

**SALT LAKE CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
In Room 326 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, February 8, 2006**

Present for the Planning Commission were Laurie Noda (Chairperson), Tim Chambless, Babs De Lay, John Diamond, Robert Forbis Jr., Peggy McDonough (Vice Chairperson), Kathy Scott, and Jennifer Seelig. Craig Galli and Prescott Muir were unable to attend.

Present from the Planning Division were Alexander Ikefuna (Planning Director), Cheri Coffey (Deputy Planning Director), Kevin LoPiccolo (Zoning Administrator), Elizabeth Giraud (Senior Planner), Ray McCandless (Principal Planner), Lex Traughber (Principal Planner), Sarah Carroll (Associate Planner) and Deborah Martin (Senior Planning Secretary).

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. Chairperson Noda called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m. Minutes are presented in agenda order and not necessarily as cases were heard by the Planning Commission. Audio recordings of Planning Commission meetings are retained in the Planning Office for an indefinite period of time.

A field trip was held prior to the meeting. Planning Commissioners present were Tim Chambless, Laurie Noda, Kathy Scott and Robert Forbis Jr. Planning Division Staff present were Cheri Coffey, Elizabeth Giraud, Lex Traughber and Sarah Carroll.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES from Wednesday, January 25, 2006.

(This item was heard at 5:46 p.m.)

Commissioner Chambless requested that the minutes (page 3, paragraph 4) reflect that the Research Park Work Group is scheduled to meet on February 13 and March 20 to prepare a recommendation for the Planning Commission at the meeting scheduled for March 22, 2006. The Work Group is hopeful that they will be able to make a positive recommendation to end the present hold on conditional use applications in the Research Park area.

Commissioner De Lay moved to approve the January 25, 2006 minutes with the noted inclusion. Commissioner Seelig seconded the motion. All voted aye; the motion passed.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

(This item was heard at 5:48 p.m.)

Chairperson Noda noted that there was nothing to report at this time regarding meetings with the City Council. Meetings with the City Council will be arranged after the legislative session.

Chairperson Noda expressed her appreciation to Planning Commission Members for their input on the letter they submitted relating to Senate Bill SB170. She was unable to be involved or sign the letter because of a conflict of interest. Chairperson Noda is affiliated with the Attorney General's Office that reviews legislative bills.

REPORT OF THE PLANNING DIRECTOR

(This item was heard at 5:49 p.m.)

Street Banner Ordinance Mr. Ikefuna informed the Commissioners that the street banner ordinance reviewed by the Planning Commission in the Fall of 2005 was reviewed by the Salt Lake City Attorney's

Office. The Attorney's Office had some concerns and made modifications to the ordinance. The original ordinance and the modifications made by the Attorney's Office were forwarded to Commission Members for their review. Mr. Ikefuna noted that he found no substantial impact on the intent of the original ordinance, and invited questions and concerns from Planning Commission Members.

The Planning Commission had no problems with the changes.

Transportation Study by University of Utah Students Mr. Ikefuna explained that on February 7, 2006, he met with planning students from the University of Utah who are performing a study on transportation in the downtown area. One of the areas they will focus on is the area southwest of Gateway, and the study will include growth, carrying capacity, economic feasibility and current transportation development and proposals. The students wish to work closely with the Planning Staff and present their findings to the Planning Commission. When the study is completed, Mr. Ikefuna will arrange for a presentation to the Planning Commission.

Petition 400-04-21 by Salt Lake City Planning Division requesting that this petition to allow stand-alone retail options as a land use within the Business Park Zoning District be withdrawn by the Salt Lake Planning Commission.

Mr. Ikefuna explained that the Planning Staff no longer finds a need to continue with the petition to review allowing stand-alone retail options within the Business Park (BP) zoning district, and Staff is requesting that the Planning Commission withdraw the petition.

