

**SALT LAKE CITY
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
In Room 326 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, April 9, 2008**

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were Chair Matthew Wirthlin, Vice Chair Mary Woodhead. Commissioners: Tim Chambless, Babs De Lay, Peggy McDonough, Frank Algarin, Prescott Muir, Susie McHugh, and Kathy Scott. Commissioner Robert Forbis was excused from the meeting.

Present from the Planning Division were; Ray McCandless, Senior Planner; Nick Norris, Principal Planner; Michael Maloy, Principal Planner and Tami Hansen, Senior Secretary. Paul Nielson, City Land Use Attorney; Mary De La Mare-Schaefer, Acting Director of Community and Economic Development; and Esther Hunter, Deputy Advisor to the Mayor were also present.

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. Chair Wirthlin called the meeting to order at 5:47 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: Matthew Wirthlin, Frank Algarin, Kathy Scott, Susie McHugh, and Prescott Muir. Salt Lake City Staff present were: Ray McCandless and Nick Norris.

DINNER WORKSHOP SESSION

Doug Dansie reviewed the Downtown and Gateway Zoning.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES from Wednesday, March 26, 2008.

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

Commissioner McHugh made a motion to approve the minutes with noted changes. Commissioner Algarin seconded the motion. Commissioners McHugh, Algarin, Scott, Chambless, McDonough, Muir and Vice Chair Woodhead voted, "Aye," Commissioner De Lay abstained. The minutes were approved.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR

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

Chair Wirthlin welcomed Paul Nielsen, the new City Land Use Attorney.

Chair Wirthlin noted that he was present at the City Council meeting to answer any question they had on the City Creek project skybridge. He noted that the City Council expressed their appreciation for the time and work the Planning Commission had put into giving them a recommendation.

Vice Chair Woodhead noted that she and Chair Wirthlin met with Mayor Becker and they had a positive meeting with him; Mary De La Mare-Schaefer, Acting Community Development Director; and Esther Hunter, Senior Advisor to the Mayor. She noted that the Commission's concerns about the Citizen's Committee were discussed and that Mayor Becker stated that the membership of the committee was still being constructed and was not permanent, but rather project oriented and would change depending on the nature of the project. They also noted that they expressed to Mayor Becker that more involvement from the west side of the city was necessary.

Commissioner Scott inquired if the Citizen's Committee was only to aid in smoothing the Planning Department's transition or if it was permanent.

Vice Chair Woodhead stated that there were some back projects that needed to be taken care of, and the specific members of this committee were chosen because they lived within project areas, and their input was viewed as valuable. She also noted that it was mentioned to Mayor Becker that the Planning Commission members were interested in being involved in each stage of these projects and not just shown the end result.

Chair Wirthlin noted that it was discussed with Mayor Becker that the Commission was interested in additional training, which should be worked into the budget, and also in filling the last vacancy of the Commission which would require additional discussion between staff, the Commission, and the Mayor.

Commissioner McHugh stated that she still had concerns in regards to the Citizen's Committee, because it seemed like it was still not an encompassing effort to better the city.

Chair Wirthlin invited Mrs. De La Mare-Schaefer and Ms. Hunter to the table to comment on Commissioner McHugh's statement and for the Report of the Director. He also noted that the meeting with Mayor Becker was extremely positive, especially since he seemed committed to keep and open dialogue with the Planning Commission.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR

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

Mrs. De La Mare-Schaefer stated that she still met with City Creek Reserve, Inc. (CCRI) weekly in regards to construction issues, and that following the Planning Commission's decision, CCRI stated some confusion in regards to a portion of the language in the motion. She noted that this would be briefly revisited on the April 23, 2008 agenda.

Ms. Hunter extended an invitation to the Commissioners to attend the Heritage Preservation Conference, a training program involving historic preservation, on April 17, 2008.

Ms. Hunter handed out a flowchart to show the new levels of public involvement and committees. She stated that none of the new committees would replace the existing public processes or the Planning Commission's role in these processes. She noted that the Internal Advisory Committee consisted of citizens to aid in advising staff during the Planning Department transition period to help build a solid process.

Commissioner De Lay stated that some of the Citizen Advisory Committee representation was too strong and was more government by committee rather than a tool to aid the Boards and Commissions.

Ms. Hunter stated that Mayor Becker was interested in devising a more solid communication with citizens and businesses in the community, and the intent was a few committees which met monthly to gain feedback and answer questions about the planning and permit processes.

