PLANNING RESOLUTION
01-2020

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE HIGH DESERT CONDOMINIUM PLAT (formerly known as World Mark)

WHEREAS, The Planning Commission and City Council reviewed an approved the World Mark Timeshare Project and the project is under construction

WHEREAS, the Applicant (John Gardiner) has prepared the Condominium Plat for the project, now known as High Desert Condominiums

WHEREAS, it is customary and usual for the Condominium Plat to be recorded once the project is complete or close to complete

WHEREAS, the Condominium Plat represents the project as previously approved by the City of Moab

WHEREAS, the Condominium Plat is an administrative action and does not require a public hearing

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission reviewed the Condominium Plat at their meeting on April 9, 2020 in accordance with Moab Municipal Code 17.79.060

WHEREAS, the requirements for a Condominium Plat and associated documents is primarily governed by Utah State Law

WHEREAS, following the consideration of the Staff recommendation and having reviewed the technical aspects of the pertinent code sections, the City of Moab Planning Commission, pursuant to Resolution #01-2020, hereby finds that Condominium Plat can meet or exceed the pertinent code requirements.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MOAB PLANNING COMMSISION hereby conditionally approves the Condominium Plat for the High Desert Condominiums with the condition that:

Prior to recordation, the following concerns/modifications will be addressed as recommended by the City Engineer:

1. A portion of the property is in FEMA Flood Zone A. Please show the flood zone on the plat.

2. The southern boundary, although it appears based on the proposed parcels of the 10/24/2017 lot line adjustment, is about 4.5' south of that line of the original parcel 1 of that lot line adjustment. The City sewer easements for this project were written apparently based on the south boundary of original parcel 1 and thus contain the 4.5' error. However, the metes of the easement description do call out the south parcel line, so there is no real legal error. However, why the 4.5’ discrepancy? The section corner of the section tie appears the same (Sheet 2).
3. All sheets - on all units adjacent to a unit with a different front or side setback distance. - Dimension jog distance between exterior walls - It is not possible to determine unit's position in 3d space with limited current dimensioning.

4. Building C-2 is not shown as a perfect rectangle but as a trapezoid. Is that an error? All the others have been rectangles (Sheet 9).

5. There is no callout for the exterior and interior wall thicknesses, as well as the jog distances between adjacent units with different setbacks, so the exact 3d space positions of the units remains indeterminate. All sheets - Specify exterior & interior wall thicknesses with a note like that of "Floor to Ceiling."

6. 7.41' distance's bearing is missing (North-east corner of Building E, Sheet 13).

7. North of Building E's bearing and distance are N76°28'59"E 375.67'. The distance does not match with the south side (S76°28'59"W 62.92'). Please review it (Sheet 13).

________________________________________  ______________________________________
Kya Marienfeld, Chair                                            Date