

**SALT LAKE CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
In Room 326 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, January 25, 2006**

Present from the Planning Commission were, Chairperson Laurie Noda and Vice Chairperson Peggy McDonough, and Commissioners Tim Chambless, Babs De Lay, John Diamond, Robert Forbis, Craig Galli, Prescott Muir, Kathy Scott and Jennifer Seelig.

Present from the Staff were Alexander Ikefuna, Planning Director; Doug Wheelwright, Deputy Planning Director; Marilyn Lewis, Principal Planner; Wayne Mills, Senior Planner; and Cindy Rockwood, Acting Planning Commission Secretary.

A roll is kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. Chairperson Noda called the meeting to order at 5:47 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, Kathy Scott, and Jennifer Seelig. Planning Division Staff present were Doug Wheelwright and Marilyn Lewis.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FOR WEDNESDAY, January 11, 2006.

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

Chairperson Noda asked for a motion to approve the minutes of January 11, 2006.

Commissioner Scott requested a correction to page ten of the minutes in the last paragraph. The change is noted below:

Commissioner Seelig and Chairperson Noda voiced their displeasure with the lack of communication with the Salt Lake City Redevelopment Agency. They asked Staff to do something to address the issue of lack of coordination with the agency.

Commissioner De Lay requested changes to page one through two, with reference to the Moss Courthouse project. She requested that the discussion with regards to “taking” the property be addressed within the minutes. Changes are as follows:

Mr. Wentworth explained that they are anticipating completion of the design process in about 1 ½ years. The site is a ½-block site to the west of the existing Frank E. Moss Courthouse bounded by Main Street and West Temple, and 400 South and Market Street. The existing Oddfellow Building on the site would be moved to the north side of Market Street and the existing Shubrick Building will be demolished.

Commissioner De Lay questioned the demolition of the Shubrick Building.

Mr. Camp stated that legislation had been passed for GSA to acquire the building and demolish it. The formal taking of the building was given to GSA although they disagreed with the suggestion. A driving force of the decision was politics.

Commissioner Muir noted a change on page four, in regards to the third paragraph. It should state the following:

*Commissioner Muir asked if the purchase would render the rear yard of the house to the south non-conforming because of the compatibility and the 40 percent **coverage** requirement.*

With the following changes, a motion was made by Commissioner De Lay to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner McDonough. Commissioner Chambless, Commissioner De Lay, Commissioner Diamond, Commissioner Galli, Commissioner Muir, and Commissioner Scott voted “Aye”. Commissioner Forbis abstained from voting. The motion passed.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

(This item was heard at 5:50 p.m.)

Nothing to report as no meetings have been held.

REPORT OF THE PLANNING DIRECTOR

(This item was heard at 5:51 p.m.)

- a) Initiate a petition for a text amendment to the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance allowing ambulance services and government facilities in the manufacturing districts.

Mr. Ikefuna requested the Planning Commission correct an oversight made during the 1995 rewrite of the Zoning Ordinance to consider the inclusion of an allowance for government facilities and ambulance services in the manufacturing districts.

The Planning Commission agreed unanimously. Therefore, a petition was initiated at 5:51 p.m.

- b) University of Utah Research Park Transportation Issues Working Group – Work program discussion and status update of the Transportation Issues Working Group established by the Planning Commission to address community council concerns regarding traffic and land use impacts related to the Research Park. The Planning Commission will discuss lifting a Planning Commission initiated hold on conditional use applications for excess building height in the Research Park.

Mr. Ikefuna addressed the Planning Commission in reference to the gag order placed on conditional use applications for the Research Park area and noted progress on the Commission’s request. The purpose of the Research Park Work Group was to create awareness of the growing situation of traffic in the University area. With awareness created, a progress report has been distributed to the Commissioners regarding the agencies and neighbors’ proposed suggestions. Considering the progress, Mr. Ikefuna requested a lift on the current hold.

Commissioner Muir noted that the hold on petitions has served the purpose of creating awareness and should be lifted. Discussion regarding the status of the Research Park Work Group and its agenda continued between Commissioners. It was noted that there are no petitions presently waiting to be pursued in the area of the Research Park.

Commissioner Diamond opposed the lift on the hold for applications because of the awareness and progress the Research Park Work Group is completing. Since there are no present applicants, it would seem reasonable to continue working as a group to find solutions to the existing concerns of the area. Commissioner Diamond also noted that if petitions arise within the area, they should be brought to Planning Commission for further discussion while the Work Group is completing their study.