Mr. McCandless explained that the current Zoning Ordinance allows retail businesses only in conjunction with planned developments in BP zoning districts. Referring to a map, Mr. McCandless noted the BP zoning districts are generally located along the west side of the I-215 freeway with larger areas zoned BP to the north and northeast of the Airport. Planning Staff received a request in 2004 to develop a stand-alone retail business west of the I-215 corridor. At that time, Staff requested that the Planning Commission initiate a petition to explore the possibility of allowing stand-alone retail land uses within the BP zoning district. Staff's in-depth analysis included reviewing ordinances from other jurisdictions and found consistently that retail uses are typically allowed to support primary land uses in BP districts. In addition, Staff concluded that most stand-alone retail uses would want to be located at the freeway interchanges of 700 North and 2100 North in the BP area. Therefore, as these types of specific requests come in, they should be analyzed as rezoning for specific projects. Thus, Mr. McCandless asked that the Planning Commission withdraw the petition.

The consensus of Planning Commission Members was to withdraw the petition.

Motion for Petition 400-04-21

Commissioner Scott moved for the Planning Commission to withdraw the petition to allow stand-alone retail options as a land use within the Business Park Zoning District. Commissioner Chambless seconded the motion. All voted aye; the motion passed.

PUBLIC NOTICE AGENDA

(This item was heard at 5:56 p.m.)

Salt Lake City Property Conveyance Matters – (John Spencer at 535-6938 or john.spencer@slcgov.com; Matt Williams at 535-6447 or matt.williams@slcgov.com; Doug Wheelwright at 535-6178 or doug.wheelwright@slcgov.com):

- a) **T-Mobile USA and Salt Lake City Property Management — T-Mobile USA received Conditional Use approval for a utility pole installation of a cellular telephone antenna under Case #410-763 at approximately 1200 West and 1000 North Streets, through an Administrative Hearing held September 27, 2005. The subject utility pole is owned by Utah Power and is located within the City owned street right-of-way of 1000 North Street. T-Mobile USA is now seeking a three foot by approximately thirty-one foot**

telecommunications right-of-way permit from Salt Lake City Property Management, to allow the connection of underground power and telecommunications cables to connect from the power pole to the required equipment shelter structure, located in the rear yard area of an adjoining Residential R-1-7000 zoned property by separate lease agreement. The Property Management Division staff intends to approve the requested right-of-way permit.

- b) **C F J Properties and Salt Lake City Property Management — C F J Properties, dba Flying “J” Truck Stop**, is requesting the Property Management Division to approve a short term (up to one year) commercial lease for the temporary use of a City owned alley and a partial street, which were never developed or improved, and which City property impacts the Flying “J” Truck Stop property, in a way as to be inconsistent with the proposed redevelopment of the Flying “J” Property. Flying “J” has submitted building permit plans to reconstruct and expand the existing truck stop facility, located at 900 West and 2100 South Street. During the initial building permit review, City Permits Office staff identified the alley conflict and referred the applicant to the Planning Office. Recently, Flying “J” filed for Alley Closure and Street Closure in petitions 400-05-47 and 400-05-48, which are beginning to be processed by the Planning Staff. Since the alley and street closure processes typically take 6 to 8 months to complete, Flying “J” is requesting a short term lease to allow the street and alley properties to be redeveloped consistent with the proposed redevelopment and expansion plans for the new truck stop facility, while the alley and street closure processes are completed. The subject alley is located at approximately 850 West on 2100 South Street and is approximately 700 feet by 12 feet, and contains 8400 square feet. The subject partial street is located at 800 West and extends north from 2100 South Street approximately 191 feet by 33 feet wide, and contains 6303 square feet. The Property Management staff intends to approve the requested short term commercial lease, pending notification to the Planning Commission and the City Council, consistent with City policy.

Chairperson Noda noted that there were no comments or questions from the public or Commissioners.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- a) **Petition 410-774 – A request by Mike Weller of Diamond Parking, for conditional use approval of a commercial surface parking lot in a D-3 zoning district at 179 West Broadway (300 South). (Staff - Elizabeth Giraud at 535-7128 or elizabeth.giraud@slcgov.com).**

(This item was heard at 5:57 p.m.)

