

**SALT LAKE CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
In Room 326 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, April 25, 2007**

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were Chairperson Peggy McDonough; Commissioners Tim Chambless, Robert Forbis, Susie McHugh, Prescott Muir, Kathy Scott and Matthew Wirthlin. Commissioner Frank Algarin was present for the field trip but was excused from the meeting.

Present from the Planning Division were George Shaw, Planning Director, Doug Wheelwright, Deputy Planning Director, Nick Britton, Principal Planner, Ray McCandless, Senior Planner, and Tami Hansen, Planning Commission Secretary.

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. Chairperson McDonough called the meeting to order at 5:48 p.m. 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: Frank Algarin, Prescott Muir, and Kathy Scott. Salt Lake City Staff present were: George Shaw, Doug Wheelwright, and Nick Britton.

DINNER

Lynn Pace, City Attorney, was present during dinner to discuss the Commissioners inquiries as to possible reopening of Petition 410-06-28 a public hearing item heard on April 11, 2007 by the Planning Commission.

Chairperson McDonough inquired if it was possible to reopen the case in order to recommend that a condition be added to the original motion.

Mr. Pace stated that it was possible, but could only be reopened by a Commissioner who voted on the prevailing side of the motion.

Doug Wheelwright, Deputy Planning Director noted that the item would have to be postponed to a later meeting for the condition to be added as part of a public hearing before there was a reconsideration of the motion. Mr. Wheelwright noted that the petition would have to be advertised on a future agenda for public awareness.

Mr. Pace stated that it should be heard at a public hearing, however, it was not necessary that the Commission allow public testimony again, just that it be open for the public to attend and for the applicant to answer any further questions.

DISCUSSION OF THE MINUTES

Chairperson McDonough noted that she wished to reconsider some of the conditions of the motion for Petition 410-06-28, a request for a rooming house by Robert Bunnell at 149 South 900 East.

Chairperson McDonough stated that condition four of the motion should be reconsidered to state that the word *occupancy* be substituted for the word *people*, or the condition be crafted to denote occupancy, ensuring that the occupancy of the rooming house be limited to seven individuals.

Chairperson McDonough also noted that condition seven of the motion should be reconsidered to state that the design and materials of the retaining wall were to be approved by the Planning Director prior to construction.

Chairperson McDonough noted she wished the Commission would also consider an additional condition; that the owner's compliance with all City code regulations and requirements be completed within six months of the approval of the conditional use and if all regulations were not met within that time frame, then the conditional use would expire. Chairperson McDonough stated that her reasoning for the consideration of the additional condition was due to public testimony indicating that the applicant had already delayed in making necessary improvements and had done a lot of work without permits.

Chairperson McDonough made a motion to reconsider Petition 410-06-28, a request by Robert Bunnell for a rooming house at 149 South 900 East. Commissioner Forbis seconded the motion. All voted, "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

Chairperson McDonough inquired of Staff if the petition needed to be placed on a future agenda in order to preserve the public notification process.

Doug Wheelwright stated that the clarification of the existing conditions was within the scope of the April 11, 2007 minutes and no public notice was required for these items, however, Mr. Wheelwright noted that the addition of a new condition should be treated as a new matter and therefore he strongly recommended that the Commission allow for the petition to be advertised as a public hearing for the conditions of approval.

Chairperson McDonough noted that the Commission would like to hear the item again, as suggested by the previous discussion and motion.

Mr. Wheelwright said that Staff would reschedule the item as early as possibly allowed by the noticing process. Mr. Wheelwright requested clarification from Chairperson McDonough on whether or not the Commission would again allow public comment on petition 410-06-28.

Chairperson McDonough stated that she did not intend to allow additional public comment for this petition.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES from Wednesday, April 11, 2007.

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

Commissioner Forbis made a motion to approve the minutes with changes. Commissioner Scott seconded the motion. Vice Chair Wirthlin abstained. All others voted "Aye", the motion passed.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND THE VICE-CHAIR

(This item was heard at 5:58 p.m.)

Chairperson McDonough noted that there would be a working session on May 23, 2007.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

(This item was heard at 5:58 p.m.)

George Shaw, Planning Director, noted that Staff is still seeking input on the Planning Commission rules and procedures document given to the Commission at the April 11, 2007 meeting. Planning Staff would still be meeting with the Chair and Vice Chair within the next few weeks.