Eliot Brinton, Sunnyside East Community Council Chair, addressed the Commissioners and requested more time to create a long-term plan to appease the numerous agencies associated with the growth in the surrounding area. Mr. Brinton noted that progress has been made with the affected agencies and that two meetings will be held to discuss the short- and long-term solutions.

Discussion continued regarding the progression of the Work Group and a conclusion was reached to defer the request for a lift on the hold of conditional use applications until March 22, 2006. Work Group meetings will be held on February 13 and March 20 to prepare a recommendation for the Planning Commission meeting on March 22.

- b) Petition 400-05-38 by the Salt Lake City Administration requesting approval of a new ordinance to require certain Salt Lake City funded projects to be certified using the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) guidelines (approved December 14, 2005) –Clarification to establish that exceptions from applicability of new LEED certification requirements and determination of substantial compliance be decided by a High Performance Building Board, staffed by the Building Official or designee, and to approve standards for exceptions.**

Mr. Ikefuna requested that the Planning Commission consider a clarification to the proposed LEED Ordinance that was presented to the Planning Commission on December 14, 2005. The clarification is concerning whether a board staffed by the Building Official or designee appointed by the City Council should approve appropriate exceptions to LEED certification and substantial compliance, instead of a procurement officer.

Commissioner De Lay stated concern that the proposed ordinance did not include incentives for LEED certification for the private sector/home owners as previously recommended by the Planning Commission.

Mr. Ikefuna noted the concern and stated that the Community Development Department is considering the incentives that could be provided to the private sector for those who participate in the LEED certification. The proposal has budget implications and requires coordination with appropriate City departments. The Planning Staff, Mayor's Staff, Building Services and Management Services are evaluating the incentive program and how to implement it.

Commissioner De Lay requested that a summary of the amendment and motion made during the December 14, 2005, meeting regarding private/sector incentives for LEED certification be added to the minutes. The summary of the motion and amendment reads as follows:

An amendment to Petition 400-05-38 encouraging private developers, builders and citizens to use and complete LEED certification on new projects was passed. Salt Lake City will encourage green building to private citizens obtaining the LEED Certification with incentives deemed practical by the city; e.g., a faster permitting process. These encouragements will be in place within six months of Salt Lake City accepting LEED Certification and enacting the LEED Certification program for new construction with City money. The amendment was accepted and passed.

Mr. Ikefuna stated that the Commissioners can be assured that the incentive program will be developed and the Commission will be kept informed of the City's progress in formulating the program.

A motion by Commissioner De Lay to accept the clarification regarding Petition 400-05-38 to establish that exceptions from applicability of new LEED certification requirements and determination of substantial compliance be decided by a High Performance Building Board, staffed by the Building Official or designee, and to approve standards for exceptions was made. Commissioner Muir seconded the motion. Commissioner Chambless, Commissioner De Lay, Commissioner Diamond, Commissioner Galli, Commissioner McDonough, Commissioner Muir, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Seelig, and Commissioner Forbis voted, "Aye". Chairperson Noda did not vote. The motion passed.

Reaffirmation was made by Commissioner De Lay to communicate to the City Council that the Planning Commission is in favor of the Staff and the City creating incentives to private developers/homeowners who build/modify properties using LEED certification programs within six months of accepting the LEED certification program for City projects, with possible faster permit processes.

Chairperson Noda stated that deference would be given to the Planning Director for the decision to provide a six month implementation period upon acceptance and enactment of the LEED certification program.

Commissioner Muir requested discussion amongst the Commissioners regarding the present legislative bill by Senator Al Mansell. Senate Bill 170 eliminates City Council authority of sitting in judgment on zoning changes unless the zoning change represents twenty-five percent of the acreage of the city. It was noted that for a large city this bill is counterproductive and not developer friendly. The Planning Commission considers land use when evaluating zoning changes, rather than the economic impact, allowing a distinct element to be considered when these proposed changes are requested. Commissioner Muir suggested that a letter be drafted regarding the unanimous opposition of the Salt Lake City Planning Commission to the bill.

Chairperson Noda agreed and stated that a letter should be drafted and reviewed by the City Staff, the City Attorney's office, and signed by the Commissioners.