Mike Weller was present to represent Diamond Parking and the property owner.

Ms. Giraud explained that the petition is for a surface parking lot consisting of 27 parking spaces on two parcels separated by a remnant strip parcel, currently vacant, located on the southeast corner of 300 South and 200 West in a D-3 zoning district. Ms. Giraud then explained that Staff determined the request meets the standards of the Zoning Ordinance relating to traffic, circulation and utility services, and provides sufficient landscaping. The proposed parking lot is mostly surrounded by nighttime entertainment uses: The P. F. Chang Restaurant and the Rose Wagner Performing Arts Center are located across the street to the north, the Metropolitan Restaurant is located next door to the east, the Palladio Apartments are located to the west, and the Broadway Lofts Condominiums are located to the south separated by the Metropolitan. Noting the comments submitted to the Planning Division, Ms. Giraud explained that many people support the proposal and only one negative comment was received from a resident residing in the Broadway Lofts. He was concerned that the nighttime activities from surrounding uses would spill over into the parking lot and adversely affect residents in the Broadway Lofts. Ms. Giraud further explained that the Downtown Master Plan discourages surface parking lots, and the Planning Division does not see the proposed lot as an ideal use for creating a vibrant downtown. However, the property could be easily redeveloped with a structure in the future and the proposed use

would improve the visual appearance of the property by including landscaping. Ms. Giraud noted that the owner has not come forward with any other plans to develop the property. Therefore, Staff recommends approval with the conditions that the parcels be consolidated into one parcel, the Applicant submit a site and landscaping plan that addresses departmental comments outlined in the Staff Report, the Applicant participates in the downtown parking token program, and the Applicant satisfies the requirement of the Certificate of Present Conditions recorded on the property. Ms. Giraud explained that a tire store existed on the property for many years and was demolished in 2001. Foundation debris was left on the property and it must be removed.

Commissioner Diamond noted that in 2003, the Planning Commission discussed at length redeveloping downtown properties into surface parking lots and the effect they would have on revitalization. In particular, properties located to the east of the proposed site were discussed and it was determined that any surface parking in the downtown area should set an example. Commissioner Diamond asked to what degree the proposal meets previous discussions and intent. Ms. Giraud explained that the subject property is located in the D-3 zoning district and the property discussed previously is located in the D-1 zoning district. The D-3 zoning district is more restrictive in that it requires a 15-foot landscaped buffer on street frontages which the Applicant has provided. The proposal for the property farther east sought reductions in setbacks and landscaping. Ms. Giraud reiterated that the surface parking lot is not an ideal situation or a situation that would be permitted without review, and for that reason, the Zoning Ordinance requires that proposed surface parking lots in the downtown area be reviewed as a conditional use.

Ms. Coffey added that several surface parking lots have been approved with the idea that they would be an interim use, and they are considered an improvement to vacant lots with requirements for landscaping and setbacks.

Commissioner Seelig noted that the Downtown Community Council declined to hear the issue and asked for an explanation. Ms. Giraud explained that she notified the Chairperson for the Downtown Community Council who in turn asked their Board whether or not they wished to hear it. The Board stated that it was not necessary for the Community Council to review it.

Mr. Weller explained that the property has been marketed for several years and no feasible options have been offered. Mr. Weller acknowledged that the proposal is an interim development.

There was no Community Council representative to speak to the issue.

Lawrence Burdett (Resident of Broadway Lofts) explained that there are 6 public parking lots with over 600 parking spaces in the area and he believes the neighborhood does not need another one. Mr. Burdett explained that he owns three vehicles and has only one parking space for his unit. Parking has never been a problem for him in that he uses surrounding parking lots and street parking.

The meeting was closed to public comment and the Commissioners discussed the proposal.