Mr. Shaw noted that Planning Staff was in the process of creating a subcommittee to explore proposed changes to the Granite Block (Sugarhouse) Development. Mr. Shaw stated that Planning Staff would like to have two Planning Commissioners serving on that subcommittee. Mr. Shaw stated that there were several groups which would be represented on this committee including the property owners, merchants, and Community Councils.

Commissioner Forbis inquired when the Granite Block subcommittee meetings would occur.

Mr. Shaw noted that the dates and times had not yet been set, but preferably would occur during the day.

Commissioner Forbis noted that if the meetings were not on Wednesdays, he could attend.

Commissioners Forbis and Chambless expressed their interest in the subcommittee as well as Vice Chair Wirthlin.

Commissioner Chambless and Vice Chair Wirthlin were designated as subcommittee members, with Commissioner Forbis as an alternate due to possible conflicts with his teaching schedule.

Mr. Shaw invited Casey Stewart, the Planning Division's new Principal Planner forward to introduce himself to the Commission. Mr. Shaw noted that the Planning Division is now fully staffed with the addition of Mr. Stewart.

PRESENTATION

(This item was heard at 6:01 p.m.)

A presentation was given by the University of Utah Planning students, regarding the land use component of the Foothill Drive Transportation Study.

Chairperson McDonough invited the University of Utah students to the table.

Andrew King, Camille Petersen, Derek Cox and Mike Minukean were present from the Architecture and Planning Department at University of Utah to present on the Preliminary Land Use study of the Foothill Drive Corridor, which was created in response to complaints of current residents regarding traffic throughout local neighborhoods and congestion on Foothill Drive.

The students presented data which they had collected and changes which they recommended for the Foothill Drive Corridor.

Andrew King noted that the area was projected to see growth in population, employment and housing, however, there was little if any developable land in the area, which presented some unique challenges.

The students reviewed some of the data collected for the study, noting that as of 2005, there were approximately 36,800 daily car trips on Foothill Drive, which was a ten percent decline from data collected in 1994, however, it was noted that traffic in the Foothill Drive area was projected to increase by thirty-six (36) percent between 2005 and 2030.

The most popular traffic destinations and points of origin along the Foothill Drive Corridor were highlighted, particularly Holladay, Draper, Sandy and the University of Utah.

The students also reviewed the Salt Lake City bike path map indicating that there were no existing bike paths along Foothill Drive; however, there was the Bonneville Shoreline Trail which ran close by.

The students reviewed the socioeconomic factors in the area. A study was taken from four census tracts which were directly adjacent to Foothill Drive. The population of the Foothill Drive area was almost 16,000 of which forty percent of the population was between twenty-five and fifty-four. The educational attainment was high for the area, with ninety-six percent of those twenty-five or older with a high school diploma and fifty-five percent of those twenty-five or older with a bachelor's degree or higher. The median household income for the area is \$62,000 per year. The median home price for a single family dwelling is \$250, 000.

The students also reviewed areas of interest along the Foothill Drive Corridor as well as area hazards, noting that the area was highly vulnerable to wildfires.

The students noted their interest in preserving the view corridor along Foothill Drive by keeping building heights low.

Current zoning was reviewed, revealing that most of the area was single family residential, but the remainder of the area included: multiple family dwellings, commercial, and retail uses.

The students noted that the Foothill Drive Corridor catered to motorists, with the automobile as the primary mode of transport and that Foothill Drive in particular was not very pedestrian friendly.

The students noted that nearly sixty percent of the businesses in the area were locally owned and operated; they stated that the Wasatch Front Regional Council had three areas of focus for this study; Foothill Village, Foothill Place Apartments, and the adjacent K-mart shopping plaza.

The students noted that they found two additional areas they felt could be redeveloped to contribute to the overall environment of Foothill Drive; Lamplighter Square (about 1700 South on Foothill Drive) as well as an area of duplex units in the area around Sunnyside Avenue and Foothill Drive. They noted that this was a possible light-rail or Bus-Rail Transit area for the future.

Regarding the duplex units centered on Sunnyside Avenue, the students would like to see a re-zone for the area into RMF-30, creating the possibility for apartment buildings, and revitalizing the area with more affordable housing for the high student population. This would also preserve open space in the Foothills by condensing living spaces.