Mr. Ikefuna noted that a letter will be drafted by Staff and distributed via email to the Commissioners. A final draft will be created once comments have been received. The letter will include the names of each of the Commissioners and will be signed by Chairperson Noda.

Commissioner Seelig requested information from Mr. Ikefuna regarding the concern of a lack of communication with the Redevelopment Agency.

Mr. Ikefuna stated that he had spoken with Dave Oka, Director of the Redevelopment Agency, and that Mr. Oka would be appearing before the Commission in February. He will share the strategic goals of 2006 for the Redevelopment Agency.

Mr. Ikefuna also provided an update on the Planning Commission retreat. Contact has been made with two individuals and the retreat should be scheduled in March or April. An update will be given at the next Planning Commission meeting, as Staff is awaiting further information from the proposed speakers.

Mr. Ikefuna also noted a copy of an article from *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution* by David Pendered. The article, Moratorium on McMansions, is duly noted as another city that has been required to conquer the situation of infill development. An executive order was issued in the City of Atlanta to discontinue the infill development that had been occurring. Mr. Ikefuna complimented the Planning Commission for helping to handle the matter for Salt Lake City.

Commissioner Seelig requested to know if the Planning Division had contacted Community Affairs in regards to the crime within the neighborhood discussed at the prior Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Ikefuna stated that he had addressed the topic with a member of the Mayor's Office of Community Affairs.

Commissioner De Lay requested information regarding a petition initiated months ago regarding 300 West and the study of a walkable community.

Mr. Wheelwright responded that he believed that the topic had been raised in conjunction with the Lowe's street closure petition. Further research on the status of the 300 West petition would be conducted.

PUBLIC NOTICE AGENDA – Salt Lake City Property Conveyance Matters
(*This item was heard at 6:24 p.m.*)

None to report.

PUBLIC HEARINGS
(*This item was heard at 6:24 p.m.*)

Petition 410-772 - H.M. Investments Retail Center – Conditional Use Planned Development Request. The H.M. Investments has submitted an application for a retail development center located at 1846 South 300 West Street, just south of Costco in the CG (General Commercial) Zoning District. Four parcels will be combined by deed to accommodate the new retail

center. The existing structures would be demolished for the development of the new center. The proposed center would be comprised of six buildings containing retail shops and food services. Two of the buildings will have drive-thru lanes. Although, the proposed uses are allowed within the CG (General Commercial) Zoning District, development of multiple buildings on a single site requires Conditional Use Planned Development approval from the Planning Commission.

At 6:24 p.m., Chairperson Noda introduced Petition #410-772 and Marilyn Lewis.

Commissioner De Lay noted that during the introduction of a petition the Commissioners should be apprised if the petition went to subcommittee.

Ms. Lewis presented a short description of the project. She stated that the applicant is proposing to combine four un-platted lots and construct six new buildings, requiring Planned Development Approval. The subject site will contain retail shops, food services, and restaurants; all permitted uses in the CG (General Commercial) Zoning District.

A minimum of fifty percent glass façade will be used on the entire building site, to maintain a uniform feeling on the interior and exterior perimeter of the proposed development. Buildings A, B, and F have clients and will remain as proposed on the map. Because the builder has not formalized clients for buildings C, D, and E, Staff is requesting the Planning Commission approve the proposed plan and allow the Planning Director to have approval of the final adjustments made to any building configurations. Any substantial changes will need to return to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Lewis stated that based on the findings of fact, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve this Planned Development request with the conditions listed in the Staff Report.

Chairperson Noda opened and closed the Public Hearing as no members of the public wished to speak. The Planning Commission went into Executive Session.

Commissioner Diamond appreciated and noted that the subcommittee minutes were included in the Staff Report. He asked if Staff had made any changes to the landscaping on the west side of the proposed subject site, as suggested in subcommittee. The subcommittee had suggested landscaping along the backside of building C and on the property line, but concluded that it might alter the building size and parking lot area.

Chairperson Noda stated concern regarding the traffic on 1830 South and the impact of the Costco parking lot to the subject property. 1830 South is a congested area of traffic and has the potential for numerous accidents. Considering the subject property has three ingress/egress options on 1830 South, the traffic could become considerably worse. Commissioner De Lay noted that during subcommittee a recommendation had been made to remove as much traffic as possible from 300 West, leaving 1830 South as the only option. Commissioner De Lay also noted that 300 West is an inappropriate location for many ingress/egress movements, due to the already congested area.

