure referenced in Conclusion of Law #1. Planner Astorga replied that it was not a historic structure and he had used the word 'historic' in error.

Commissioner Thomas thought it would be helpful to see the plat before and after side by side. He noted that the plat as revised was shown but there was no clear picture of what it looks like now. It was difficult for the Planning Commission to understand what they would be changing. Planner Astorga noted that the plat amendment shown on the screen and in the Staff report identified all the lot lines that would be removed, as well as the proposed lot lines. Commissioner Strachan suggested that the plat map on page 46 of the Staff report might help address Commissioner Thomas' concern. Planner Astorga stated that in the future the Staff could include the County plat map, like the one shown on page 46, and compare it next to the proposed plat.

Assistant City Attorney explained that the County plats are for taxation purposes and they are not always accurate. She agreed that it could be a helpful document, but they need to be aware that if there is a conflict between the plat map and the survey, the survey would control.

Commissioner Thomas clarified that he was only asking for a before and after comparison to see the difference. Chair Wintzer requested a better map that clearly defines property lines, encroachments, and other elements they need to understand.

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing.

Carleen Riley, a resident at 84 Daly stated that she lives next door to the property line at 80 Daly Avenue. Ms. Riley wanted to know more about the plat amendment and what would be built.

Planner Astorga remarked that at this point the Planning Department had not received any plans. The area is zoned HR-1, which allows single family dwellings. The applicant was requesting a plat amendment to combine the lot into two lots of record.

Ms. Riley asked if that would allow two dwellings.

Planner Astorga replied that it could be duplexes under a conditional use permit reviewed by the Planning Commission. When the applicant is ready to move forward with a design, it would be subject to a Historic Design Review, which would trigger a notice to property owners within 100 feet.

Ms. Riley stated that her lot also encroaches on that property by approximately 60 inches. She did not build her house, but she was informed of that when it was surveyed years ago. When the owners decide to build, she would like some space between their structure and hers. She has 100 year old, 20-foot lilac bush that would be split in two. Ms. Riley was interested in knowing the details of whatever structure is built. She was opposed to steep slope construction and wanted guarantees that it would not occur.

Commissioner Thomas informed Ms. Riley that the design would not come before the Planning Commission unless a steep slope CUP is required. Otherwise, the use is reviewed administratively by Staff. Planner Astorga reiterated that a request for a duplex would require CUP approval. Director Eddington noted that an administrative review is still noticed to the public.

Director Eddington asked if there were any easements along the property adjacent to Ms. Riley. Jonathan DeGray, representing the applicant, believed it was a 6-foot utility easement. Ms. Riley stated that at one time the plan was to put all the power lines and sewer lines next to her house. However, she understood from looking at the drawings that the water and sewer lines would be on the other side. Mr. DeGray stated that there were no sewer lines. The sewer is serviced from above. A storm sewer would go through the Daly lot, but not sanitary sewer lines. He noted that Planner Astorga had that documentation from the Sewer District.

Commissioner Strachan asked if any portion of the lot could be built on that would not trigger a CUP. Mr. DeGray answered no. Commissioner Strachan clarified that regardless of what they build, the owners would have to submit their plans to the Planning Commission. At that point, Ms. Riley would be able to see the specifics details related to her questions this evening.

Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

Jonathan DeGray noted that the Staff report shows one large single parcel comprised of Lots 9 and 10, portions of 11 and the fragment right-of-way to the rear. He stated that currently Lots 9 and 10 are buildable without a plat amendment. The intent of the plat amendment is to clean up property lines and take care of the encroachments through easement agreements.

Commissioner Thomas remarked that there was an unusual situation of creating a flag lot out of the house behind Lot A, and nothing in the Code restricts that from occurring. Commissioner Thomas thought that should be considered in the future because it is an unusual condition. There is no way to for a vehicle to access the property, which creates a problematic situation for fire access and fire fighting. In addition, there is no parking and it lends itself to an eyesore condition. In this particular instance, if you drive in front of this property there would be three houses in a row off the street. Commissioner Thomas found it peculiar but totally within the law. Unfortunately it was a consequence of the Code. He would support the approval but he did not like it.

Chair Wintzer could not understand how that was parceled off that way in the first place. However, it was done a long time ago and it was out of the hands of this Planning Commission. Planner Astorga explained that he found a building permit issued in 1982 for the house showing that it had to be exact in configuration. He could not find the permit for the stairs. He also found record of a variance that was approved by the Board of Adjustment in 1982 to allow the owner to rebuild the house due to an incident with a water tank falling from King Road. The variance that did not necessitate parking areas on site. Carleen Riley provided the history of what happened that caused the water tank to fall.