The consensus of the Planning Commission was that although the proposal would be an improvement to a littered vacant lot and provide desired landscaping, they found that it would not meet Standard B of Section 21A.54.080 relating to consistency with adopted master plans. It may be debatable that another surface parking lot would be compatible with surrounding lots, but it would not be in harmony with the general purposes and intent of the Downtown Master Plan. Furthermore, there is no detectable parking problem that would merit an additional 27 parking spaces, and the proposal would not implement the planning goals and objectives of the City to revitalize the downtown area.

Commissioner De Lay said that she would be inclined to support the proposal merely because it would provide landscaping and two handicapped accessible parking spaces. She voiced her concerns about the City being proactive on handicapped curb cuts, but lacks in providing private or public handicapped assessable parking stalls. Commissioner Seelig shared the concern and suggested initiating a petition. Mr. Ikefuna and Ms. Coffey asked the Planning Commission to delay initiating a petition until a representative from the Transportation Division could speak to the issue.

It is noted that the Commissioners also voiced concern about the property owner not being present to discuss potential redevelopment for the property.

Motion for Petition 410-774

Based on the analyses and findings outlined in the Staff Report and discussions set forth, Commissioner Scott moved for the Planning Commission to deny approval of a conditional use for a parking lot at 179 West 300 South (aka Broadway) because it would not meet Standard B of Section 21A.54.080 of the Zoning Ordinance; specifically, the proposal is not compatible with and does not implement planning goals and objectives of the City including applicable master plans. Commissioner Chambless seconded the motion, all voted aye; the motion passed.

- b) Petition 400-02-41 – A request by the Salt Lake City Planning Commission to modify the text of Capitol Hill Protective Area Overlay District to establish height limits for residential and Urban Institutional zoned properties and to amend the Zoning Map by adjusting the boundaries of the Capitol Hill Protective Area Overlay District in the following locations: 1) Generally, from Main Street and Center Street to 200 West between Girard Avenue and 200 North; and 2) Generally, from Canyon Road to “A” Street between Fourth Avenue and Second Avenue. (Staff – Everett Joyce at 535-7930 or everett.joyce@slcgov.com)**

This petition was postponed. Issues relating to the modification of the text for the Capitol Hill Protective Area Overlay District will be discussed with City Council Member Eric Jergensen before rescheduling it for the Planning Commission public hearing.

- c) Petition No. 400-05-24 – A request by Harrison Apartments, LLC for a zoning map amendment to rezone the property located at 713 East Harrison Avenue from R-1/5000, Single Family Residential to RMF-35, Moderate Density Multi-Family Residential in order to demolish the existing structure and construct six individually owned town homes. The project will also require an amendment to the future land use map of the Central Community Master Plan to identify the property as Low Medium Density Residential rather than Low Density Residential. (Staff – Sarah Carroll at 535-6260 or sarah.carroll@slcgov.com)**

(This item was heard at 6:28 p.m.)

Bob Strasters and Chuck Klingenstein were present to represent Harrison Apartments, LLC.

Ms. Carroll explained that the request was originally heard on December 14, 2005 and the Planning Commission tabled it requesting a development plan, including floor and elevation plans. Plans were submitted and reviewed by the Subcommittee in which design features were requested. The Subcommittee asked that windows and shrubbery be provided on the 700 East elevation of the garages, graffiti-proof fencing along 700 East, front doors with windows or doors that would be more characteristic to existing doors along the street, and columns and other architectural features that would reflect the architecture of the streetscape such as picket fences and front porches. Noting the revised elevation drawing, Ms. Carroll explained that the Applicant provided all the suggested features except for front porches.