Ms. Lewis noted that Transportation had deemed that the proposed ingress/egress areas would be the most controlled way to maintain a continuous flow of traffic. Mr. Russ Naylor, Project Architect, noted that the ingress/egress was further west than the existing Costco ingress/egress.

Mr. Naylor responded to the question from Commissioner Diamond regarding the landscaping along the western property line by stating that the area west of building C is anticipated to be employee parking. Mr. Naylor assured the Commission that landscaping would surround the area of the building to create a pleasing addition to the area.

Mr. Naylor stated that a possible client for building C has been determined and may only require a little over 6,000 square feet of the original property proposed. The north positioning of the building would remain, allowing a connecting lane between the parking lot on the west side of building C and the parking lot in the center of the retail shops be constructed. It is ninety percent assured that Tepanyaki (client needing only 6,000 square feet) will be the buyer.

Commissioner Diamond questioned if a connection through the west parking lot of building C would eliminate any curb cuts along 1830 South. Mr. Naylor stated that the number of curb cuts would remain even if the connection was made.

Mr. Kevin Young, SLC Transportation, noted one of the reasons why traffic is congested is due to the on-street parking on 1830 South. The option of eliminating the on-street parking is being researched. Considering the new development of Sam's Club, a new signal will be created at Hartwell and 300 West to provide another option for drivers to make a left turn. Transportation is continuing to research options to sustain flowing traffic in the area, including a center turn lane on 1830 South, but time and development will lead to further information and possible solutions.

Commissioner Diamond noted that given that information, it should be considered as a suggestion from the Planning Commission that an access for vehicles/pedestrians be created on the south end of building C (given the proposed 6,000 square foot tenant) allowing traffic to flow in front of buildings D, E, and F. This would also create a plaza space for pedestrians.

Commissioner Scott made reference to the north elevation plan found in the Staff Report and the overall look of the development and whether the look was to be a façade or have working doors.

Mr. Naylor stated that glass and entries will be located on the north side of the building, but type and location will be dependent upon the tenants. The intent is also the same for the west side of building C. Mr. Naylor noted that fenestration and glass will be placed around the subject site to create an attractive development.

Based on the Findings of fact, Commissioner De Lay made a motion to approve the Planned Development with the following conditions:

- 1. The applicant must install continuous sidewalks on 1830 South Street and 300 West Street. The applicant must coordinate with City Engineering and Transportation to set up a pre-inventory meeting of all existing public way (curb, gutter and sidewalk) conditions. Street lighting upgrades will be required. Verification of right of way**

locations may require additional dedications. A public-way permit will be needed to work within the City right of way.

2. There will be no on-street staging for deliveries, all services are to be provided on site. The site plan as shown is restricted to single unit box truck deliveries with front of store access.
3. Applicant must combine all of the lots by deed, as proposed, prior to the permit process. Right of way dedication is anticipated at the northeast corner for traffic control device, which may also be performed by deed. This dedication must be done to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Transportation Divisions' prior to the issuance of Certificate of Occupancy for any of the buildings on the site.
4. The Planning Director has final approval of the modifications to the site plan.
5. The applicant must meet all of the required parking for the uses on the final site plan.

Commissioner De Lay also noted that the minutes from the discussion conducted by the Planning Commission should be applicable to the consideration of any modifications to the final site plan. The following condition is a result of the discussion:

6. Planning Commission further requires that all facades of all buildings be fifty percent glass and contain all other aesthetic treatments. If building C is reduced in square footage it must be from the southern face. The developer will provide vehicular/pedestrian access from the west employee parking lot to the main parking lot and add additional landscaping. Developer will also attempt to provide landscaping along the western façade of building C.

The motion was seconded by Commissioner Scott. Commissioner Chambless, Commissioner De Lay, Commissioner Diamond, Commissioner Galli, Commissioner McDonough, Commissioner Muir, Commissioner Scott, Commissioner Seelig, and Commissioner Forbis voted "Aye". Chairperson Noda did not vote. The motion passed.

Petition 400-05-17 – A request by the Planning Commission to analyze the feasibility of allowing additional conditional uses to be approved by an Administrative Hearing Officer. The Planning Division has analyzed the request and proposes to amend Section 21A.54 of the Zoning Ordinance to permit Public/Private Utility Buildings and Structures and non-residential conditional uses to be approved by an Administrative Hearing Officer if the requested use complies with zoning ordinance regulations and is unopposed.