Planner Astorga stated that planning and planning practices have changed since 1982, but he found the configuring of such lot, which was approved by the City, and then moved forward with a variance and the building permit.

Chair Wintzer was not concerned with the small lot. In terms of the big lot, he suggested doing a comparison of other structures on the street to make sure they would not be creating an oversized lot and structure for that area. Commissioner Strachan concurred. He noted that the large house above was an exception and it is not on Daly Avenue. Commissioner Strachan remarked that Daly Avenue has more historic heart than anywhere else in town and they need to make sure the compatibility requirement of the Code is met. The Commissioners concurred. Commissioner Hontz felt they had to do that to remain consistent with what they have asked of other applicants on Daly Avenue.

Commissioner Hontz remarked that in many cases when a plat amendment is requested to clean up one issue, the applicant identifies many others. It is not uncommon to have portions of roofs or landscaping or small portions of stairwells across property lines. In this case she found the significant amount of structures from 68 Daly that extends into these other properties to be concerning and problematic. If this plat amendment is approved it would further impact parking issues that are created off-site. She felt it was unfortunate that there was not better foresight in 1982 to see what problems they were creating for the neighborhood when they allowed 68 Daly to be built without parking. Chair Wintzer was unsure how that issue could be rectified, but they definitely need to look at the size of houses on the lots.

Commissioner Thomas suggested using the same study criteria that was used for 191 Woodside and 313 Daly Avenue.

MOTION: Commissioner Thomas moved to CONTINUE 80 Daly Avenue to May 9, 2012. Commissioner Strachan seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

**2. 12 Oak Court – Plat Amendment
(Application #PL-11-01-1491)**

Planner Matt Evans reviewed the application for a plat amendment to remove the lot line between Lots 35 and 36 of the Amended Plat of the Evergreen Subdivision to create one lot of record. The request is to combine two lots to create one new parcel. Planner Evans indicated a 30-foot wide ski easement for the benefit of Lot 36 to the Last Chance ski trail, which would be vacated as part of this subdivision.

Planner Evans reported that the applicant owns both parcels and the purpose for combining the two lots is to expand the existing home over the lot line. The existing lot line with a public utility easement would also be vacated.

Planner Evans stated that the actual square footage of the proposed addition was unknown; however the combined lots would allow the applicant to build an 11,250 square foot home. Under the existing conditions the existing house is 7,343 square feet, with a maximum of 7500 square feet. Planner Evans noted that combining the lots would reduce the density in the subdivision.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for the plat amendment at 12 Oak Court, based on the findings of fact, conclusions of law and conditions of approval.

Rick Otto, representing the owner, stated that the addition would bring the total square footage to just over 11,000. He assumed the Staff report contained a letter from Bob Wells. Mr. Otto remarked that the pad is set up to provide enough room to build the addition.

Commissioner Thomas asked if the LODs of the Evergreen Subdivision were platted on the plat. Mr. Otto answered yes. Commissioner Thomas asked if the plat needed to be modified in order to modify the LODs. Mr. Otto believed they would; however, if the Planning Commission was comfortable with the configuration of the pad, they would make that part of the plat amendment. Commissioner Thomas recalled that the Evergreen Subdivision had area requirements for each building pad. Mr. Otto stated that he had counted the square footage for the two different pads, which was approximately 11,168 total. Each pad is 5500 square feet each.

Chair Wintzer asked if the Evergreen Subdivision has an active homeowners association. Mr. Otto was unsure about an HOA; but Brad Wilson reviews the plans. Chair Wintzer referred to the LODs and stated that it was not the job of the Planning Commission to make sure it complies with the Homeowners Association. Since the plat amendment would be changing their anticipated footprints, he requested a condition requiring approval by the HOA. Commissioner Thomas remarked that if Evergreen Subdivision was registered with the City as an active HOA that review would be required. If they are not registered with the City, the Planning Commission has no responsibility. He did not believe a condition of approval was necessary to stipulate HOA approval. Mr. Otto stated that if it was necessary, the applicant would obtain a letter from Brad Wilson indicating approval.

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing.

There was no comment.

Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

MOTION: Commissioner Hontz moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the Plat Amendment at 12 Oak Court, in accordance with the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the draft ordinance. Commissioner Thomas seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 12 Oak Court

1. The property is located in the Residential Development (RD) zone and is subject to Section 15-2.13 of the Land Management Code, the amended Evergreen subdivision plat, and the Deer Valley Master Planned Development.