Commissioner De Lay stated that it would be wonderful to have evaluations and citizen input in regards to the city processes. She noted that everyone was in favor of that, but to see it on the chart as a government position in the statutory process was not reasonable and it seemed necessary to reconstruct the flow chart to better show this.

Ms. Hunter noted that the chart would be corrected to better reflect the intent. She noted that Mayor Becker was also interested in input from people who had experiences going through city processes and listening to their suggestions on how they could be refined.

Commissioner De Lay suggested having a blog on the city website, where members of the public could have the opportunity to submit comments and communicate with each other and city staff in an open forum.

Mrs. De La Mare-Schaefer noted that having an opportunity for members of the public to have direct contact with the city planners was best done in an open house forum.

Commissioner De Lay requested Planning Department statistics; including the amount and types of applications received.

Mrs. De La Mare-Schaefer stated that staff did have those statistics and would get those to the Commissioners.

Vice Chair Woodhead stated that she would like to see more input from citizens of the west side of the city, while the Mayor and staff are forming the various public input committees. She stated that Polly Hart, Chair of the Capital Hill Community Council, pending member of the Historic Landmarks Commission, and now a member of the Citizen's Committee was quoted in the City Weekly magazine saying, "The coalition has worked very hard at trying to recruit Westside activists, but it has been a struggle... because of fewer west side homeowners, as compared to renters, make for fewer neighborhood activists who feel they have a stake in the process."

Vice Chair Woodhead stated that she hoped this was not the view of the city, and if Mayor Becker was looking for activist from the west side of the city, members of the Commission would be happy and able to find them.

Ms. Hunter noted that she would welcome help from the Commission and the Mayor's office had established a strong outreach program to help aid in this area.

Commissioner McDonough stated that she had heard a rumor that there had been some consideration of placing administrative hearing cases back on Planning Commission agenda, which she understood were initially taken off because they were bogging down the agendas.

Mrs. De La Mare-Schaefer stated that there was a large backlog of some issues and in order to do a departmental clean up, there was an interest in bringing some things through the Planning Commission, which would not be necessarily on a regular basis, but to ensure that these petitions got a fair public process.

Commissioner McDonough stated that she saw more valuable decision making by the Planning Commission as far as long range planning, and that it would not be useful to permanently bring back petitions that have been handled successfully administratively in the past.

Ms. Hunter stated that the petitions her and Mrs. De La Mare-Schaefer were discussing were complicated and would indeed need to go through the Planning Commission process.

ISSUES ONLY

(This item was heard at 6:23 p.m.)

A discussion by the University of Utah concerning the University of Utah's Project Universe, a mixed use development proposed to be located in the existing parking lot immediately west of the Rice Eccles Stadium on the University of Utah campus. Public comment concerning the proposed development is encouraged; however, the Planning Commission's role in this process is advisory.

Chair Wirthlin recognized Nick Norris as staff representative.

Mr. Norris stated that the site encompassed 7.9 acres of land and was currently a surface parking lot and the University line TRAX station. He noted that the University of Utah had issued a request for qualifications to find developers that were interested to participate in the development of the project. He noted that the City's role was only advisory due to the ownership of the property and the fact that it is state land. He noted that the University of Utah had agreed to use the City's public processes to identify the issues and provide a forum for the community to provide input. He noted that this was a way for the City to create a good relationship with the University, and this was the first transit oriented development along the TRAX line.

He noted that the City did have several concerns with development at this location, particularly possible impacts to the surrounding historic district, just west of the site, and the residential and historic fabric that exists in the area. Staff was also concerned about the compatibility of adjacent land uses in terms of scale, form, urban design, and potential impacts on the 1300 East business community.

Mr. Norris noted that access to this site was a challenge due to the location of TRAX and the limited potential ingress and egress to the site. He noted that the combination of TRAX, existing traffic during school hours, and events at the stadium created a huge concern. He noted that the stadium had become an icon in the city due to its visual prominence and the role it has played in the history of the City. He noted that view corridors to and from the city were important for a good urban design and for community expression.

Commissioner De Lay inquired if the Historic Landmarks Commission had any input that the Planning Commission should be aware of.

Mr. Norris stated that they were obviously concerned about the University Historic District and the impact to the surrounding University area, property values, views, commercial businesses and other issues that had been echoed by the city.

Commissioner De Lay inquired who the University of Utah answered to if they were not bound by City regulations

Commissioner Chambless noted that the University was a state facility and would answer to the State Building Board and to the State Legislature.