At 6:55 p.m., Chairperson Noda introduced Petition 400-05-17 and Wayne Mills.

Mr. Mills stated that presently there are two types of development requests that may be approved through the Administrative Public Hearing Process. They are:

- Applications for low power wireless telecommunication facilities that are listed as conditional uses; and
- Alterations or modifications to a conditional use that increase the floor area by 1,000 square feet or more and/or increase the parking requirement.

The review processes are the same for these types of conditional uses as for conditional uses reviewed by the Planning Commission. All City departments and affected community councils review the applications. Notification of the Administrative Hearings is the same as the Planning Commission Public Hearings. An Administrative Request can be approved once the hearing has been held and all conditions met. If the Administrative Request is contested, the Request is forward to the Planning Commission for review.

Staff has analyzed the Zoning Ordinances and proposes to allow the Administrative Hearing Officer to review all conditional uses except those that:

- Are listed as a “residential” land use in the Table of Permitted and Conditional Uses for each zoning district;
- Are located within a Residential zoning district;
- Abut a Residential zoning district or residential use; or
- Require Planned Development approval.

The Planning Staff also recommends that Chapter 21A.54 of the Zoning Ordinance be amended to permit Administrative Hearing review of Public/Private Utility Buildings and Structures that are proposed in both residential and non-residential zoning districts.

Mr. Mills stated that this petition was initiated by the Planning Commission to further allow the Commission more time to allocate for long-range planning.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed zoning text amendments pertaining to Chapter 21A.54 of the Zoning Ordinance found in the Staff Report.

Chairperson Noda opened and closed the Public Hearing as no public was in attendance. The Planning Commission went into Executive Session.

Commissioner McDonough requested clarification regarding the Administrative Hearing process and the housing infill ordinance. Mr. Mills clarified by stating that the proposed amendment is for conditional uses only and is not associated with the compatible infill ordinance.

Commissioner Scott noted that some community councils are less aware than others and some applications may be approved without sufficient public input. Commissioner Muir noted that there should be additional sensitivity to the area of West Salt Lake. It was also noted that the conditional uses brought before the Commission last year were not very time consuming or contentious.

Mr. Mills noted the concern, but stated that an appeal can be made by any member of the public if they are opposed to the decision made in the Hearing within fourteen days of the decision. With reference to the time spent on these issues, Mr. Mills noted that it is important to remember the time spent in preparing for the meeting.

Commissioner Galli noted that numerous governments throughout the United States have transferred responsibilities to the Planning Staff and agrees with the proposed petition.

Chairperson Noda agreed with Commissioner Galli and considered the possibility of freeing up more time for the Planning Commission as a positive reform. Although, when community councils are not active, there should be concern and sensitivity by Staff.

Commissioner Scott referenced a citizen comment found in the Staff Report from Ms. Judi Short supporting the idea of freeing up time of the Commission. Commissioner Seelig also noted that many citizens are not made aware of the implications of petitions when they state their support or opposition. Commissioner Scott stated concern regarding the possibility of an issue passing through the process without being brought to an appropriate measure of attention.

Mr. Mills responded that he had written Ms. Short back with the proposed changes. As she has not contacted him, nor did she show up at the open house, Mr. Mills believes she is satisfied with the proposed changes.

Mr. Mills stated that the Planning Commission will be informed on the issues because of the information distributed to them via email and the City's list serve. Agendas for each meeting, including Administrative Hearings, are distributed through the list serve and should be considered carefully. If the Planning Commissioners wanted more information on the proposed project or to encourage the petition to go to the Planning Commission, Staff should be contacted and a discussion conducted.

Commissioner Diamond asked if these changes would alter any conditional uses on signage. Mr. Mills responded that presently there are no conditional uses on signage within the City.

Commissioner Muir made a motion in the case of Petition #400-05-17 in light of the comments, analysis, and findings of Staff in the Staff Report, that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to adopt the following proposed zoning text amendments pertaining to Chapter 21A.54 of the Zoning Ordinance.