The students noted that they would propose that the Foothill Village area be rezoned to RMF-35, because there is potential across the street from Foothill Village for additional housing, retail and commercial uses. It was also suggested that Foothill Village was also an ideal area for alternative modes of transportation.

Lamplighter Square was reviewed as an area to consider for increased housing density to accommodate the projected population growth of the area and provide more affordable housing. It was suggested that the strip mall and block be connected back to Foothill Drive as well, noting that the mall would be an excellent point for a transit stop.

The students noted that they felt that the K-mart shopping plaza would be an ideal location for area businesses as well as a potential park and ride station, to provided additional opportunities for decreased traffic congestion throughout the valley.

Commissioner Chambless inquired when the Salt Lake valley might see a type of TRAX equivalent on Foothill, possibly connecting the University of Utah with a park and ride station at the K-mart Plaza.

The students noted that such a prediction was not possible at this time, but looking at the Transportation Master Plan completed by the Wasatch Front Regional Council, the area had been identified as a transportation corridor, noting that the first BRT was projected to be installed on 3500 South in the Fall of 2007 and would be an interesting proving ground.

Vice Chair Wirthlin inquired if there was a reason behind the traffic decrease noted between 1994 and 2005.

Andrew King stated that during construction on 1-80 between 1994 and 2001 there was an increase in traffic on Foothill Drive; however, Trax had also been introduced on 400 South, which lead to a decrease in the traffic on Foothill Drive as well.

Vice Chair Wirthlin noted that many of the students' recommendations suggested an increase in housing, which would result in an increase in traffic. He asked if they considered this inconsistent with their findings.

The students noted that the introduction of alternative modes of transit would help to calm and reduce the current traffic strain or any future strains which might be caused by increased density.

Commissioner McHugh noted that the K-mart property had been sold to Wal-Mart and inquired how this might change the proposal.

Mr. King stated that this did change things, creating a regional draw for residents outside of the immediate area and the sale of the property to Wal-Mart may not allow for a park and ride at that site.

Commissioner Forbis stated that he did not see anything in the presentation devoted to increasing bicycle lanes or the possibility of enlarging the sidewalk areas to encompass both pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Commissioner Forbis noted that he would have liked to see more emphasis on light rail within the presentation as well as the inclusion of proposals such as bicycle loaning stations at points along Foothill to encourage cycling, as well as the possibility of running a light-rail line along the I-15 corridor to accommodate winter sports traffic.

George Shaw was excused from the meeting at this time.

PUBLIC HEARING

(This item was heard at 6:32 p.m.)

Petitions 400-06-47 and 490-06-52—requests by Blue Tee Corporation to close a portion of 800 South between Chestnut Street (2500 West) and approximately 2700 West and to combine four parcels generally located at 800 Chestnut Street into a new one lot subdivision, in order to develop a steel distribution facility. The proposal is located in the Heavy Manufacturing (M-2) Zoning District.

Chairperson McDonough recognized Nick Britton as Staff representative.

Mr. Britton reviewed the request noting that Blue Tee Corporation had made a request for a right-of-way on a portion of 800 South, between Chestnut Street and approximately 2700 West, to be closed, declared surplus, and sold to them at fair market value.

Mr. Britton stated that the subject right-of-way had never been used as a public street and was currently inaccessible to vehicles and pedestrians. Mr. Britton noted that the applicant was also requesting that the Planning Commission approve a one lot subdivision that would combine four of Blue Tee Corporations parcels at the site into one parcel, approximately 26.3 acres in size.

He noted that as part of the subdivision and street closure request, Blue Tee Corporation would dedicate a cul-de-sac at the northern terminus of Chestnut Street to the City to meet their frontage requirement.

Commissioner Scott noted that on page four of the staff report water table requirements were reviewed and it was inquired how high the surplus canal running along the property would be, also if the floor elevation would represent any problem.

Mr. Britton noted that the floor elevation would have to be higher than the historic level on the surplus canal.

Commissioner Forbis inquired if anyone on Planning Staff knew how old the information on the Jordan River and surplus canal was.

Doug Wheelwright stated that it was built post World War II as a United States Army Corps Engineering Project, and that the canal was currently managed by Salt Lake County Flood Control.

Chairperson McDonough invited the applicant to the table to comment.

Al Giffin, with Brown Strauss Steel, was present to represent Blue Tee Corporation. Mr. Griffin stated that there would not be additional traffic impacts in the area and that the proposal would utilize the entire subdivided parcel for storage.