Chair Wirthlin invited Mike Perez to the table.

Mike Perez, Associate Vice President of the University of Utah, noted that in regards to the approval process the University would go the Board of Trustees at the University, then the State Board of Regents, followed by the State Building Board, which was where there would be some level of public process, followed by the State Legislature.

Commissioner Scott inquired about retail, entertainment, lifestyle type businesses owned by the University in state owned buildings, and if the new development would be state owned or just on state owned land.

Mr. Perez stated that they did not know the details of this yet, but it would not be a source of income to the University of Utah, he noted that the University would only receive additional necessary space and the invigoration of the south east entry to the campus. Mr. Perez gave a PowerPoint presentation to show the projections of the project. He noted that the University was looking to create active nodes, and act as a gateway to the city through capitalizing on natural setting, LEED certification, and to eliminate an asphalt parking lot. Mr. Perez stated that the Project Universe development would be open and have open pedestrian thoroughfares. He also stated that the University was adjacent to a historic neighborhood and all the layers and the concerns of the area and view corridor would be taken into consideration.

Commissioner Chambless inquired about the proposed parking structure and if the view corridor would be impeded.

Mr. Perez stated that parking would not be lost; however, it had not been designed yet, so he could not fully discuss the aesthetic implications or the impact of the view corridor.

Commissioner Scott inquired if the University had done a traffic study in the area and if there would be changes in traffic patterns.

Mr. Perez stated that there would be potential changes, and a study would be done in the area, but these would be further reviewed after a more concrete architectural plan. He also noted that the three additional TRAX hubs throughout the University campus were being looked at to undergo transformations to become vital mixed-use activity hubs in the future as well.

Commissioner Scott noted that the market and historical analysis were prepared by the University of Utah and she inquired if the City was involved in that process or if they were independently obtained.

Mr. Perez noted that they were done independently.

Mr. Norris noted that the historic information was created when this district was nominated for historic status.

Chair Wirthlin opened up the public hearing portion of this discussion.

Joel Briscoe (1124 East 600 South), East Central Community Council Chair, stated that this development could potentially damage 1300 East businesses. He did appreciate the fact that the University was trying to establish strong, compatible connections with the community and attempting to weave the interest of the University into the fabric of the community.

Commissioner De Lay stated that members of the public should feel free to email their comments to the Commission if they felt like they did not have enough time to express their opinions.

Cindy Cromer (816 East 100 South) stated that she did not agree with this project and as she reviewed the fundamental premise underlying this project, it was a long term lease—a transfer of ownership rights to a private developer. She gave the Commissioners a hand out that further summarized her comments, which will be included with the minutes of the meeting.

Michael Colby (1311 East 400 South) stated that he was in favor of some development on the site, because the parking lot that exists now is an eyesore.

Kendall Phillips stated he was concerned about the proposed 150 condominiums and felt that the Salt Lake City market was already saturated with available condominiums; however, he was in favor of the commercial aspect and additional and better parking because it would benefit University students.

Rawlings Young (2135 South 1900 East) stated that the University of Utah was in the East Bench community and should follow that master plan and also there were some planning issues that need to be looked at.

Steve Alder (965 South 2200 East) Sunnyside East association, stated that he would request that Mr. Nielson, City Land Use attorney, should review control and regulation of this development and require the University to recognize and mitigate impacts of this project.

Lawrence Eckman (1116 East 400 South) stated he was concerned that this project would impact 400 South.

Jim Webster stated that TRAX was already impacted by the public not being able to access it once it delved into the University of Utah campus. He stated that this project had a lot of potential.

Chair Wirthlin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner De Lay stated that it seemed more than obvious that this discussion should be part of the Citizen Ordinance Review and Process Resolution Advisory Committee, where additional input could be taken.

Mr. Norris noted that there was a proposal before the University of Utah to establish a committee for review as it goes through the process.

Vice Chair Woodhead inquired if there needed to be a separate committee to advocate for the City.

Commissioner De Lay stated that the citizen input had already been abundant, and she felt this would be a great idea and would like to see active members on a committee consisting of the City Council, community councils, Commission members, and the University of Utah working together.

Vice Chair Woodhead inquired if an additional committee or an individual could offer the University of Utah a different, fresh view point to aid in this process.

Mr. McCandless stated that there had been a chart outlining the process in the packets sent to the Commissioners, discussing the possibility of a joint committee between the Planning and Historic Landmarks Commissions.