Responding to questions and concerns from Commissioners regarding design features and support from the neighborhood, the Applicants explained that they strived to incorporate the suggestions of both the Subcommittee and neighbors. The Applicants are satisfied that the design is consistent with the design of the neighborhood. Noting the elevation drawing, the fencing is not depicted in order to show the windows and shrubbery that were requested. Fencing could be installed for each individual unit encompassing individual front yards or encompassing small combined courtyards. Mature trees along the 700 East frontage also were not shown, but exist and will not be removed to provide buffering from traffic noise emitted from 700 East. It was also suggested to use sound-deadening material to mitigate

noise, which the Applicants agree to do. The units will consist of about 1,800 square feet total with two finished levels and an unfinished basement with roughed-in plumbing. The structure as a whole is approximately 24 feet high, in which the RMF-35 zone would allow a maximum height of 35 feet. Most homes in the neighborhood are bungalows at about 16 feet high, and the Applicants believe that the proposed height compliments the heights of surrounding bungalows and the two-story Victorian homes a block away. Each unit will have a detached double-car garage connected to each other located in the rear yard. The garages will be accessed from Harrison Avenue and there will be no access to the property from 700 East. Mr. Klingenstein noted that the Transportation Engineer accepted the design of the driveway and access. The projected market price of a unit is \$200,000 to \$225,000. The Applicants believe that the size and price of each unit are consistent with the size and market value of the neighborhood.

As for neighborhood support, Mr. Klingenstein acknowledged that the project did not initially receive support, but they have worked closely with neighbors and only two of seven immediate neighbors still oppose it. One of the changes made was to offer the units as owner occupied units rather than rental units. In addition, the location is ideal for families (their target market) because of the amenities in the vicinity such as the schools, park and bus stops. They believe that they meet the intent of the Central Community Master Plan which provides opportunities for people to live in the neighborhood.

The Applicants addressed Commissioner's McDonough concern about requesting a moderate density zoning classification rather than a lower density zone and setting a precedent for future development. Mr. Strasters explained that four or five units on the property would not be compatible with the neighborhood in that the units would be larger and more expensive. They are proposing six units because the square footage of the lot supports six units if the lot were zoned RMF-35.

Chairperson Noda entered into the record a letter received by Judi Short at 862 East Harrison Avenue opposing the proposal.

There was no Community Council representative to speak to the issue.

Cindy Cromer, 816 East 100 South, explained that she opposes the rezoning and the process in which the City has taken the request. The request would better serve the Applicants, the neighborhood and the City if it were reviewed under the Planned Development process. A request for rezoning does not have standards for compatibility and design review. She believes that the design elements the Subcommittee requested are beyond the purview of the Planning Commission and may be arbitrary and capricious. Ms. Cromer further believes that the proposal is inconsistent with the Central Community Master Plan which was adopted just a short time ago. Ms. Cromer voiced her disappointment in the fact that other neighborhoods have compatibility design review supported and implemented by the City, but the City has delayed such support for her neighborhood making it appear that it is unworthy. She has requested for several years to implement compatibility design review for in-fill housing in her neighborhood, but the Planning Commission has declined. Porches are the most defining characteristic of the neighborhood, yet stoops rather than porches are being proposed. The mere fact that the property can not support porches is evidence to her that it is a situation of sweating the land. Ms. Cromer added that the subject property is not unique in that several non-conforming four-plexes exist in the Liberty Wells, East Liberty and Emerson areas. Allowing the rezone for the subject development would further set a precedent by allowing others to request the same.

Ms. Coffey explained that the Planning Division has an active petition relating to planned development that includes addressing the issue of obtaining more density without rezoning properties. She noted that a similar review took place in 2005 to reduce square footage requirements for planned developments in the RMF-45 or RMF-75 Zone. Mr. Ikefuna said that Staff will present the status of this review to the Planning Commission at the next meeting scheduled for February 22, 2006.

Mr. Klingenstein said that they recognize the Planning Commission may have asked for information that may have been outside their purview, but the Applicants were willing to accommodate such requests because it is clear to them that the situation is a legislative act. The Planning Commission is making a

recommendation to the City Council rather than an administrative decision based on a set of rules and standards. The Applicants are also willing to enter into a development agreement in order to address the Planning Commissioners' concerns regarding density control for any other future development on the property.