Lee Sadler, general contractor for the project, was also present to speak to the petition. Mr. Sadler noted that the proposal was ideal for the site as there was no way to service the area with sewer access, and that this proposal would be of very minimal impact to the ecology of the area.

Chairperson McDonough noted the concerns of the Commission regarding the water table at this site.

Mr. Sadler stated that several studies were done in the past year and the water table had not been an issue.

Commissioner Scott noted the nearby rail line and asked if the applicant intended to use that resource.

Mr. Griffin stated that they did intend to use this resource.

Commissioner Forbis inquired how the proposal would deal with run-off from the storage site and noted his concern that some run off might leech into the nearby canal.

Mr. Sadler noted that storm water would be handled on the property with on-site storage areas underneath the steel in combination with light percolation areas and emergency holding ponds, noting that the property would be raised off of the ground approximately two feet to incorporate this system. Mr. Sadler noted that the run-off would have to travel some distance to reach the canal and the rail tracks would act as an additional barrier to any run-off reaching the canal.

Mr. Griffin stated that the grade of the land would also ensure that the run-off traveled west, away from the canal.

Commissioner Forbis inquired if the storage would face the canal.

Mr. Griffin noted that the parking area and office frontage would face the canal and the steel storage would be behind this.

Mr. Sadler noted that the proposed street frontage in the form of the cul-de-sac would be a much improved area with landscaping, office space and lighting.

Chairperson McDonough opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Bruce Markosian, representing a family owning a property to the west of the proposed development, inquired why the proposal included the closure of 800 South and what it added to the function of the development. Mr. Markosian added that this closure could prevent future access to his client's property.

Doug Wheelwright noted that Staff had explored the possibility of expanding 800 South, however, the property owners determined that they did not need access to this street and did not want to deal with the financial costs involved in extending the public street and utilities. Mr. Wheelwright noted that city policy stated that if they did not intend to extend the street to the west, they must close it and incorporate it as part of their property, and would otherwise be considered a nuisance parcel for the city.

Commissioner Scott noted that 800 South did not extend all the way through the subject property, it ended about halfway through; therefore there would be no possibility of reaching Mr. Markosian's client's property without the city purchasing the land and pursuing the extension of 800 South.

Mr. Griffin stated that they hoped to start on the project and take occupancy of the site by the end of September.

Regarding Petitions 400-06-47 and 490-06-52, a request to close a portion of 800 South between Chestnut Street approximately 2500 West) and approximately 2700 West and to combine four parcels generally located at 800 Chestnut Street into a new one lot subdivision, in order to develop a steel distribution facility, Commissioner Forbis made a motion to approve the minor subdivision and transmit a favorable recommendation to City Council for the street closure, to declare that portion of the road surplus and recommend that the Mayor sell the property to the applicant at Fair Market Value subject to the following conditions as listed in the Staff Report:

1. All requirements and comments outlined in the staff report and attached as Exhibit C must be met.
2. A cul-de-sac at the northern terminus of Chestnut Street with a minimum diameter of 96 feet must be dedicated to the City to meet the required frontage for the M-2 Zoning District.
3. An avigation easement must be given to the City for continued airport activities.
4. A final plat is required.

Commissioner McHugh seconded the motion. All voted, "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

Petition 490-07-08—a request by Ken Milo for approval of a proposed routine and uncontested Lot Line Adjustment/Minor Subdivision for property located at approximately 678 North "F" Street, located in a Special Development Pattern Residential (SR-1A) Zoning District.

(This item was heard at 6:52 p.m.)

Chairperson McDonough recognized Ray McCandless as Staff representative.

Ray McCandless reviewed the lot line adjustment request and noted that generally lot line adjustments can be reviewed administratively; however, the applicant did not obtain signatures from all abutting property owners.

Mr. McCandless stated that the applicant had indicated that there was a survey error which made it impossible for the property to comply with the SR-1A Zoning District side-yard requirement.

Chairperson McDonough inquired if this request came about through a realization the city made or was it applicant based.

Doug Wheelwright noted that it was the applicant's request. Mr. Wheelwright stated that this proposal has been reviewed by Planning Staff, the City Attorney, and the Zoning Administrator and all parties were comfortable with the jogged lot line approach.