2. The RD zone is characterized by mainly single family homes and resort development condominiums and hotels.
3. The property is located at 12 Oak Court in the North Silver Lake neighborhood of the Deer Valley MPD. The property is located next to the "Last Chance" ski run of the Deer Valley Resort.
4. There is an existing ski easement across Lot 35 to provide ski access for Lot 36 to Last Chance ski run. The ski easement does not connect any other lot or common area to this ski run. The applicant is pursuing a vacation of this easement as it would no longer be necessary if the lots are combined. If vacated, the recording information regarding the vacation should be noted on this amended plat.
5. The property consists of Lots 36 and 36 of the Amended Plat of Evergreen Subdivision. The amended plat was recorded at Summit County on May 17, 1988. A plat amendment to combine the two (2) lots into one (1) lot of record is required before final building permits for any new construction can be issued if that construction increases the size of the house on Lot 35 beyond the 7,500 square foot maximum, crossing onto Lot 36, or is not in compliance with required setbacks to the common lot line.
6. Building footprint and limits of disturbance areas are indicated on the Amended Plat of Evergreen Subdivision. The proposed plat amendment identifies a revised building footprint and limits of disturbance area for the combined lot.
7. Maximum house size is 11,250 sf for a combination of 2 lots. The existing house contains 7,343 sf of floor area, excluding 600 sf for the garage. A revised building pad is identified on the plat amendment.
8. There is no minimum or maximum lot size associated with the Amended Plat of Evergreen subdivision. The combined lot resulting from this plat amendment is 40,248.39 square feet in area.
9. Lots in the Amended Plat of Evergreen range in area from 10,124 sf to 54,394 sf.
10. The proposed plat amendment does not increase the density allowed by the Deer Valley Master Planned Development.
11. The applicant stipulates to the conditions of approval.
12. The discussion in the Analysis section is incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law – 12 Oaks Court

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 plat amendments.
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 – 12 Oaks Court

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat amendment for compliance with State law; the Land Management Code; requirements for utility, snow storage, ski easement vacation, and any encroachment agreements; as well as any conditions of approval that apply to this property, prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant will record the plat amendment at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year's time, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a request for an extension is granted by the City Council.
3. A note shall be included on the plat prior to plat recordation stating that the maximum house size and building setbacks for new construction on a combined lot shall be determined by the LMC Section 15-2.13-6(B).
4. A note shall be included on the plat prior to recordation stating that the conditions of approval and plat notes of the Deer Valley MPD and Amended Plat of Evergreen subdivision continue to apply to this lot.
5. A 10' (ten foot) snow storage easement shall be dedicated to Park City across the property's frontage on Oak Court.
6. The property owner shall comply with the requirements of the Snyderville Basin water Reclamation District (SBWRD).
7. Modified 13-D residential fire sprinklers are required in all modifications or new construction.
8. If the applicant pursues a vacation of the ski easement, the recording information of the easement vacation shall be noted on the amended plat prior to recordation. Otherwise the dedicated ski easement shall be shown on the amended plat.
3. **269 Daly Avenue – Plat Amendment**
(Application #PL-11-01232)

Planner Evans reported that the Planning Commission reviewed this application on March 14th and continued the item with a request that the applicant consider a reduction in the footprint and total

floor area, as well as a maximum building line to ensure that building encroachment on the Daly Canyon side was limited. Another option was for the applicant to sell the development rights of the rear parcel as a TDR.

Planner Evans stated that the applicant has proposed a smaller addition and to limit the total size of the structure to 2,000 square feet maximum and delineate a maximum building line of approximately 20 feet on the plat. Planner Evans noted that the crosshatch shown on the site plan was the area that exceeds 30% slope. Planner Evans noted that combining the two lots was necessary for any type of addition because it would have to occur at the rear of the home. The existing structure is a historic home on the Historic Sites Inventory. Moving the home or relocating it elsewhere on the site is prohibited by Code.

Chair Wintzer opened the public hearing.

There was no comment.

Chair Wintzer closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Hontz referred to finding of fact #11, and noted that the word "feet" needed to be added after 20, to read, "...a maximum building line approximately 20 feet to the rear of the existing lot lines that separate the two parcels."

The applicant's representative stated that he had calculated 17 feet. Commissioner Hontz preferred that number, and changed to finding to read 17 feet. It was suggested that the sentence could read, "17 feet to the east of the existing property line."