Addressing concerns regarding the front porches, Mr. Strasters explained that one of the porches is larger than the others in that it measures 10 to 12 feet wide and 4 feet deep. The others are 4 feet by 4 feet. Along with the smaller porches, they added features that would bring the existing influence of the neighborhood into the building and onto the property. Mr. Strasters said that they would further review modifications that would allow them to provide significant porches.

The meeting was closed to public comment and the Commissioners discussed the proposal.

The consensus of the Commission was that the Applicants have been sensitive to the economic growth and the characteristics of the neighborhood, and the proposed development would be compatible. However, the Commission was divided in favoring the proposal because it will set a precedent and delay the more important issue of addressing infill housing.

Commissioner McDonough addressed the concern that in the future this same scenario might be presented as a Planned Unit Development and possibly be approved. (This would occur only if the Planned Unit Development process was amended.) She raised concern in relation to the manner in which the project is being approved. Given future development, her concern was that approval of this petition could set an unwanted precedent for spot rezoning, rather than using the more effective tool of the Planned Development Process for unique sites within larger overall zones.

Commissioner De Lay noted that although the approval could occur, the deed restriction placed on the property, limits and restricts the property uses.

Commissioner Seelig added that she finds the proposal conflicts with the Central Community Master Plan that has recently been adopted and the expectations of the community to follow the plan.

Motion for Petition 400-05-24

Based on the Findings of Fact outlined in the Staff Report and the review and discussion set forth, Commissioner McDonough moved to forward a recommendation to the City Council to deny the request to approve the proposed zoning map amendment and the amendment to the Central Community Master Plan to identify the property as RMF-35 Moderate Density Residential zoning and Low Medium Density Residential land use. The Planning Commission finds that the proposal would not meet Standard A of Section 21A.50.050 of the Zoning Ordinance in that the amendment is not consistent with the purposes, goals, objectives and policies of adopted general plans of Salt Lake City including master plans and zoning maps. Commissioner Scott seconded the motion. Commissioners McDonough, Scott, Seelig and Diamond voted aye. Commissioners De Lay, Forbis and Chambless voted no. The motion passed with a four-three vote.

The Applicants may proceed to the City Council with a negative recommendation.

It is noted that Commissioner De Lay moved for the Planning Commission to forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Forbis, but it was defeated with a three-four vote. (This motion was made prior to the break. The motion to forward an unfavorable recommendation to the City Council was made after the break. Commissioner Diamond was excused at 7:30 p.m.)

(The Planning Commission took a break from 7:19 p.m. to 7:27 p.m.)

- d) **Petition 400-02-22 - Restaurant Definition, Parking Ratios, Shared Parking, Off-site and Alternative Parking Amendments - Proposal to amend the text of the Salt Lake City Zoning**

Ordinance relating to small commercial areas zoned CN (Neighborhood Commercial), CB (Community Business) and CS (Community Shopping). Specifically, the proposal is to amend the definition of “restaurant” (large or small), and amend the parking requirements for small restaurants, retail goods establishments, and retail service establishments, such that the requirement is the same for these three uses. The purpose of this parking requirement amendment is to facilitate the interchangeability of these three types of uses. Additionally, the proposal includes a re-evaluation and expansion of shared, off-site, and alternative parking solutions. (Staff – Lex Traughber 535-6184 or lex.traughber@slcgov.com)