Mr. Wheelwright stated that this approach was also acceptable to the property owner to the north of the subject property, by selling the minimum amount that the property owner to the south needed. Mr. Wheelwright stated that this proposal was the culmination of an honest effort by Staff to accommodate the property owner, who had a two million dollar duplex building with a preliminary approval for a condominium conversion that he could not currently occupy, finalize or sell until he obtained a legal occupancy permit from the city, and this request was an accommodation of that interest.

Commissioner Scott noted that the property line needed to be jogged due to the street frontage of the property to the North, otherwise there would not be sufficient area for two lots.

Mr. Wheelwright noted that this was correct.

Chairperson McDonough invited the applicant forward to comment.

Ken Milo was present to speak to the petition. Mr. Milo noted that preliminary approval for a subdivision for both properties already existed, and due process and public input had occurred regarding the preliminary condominium plat, which was approved in September.

He noted that it was when trying to obtain the final plat that Bush and Gudgeon, who had done the original survey, came forward and indicated that an error was made and that the final plat could not be recorded.

Mr. Milo stated that Planning Staff had worked hard to address this problem and that to any onlooker; there would be no visual change, or any additional residential impacts from this request.

Commissioner Scott inquired about an air conditioning unit proposed for the north side of the property.

Mr. Milo indicated that the unit would be relocated or a special exception would need to be made to place the air conditioning unit at that location, which would be pursued through the Board of Adjustment.

Chairperson McDonough opened the public hearing portion of the meeting.

Shane Carlson, Chairperson of the Housing Compatibility Committee for the Avenues Community Council, was present to speak in opposition to the proposal. Mr. Carlson noted his concern over impacts to the residential character of the Avenues which projects like this one seemed to be creating, and that this proposal would create a lot that would no longer meet the minimum setbacks for the zoning district.

Mr. Carlson stated that the Community Council had been in support of the zoning ordinance, but that the overall issue was one of a pattern of developers coming in and overbuilding, then asking for forgiveness, rather than constructing it correctly the first time.

Mr. Carlson also noted that the finished driveway was twenty-two feet (22') in width rather than seventeen feet (17'), as indicated on the site plan and inquired why this was so. Mr. Carlson stated that the northwest corner of the property would actually be twelve inches (12') from the property line.

Commissioner Chambless noted that this may be considered 'shoehorning', as Mr. Carlson suggested, but was within the limits of the zoning ordinance.

Mr. Carlson stated that this was true, but not for two twin homes on the two northern lots. Mr. Carlson noted that if the lot line adjustment was made, there would be no exception for anything more than a single family home between a new duplex on the northernmost lot at 688 North 'F' Street and the existing duplex at 678 North 'F' Street, because it does not meet the requirements for lot square footage.

Julie Mackie (685 North 'G' Street) spoke in opposition of the proposal, stating that it would bypass the established ordinance. Ms. Mackie noted that it would undermine the intention of the ordinance which required the one hundred foot (100') frontage for the subdivision of the adjacent lot at 688 North 'F' Street.

Bill Mackie (685 North 'G' Street) noted that he wanted to see Mr. Milo occupy the current structures, but did not want to see three twin homes stacked on top of one another and would do anything within his means to ensure it did not happen.

George Buys (525 South 300 East), Chairman of the Board for Bush and Gudgell, explained that when Mr. Milo began the project, he was unaware that the building was in the wrong location in order to meet ordinance requirements. He noted that there was an error made in the survey of the property, and this was not discovered until his firm was hired to complete a survey of an adjoining property. Mr. Buys stated that he was in favor of the lot line adjustment, and felt that it would not change the original intention of the property.

Commissioner Scott inquired how far off the survey was and how such an error occurred.

Mr. Buys noted that the survey was off by four feet (4') and was a result of the location of the monument on 13th Avenue, which was not centered upon the center line of the street. He stated that when the surveyor applied the original half-width to the property on the North side, he inadvertently took the distance from the South side of the monument.

Vice Chair Wirthlin inquired of Mr. Buys how often this type of error occurred.

Mr. Buys noted that he did not know how often this type of error occurred in general, but noted that it did not happen to his firm very often.

Kevin Horn (284 West 400 North) represented the owner of the property located at 688 North 'F' Street. Mr. Horn noted that the agreement with Mr. Milo on the lot line adjustment is contingent upon not encumbering development at 688 North 'F' Street.