1. That ***Section 21A.54.020: Authority***, be amended to permit the Planning Director or designee to approve Administrative Conditional Uses;
2. That ***Section 21A.54.030C: Administrative Consideration of Conditional Uses***, be amended to eliminate the phrase, "have been determined by the City to be low impact" and replace it with, "may be considered to be low impact due to their particular location."
3. That ***Section 21A.54.030C3***, be added to permit the Planning Director or designee to approve (through an Administrative Hearing) all conditional uses except those that:

- a. Are listed as a “residential” land use in the Table of Permitted and Conditional Uses for each zoning district;
 - b. Are located within a Residential zoning district;
 - c. Abut a residential zoning district or residential use; or
 - d. Require Planned Development approval.
4. That Section 21A.54.030C3, be added to permit the Planning Director or designee to approve (through an Administrative Hearing) Public/Private Utility Buildings and Structures in Residential and Non-Residential zoning districts.
 5. That Section 21A.54.060D: Staff Report-Site Plan Review Report, be amended to state that staff report and site plan review report be forwarded to the Planning Director or designee for Administrative Conditional Uses.
 6. That Section 21A.54.060E: Public Hearing, be amended to state that the Planning Director or designee shall hold a public hearing in the case of Administrative Conditional Uses and shall conduct the public hearings in conformance to the Zoning Ordinance.
 7. That Section 21A.54.060G: Planning Commission Action, be amended to state that, in the case of Administrative Conditional Uses, the Planning Director or designee shall approve, approve with conditions, or deny the Administrative Conditional Use.
 8. That Section 21A.54.090: Conditions on Conditional Uses, be amended to state that the Planning Director or designee may impose conditions on Administrative Conditional Uses.
 9. That Section 21A.54.110: Effect of Approval of Conditional Use, be amended to include the Planning Director or designee in the case of Administrative Conditional Uses.
 10. That Section 21A.54.120: Limitations on Conditional Use Approval, be amended to include the Planning Director or designee in the case of Administrative Conditional Uses.
 11. That Section 21A.54.155B2: Administrative Hearing, be amended to state that the Planning Director or designee may approve an Administrative Conditional Use only if it complies with all standards in the Zoning Ordinance that regulate the particular use.
 12. That Section 21A.54.155: Appeals of Administrative Conditional Uses, be amended to state that an appeal of an Administrative Conditional Use must be based on procedural error, compliance with the standards that regulate conditional uses, or any specific standards listed in the Zoning Ordinance that regulate the requested use.

Commissioner Chambless seconded the motion. Commissioner Chambless, Commissioner De Lay, Commissioner Diamond, Commissioner Galli, Commissioner McDonough,

Commissioner Muir, Commissioner Seelig, and Commissioner Forbis voted “Aye”. Commissioner Scott voted “Nay”. Chairperson Noda did not vote. The motion passed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

(This item was heard at 7:20 p.m.)

Commissioner Scott noted a subject of concern to the Commissioners regarding the Transit Oriented District Petition. Portions of the Transit Oriented District Petition has been approved by the City Council with a large change on the proposed height restrictions. A discussion occurred when the petition was presented to the Planning Commission regarding the proposed height restriction. The Planning Commission recommended the proposed height to be at 50 feet; although, the City Council has now approved a height restriction of 75 feet, with the option of going to 120 feet on the north side of the street.

Commissioner Scott recommended that an effort be made to send a message to the City Council regarding the proposed height change and the recommended height from the Planning Commission. She requested a letter be sent.

Commissioner Galli noted that the Planning Commission may send a letter, but it should be drafted by the Chair of the Planning Commission in order to represent the appropriate jurisdiction. He noted that if someone wants to be heard in regards to a concern on an issue, the best effort is to attend the Hearing and discuss the matter with the representatives. He noted that many letters are received by the Planning Commission, but hearing the concerns directly from the individual are more helpful. He requested that more participation from the Planning Commission be directed towards large item issues of concern to the City Council.

Chairperson Noda agreed and concluded that she would attend the next City Council meeting with Commissioner Scott to discuss the concerns. Chairperson Noda also suggested that perhaps having a member of the Planning Commission attend a City Council meeting each month could help resolve some of the concerns as well as enhance the position of the Planning Commission. .

Mr. Wheelwright stated that although the month of January has not had many items on the agenda, the February meetings will have more. He informed the commissioners to be prepared for longer meetings in February.

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 7:33 p.m. by Chairperson Noda.

Cindy Rockwood, Acting Planning Commission Secretary