Mr. Traughber explained that the petition was initiated several years ago by City Council Members Jill Remington-Love and Nancy Saxton. It consists of two legislative actions that were combined into one petition. Council Member Saxton’s legislative action was to review parking requirements in the CB and CS zones, and how to better implement alternative and shared off-site parking in commercial centers. Council Member Remington-Love’s legislative action was to study parking impacts occurring in residential neighborhoods near small commercial nodes; such as the areas of 9th & 9th and 15th & 15th. Noting the original Staff Report and minutes, Mr. Traughber has formulated a response to each of the issues the Planning Commission put forth when the petition was originally presented to them on March 12, 2003. In summary: 1) The definition of a restaurant was reviewed because it was difficult to utilize and enforce, so Staff is proposing a new definition based on seating which would be easier to quantify and enforce. 2) Parking requirements for retail goods establishments, retail service establishments and small restaurants are proposed to be standardized in order to promote flexibility and interchangeability between the three uses. Staff found that these uses are interchangeable. 3) Expanded off-site and shared parking in residential and commercial zones. Staff is proposing allowing nonresidential occupied property within a residential zone to be used for off-site parking. For example, small commercial nodes would be allowed to use a church parking lot zoned residential at other times of the week. This proposal would also provide the option for off-site parking in all commercial zones. 4) Expand the alternative parking options. Currently, the Zoning Ordinance allows only four specific uses to be eligible for alternative parking. Staff is proposing that any entity meeting criteria already established in the Ordinance would be able to go through the alternative parking process. Mr. Traughber added that departmental comments and Staff analyses are included in the original Staff Report and are still valid. The Planning Division also held an open house on January 9, 2006 and input received at that time is included in the analysis of the updated Staff Report. Based on the comments, analysis outlined in the updated Staff Report and the Findings of Fact in the original Staff Report, Planning Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council to adopt the text amendment to the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance.

The Planning Commission voiced concerns about the length of time the petition has been in the process and acknowledged that the Planning Division is understaffed. However, Chairperson Noda asked that Staff update the Commission from time to time when review of petitions takes this long.

There was no Community Council representation present to speak to the issue.

Wayne Belka asked the Planning Commission to consider approving the amendments because he is an owner of a small piece of commercial property that has been difficult to develop. For the past six years, he has tried to develop the property only to be stopped by obstructions, one is required parking. The proposed amendments would provide him several options for developing the property and perhaps attract an immediate tenant. Furthermore, tenants do not stay forever and having the flexibility of interchanging uses would help development of smaller commercial properties and the economy of the City.

The meeting was closed to public comment and there was no further discussion.

Motion for Petition 400-02-22

Based on the Findings of Fact as outlined in the Staff Report and the discussion set forth, Commissioner Seelig moved for the Planning Commission to forward a favorable

recommendation to the City Council to adopt the amendments. Commissioner Forbis seconded the motion, all voted aye; the motion passed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

(This item was heard at 7:47 p.m.)

300 West Improvements Addressing Commissioner De Lay's concerns at the January 25 meeting regarding implementation of beautification features along 300 West, Mr. Ikefuna explained that Staff and the Planning Commission discussed the issue in April 2005, but no petition was initiated. However, the Walkable Communities initiative is in progress and beautification features has been taken into consideration when approving development proposals along 300 West.

Ms. Coffey added that the Mayor's Office in collaboration with citizens and other City Divisions developed the "Livable Communities" brochure that addresses providing pedestrian friendly streets which would also address improvements along 300 West. Planning Staff will include copies of the "Livable Communities" brochure in Planning Commission packets for February 22, 2006.

Mr. Ikefuna invited the Commissioners to ask the Transportation Division representative about their plans for improvements along 300 West when they come to the Commission to discuss handicapped parking stalls in the downtown area.

Planning Commission Retreat No date has been set as of yet for the retreat because Mr. Ikefuna has been unable to get in touch with Professor Lyle Sumek. Mr. Ikefuna invited the Commissioners to submit prospective facilitators for a retreat.

Salt Lake City Redevelopment Agency Responding to Commissioner Seelig's concern about communication with RDA, Mr. Ikefuna said that Mr. David Oka, Director, will be attending the meeting scheduled for February 22.

Planning Commission Agendas Commissioner Seelig voiced her appreciation for the thorough contact information for each petition on the agendas.

Transit Oriented District Responding to Commissioner Scott's question regarding the TOD proposal, Mr. Ikefuna explained that it will go back to the City Council next month. Planning Staff will then conclude their recommendation and provide feedback to the Planning Commission.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:54 p.m.

Deborah Martin, Senior Planning Secretary