Commissioner Muir noted that it should be clarified that the development of the lot at 688 North 'F' Street was not part of this petition, and this petition was only to consider a lot line adjustment between the two properties.

Doug Wheelwright noted that it was anticipated that when the two lot subdivision of the property at 688 North 'F' Street occurred, it would be similarly adjusted as the South property line was and

it would not drop below 8,000 square feet. Mr. Wheelwright noted that Staff would not support a duplex on less than a minimum of 8,000 square feet. Mr. Wheelwright stated that Staff had administrative authority to make that adjustment, noting that no additional lots would be created; it would be a corresponding adjustment. Mr. Wheelwright noted that, yes, the lines were gerrymandered, but the reasoning for that had been explained previously.

Chairperson McDonough noted that this was not a consideration for a planned development, however, the Commission needed to take the entire picture into consideration.

Chairperson McDonough invited the applicant back to respond.

Mr. Milo stated that he felt he had done everything correctly, but a mistake had been made in the process. Mr. Milo noted that the ordinance had been met and Staff could explain how this was so.

Chairperson McDonough brought the discussion back to the Commission.

Mr. Wheelwright stated that there was a preliminary subdivision approval in place for the lot located at 688 North 'F' Street. He noted that the parcel had one hundred feet of footage and over 16,000 square feet of lot area. Mr. Wheelwright stated that the Planning Commission was being asked to approve a lot line adjustment which would take away from the total area of the lot to the north, but the lot to the north would still be 16,000 square feet and a corresponding jog would be placed in the new dividing line.

Mr. Wheelwright noted that there was no deed yet, but it must meet the zoning requirements or it could not be approved. Mr. Wheelwright added that Staff's intent was to look at their proposal and have them redraw the dividing line, and to determine if it complied with the zoning ordinance requirements.

Mr. Wheelwright noted that Staff would fully expect, as Mr. Horne said, that this would be a condition of the sale. The 688 North 'F' Street property would still retain the potential of placing a duplex on each of the parcels. Mr. Wheelwright stated that the area was zoned SR-1A and a duplex was a permitted use as long as there was 8,000 square feet and 50 feet of frontage.

Commissioner Scott noted that what made the proposal unusual was the jogged property line and inquired of Staff if there were other examples of this type of approach in the past few years.

Mr. Wheelwright noted that 'dog-legged' lot-lines were not uncommon, and typically those types of requests occurred on non-linear streets or cul-de-sacs, to try and balance the required frontage and match it to the larger-than-zone minimums which often occurred on corner parcels. Mr. Wheelwright noted that the preference was to have all lot lines be straight and have frontage on the street, but in a city that had seventy years of development before any zoning regulations, it was impossible.

Commissioner McHugh noted her confusion on why approving this request would not make one lot non-complying when the Staff Report indicated that one lot would be reduced to 7,716 square feet, below the requirement for a twin home.

Mr. Wheelwright noted that the proposed change made Mr. Milo's property compliant with the ordinance, and to not make the change would ensure that no duplex could be there. Mr. Wheelwright noted that it had been decided through the attorney's office that Planning Staff had the administrative authority to modify the Notice of Minor Subdivision to reflect the dog-legged division of the 688 North 'F' Street parcel.

Commissioner Scott noted her concern about condition number three suggested by the Staff Report regarding the placement of the air conditioning unit, and stated that she would remove it from the conditions of approval.

Regarding Petition 490-07-08—a request by Ken Milo for approval of a proposed routine and uncontested Lot Line Adjustment/Minor Subdivision for property located at approximately 678 North "F" Street, Vice Chair Wirthlin, based upon received testimony, the Staff Report and Noted Findings, made a motion to approve the request based upon the following conditions:

1. Compliance with all applicable Salt Lake City departmental requirements
2. Revising the property line so that the minimum lot width requirement of 50 feet at the setback line for 688 North 'F' Street is met.
3. Any reconfiguration or modification to lot 2 at 688 North 'F' Street to make it larger or alter approved property lines will require future subdivision approval by the City.

Commissioner McHugh seconded the motion. Commissioners Chambless, Wirthlin, McHugh, Scott and Muir voted in favor of the motion and Commissioner Forbis voted in opposition to the motion. The motion passed 5-1.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business.

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Tami Hansen, Recording Secretary

Cecily Zuck, Transcribing Secretary