Commissioner Thomas asked if the first part of the finding, "...limiting the maximum structure size not to exceed 2,000 square feet", was footprint. He was told that it was the total square footage. Director Eddington suggested that it be clarified as 2,000 square feet gross floor area.

Chair Wintzer suggested that they go off the front property line 76 feet plus 17 feet, rather than go off the lot line. He was told that the actual calculation would be 93.5 feet. Commissioner Hontz was comfortable with that calculation. She was concerned about the vegetation and large trees and asked if they would be affected. She was told that they would be affected as part of the process of working on the addition. The trees would be protected as much as possible. Planner Evans stated that during the HDDR process the Staff would note any vegetation that the applicant would propose to disturb and they would be required to replace in kind by either moving it or replacing it with a similar size.

Finding of Fact #11 was revised to read, "The applicant has proposed a plat note limiting the maximum structure size not to exceed 2,000 square feet of gross floor area, and is also proposing a maximum building line approximately 93.5 feet from the front property line."

Based on the revision to Finding #11, Planner Evans suggested that the Planning Commission address conditions of approval 7 and 8. Commissioner Strachan thought the language read by Commissioner Hontz should be a condition of approval rather than a finding of fact. He suggested

that they leave Finding #11 as originally written, and put the revised language as Condition #7. The Commissioners concurred.

MOTION: Commissioner Thomas moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council for the plat amendment at 268 Daly Avenue, based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Condition of Approval as modified. Commissioner Hontz seconded the motion.

Chair Wintzer thanked the applicant for revising the plan to meet the concerns raised by the Planning Commission. He appreciated that the applicant understood the sensitivity of the neighborhood.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 269 Daly Avenue

1. The property is located at 269 Daly Avenue within the Historic Residential (HR-1) Zoning District.
2. The property is shown on the Historic Sites Inventory as a “Landmark Site” and includes a 720 square foot mining era home constructed in 1901.
3. The applicants are requesting to adjoin two metes and bounds parcels into one Lot for the purpose of a future expansion of the home.
4. The plat amendment is necessary in order for the applicant to obtain a building permit for the proposed addition to the rear yard due to the location of an existing lot line.
5. The amended plat will create one new 7,283 square foot lot.
6. Currently the property is two separate parcels. The front parcel is where the existing home is located, and has frontage onto Daly Avenue, and all of the rear lots exceeds 30% slope and has no street frontage, and thus no separate development potential without the lot combination.
7. The existing garage is also listed on the historic sites inventory and does not count against the maximum building footprint square footage.
8. A majority of the lot exceeds 30% slope and any addition beyond 1,000 square feet will require a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission.
9. The existing historic home and garage cannot be moved or relocated to another site on the lot.

10. Any addition to the existing historic home would require review by the Design Review Team and any exterior remodels or additions would reviewed under the adopted 2009 Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites.
11. The applicant has proposed a plat note limiting the maximum structure size not to exceed 2,000 square feet gross floor area and is also proposing a maximum building line approximately 20 feet to the rear of the existing lot lines that separate the two parcels.

Conclusions of Law – 269 Daly Avenue

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 subdivisions.
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 – 269 Daly Avenue

1. The City Attorney and City Engineer will review and approve the final form and content of the plat amendment for compliance with State law, the Land Management Code, and the conditions of approval prior to recordation of the plat.
2. The applicant will record the plat amendment at the County within one year from the date of City Council approval. If recordation has not occurred within one year's time, this approval for the plat will be void, unless a complete application requesting an extension is made in writing prior to the expiration date and an extension is granted by the City Council.
3. No building permits for the rear expansion of the existing home will granted until the plat amendment is recorded with the Summit County Recorder's office.
4. More than half of the new lot will exceed 30% slope and future development may be subject to a Steep Slope Conditional Use Permit.
5. Modified 13-D sprinklers will be required for renovation of the existing structure.
6. A 10-foot wide public snow storage easement will be provided along the frontage of the property.
7. The applicant has proposed a plat note limiting the maximum structure size not to exceed 2,000 square feet of gross floor area, and is also proposing a maximum building line approximately 93.5 feet from the front property line.

8. The maximum building line (no building zone) shall be established as shown on the current plat date stamped April 5, 2012.

The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned the regular meeting and moved into work session to discuss the Quinn's Junction Partnership Annexation. That discussion can be found in the Work Session Minutes dated April 11, 2012.

The Park City Planning Commission meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Approved by Planning Commission: _____