Commissioner Scott inquired if there needed to be some clarification before the committees started to meet to review impacts on the city and how to mitigate them or atleast define parameters.

Vice Chair Woodhead noted that it would be nice if Mr. Nielsen reviewed this and gave the Commission some advice.

Commissioner Chambless noted that he would like some clarification about long range planning for the University of Utah to have student attendance increase significantly in the near future.

Mr. Perez stated that the master plan identified minimal growth in the student population over the next decade. He noted that in the second decade there would be moderate growth.

Chair Wirthlin invited Ms. Hunter back to the table to discuss the public process in more detail.

Mrs. De La Mare-Schaefer stated that after speaking with Mr. Perez she and Ms. Hunter had suggested coming before the Commission to get a feel of what the issues were, and then organize a committee to formulate some guiding principles to offer as a back drop to go into the RFP. She stated that it seemed critical to give some guidance before there was a design.

Commissioner De Lay stated she was still concerned about the organizational timeframe.

Mr. Nielsen noted that he would review this from a legal standpoint and there were some process issues that needed to be looked at.

Vice Chair Woodhead stated that she felt it was important that the City explore what the legal scope of authority was early in the process.

Chair Wirthlin called for a five minute break at 7:36 p.m.
Commissioner Algarin excused himself from the meeting.

Chair Wirthlin reconvened the meeting at 7:43 p.m.

PUBLIC HEARING

(This item was heard at 7:43 p.m.)

Petition 410-08-04, Westminster Science Building Conditional Use for Additional Building Height—A request by Westminster College, represented by Curtis Ryan, for a conditional use for extra building height located on the campus of Westminster College at approximately 1840 South 1300 East. The proposed new building, located immediately north of Converse Hall, would house the college's science program and would be 75 feet tall. The property is located in an I Institutional Zoning District where the maximum height limit is 35 feet. The maximum height may be increased to 75 feet if approved by the Planning Commission as a conditional use. The proposed development is located in City Council District Seven represented by Søren Simonsen.

Chair Wirthlin recognized Casey Stewart as staff representative.

Mr. Stewart stated that the proposed building would house the college of science program and was proposed to be approximately 73 feet tall. He noted that the building site would be where there currently existed a basketball court and climbing wall on campus. He noted that the west face, because of the slope, would have a taller side, which was the reason for the conditional use. Mr. Stewart stated that he felt this building would be compatible with others on campus and the buffering was sufficient for the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Stewart stated he received a letter from Kathleen Anderson, who objected to the new building.

Commissioner De Lay disclosed that she was a two time graduate from Westminster College and wanted to receive the Commissioners input as to whether or not they felt this was a conflict of interest.

The Commissioners established that because Commissioner De Lay did not receive financial gain from the college there was no reason for her to recuse herself.

Mr. Nielsen also agreed that he did not see any reason for Commissioner De Lay to recuse herself.

Chair Wirthlin invited the applicants to the table.

Curtis Ryan, Westminster College Vice President of Finance, stated that the college developed its own master plan in the late 1990s, which was also approved by the Sugar House Community Council; he noted that the proposed building would be the last structure built under that ten year master plan. He also noted that the college was committed to gold level LEED certification.

Derrick Pane, Lead Architect, stated that the design was based visually on the two surrounding historic buildings, as well as building density and height. He noted that they were also making the building transparent to display the different sciences to the outside community.

Chair Wirthlin opened up the public hearing portion of the petition.

Judy Short (Sugar House Community Council) stated that she was in favor of the proposed structure and liked that the building looked modern and transparent and hoped that the Commission would approve it.

Chair Wirthlin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Chambless inquired if any of the building levels were subsurface.

Mr. Pane noted that the structure was a dual entry level scheme so from the east side the entry would be on the second level, and from the west side the entry would be on the bottom level.

Commissioner Scott made a motion regarding Petition 410-08-04, based on public testimony, the staff report, and the Commissions discussion, that the Westminster Science Building conditional use for additional height be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. **Approval shall not be valid for a period longer than one year unless a building permit is issued and construction is diligently pursued. However, upon written request of the applicant, the one year period may be extended by the Planning Commission for such time as it shall determine for good cause shown, without further public hearing.**
2. **Compliance with the departmental comments as outlined in this staff report.**

Commissioner McDonough seconded the motion.

Commissioners De Lay, McHugh, Scott, Chambless, McDonough, Muir, and Vice Chair Woodhead voted, "Aye," the motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Scott suggested that a copy of the letter from Kathleen Anderson be given to enforcement, because she had claimed that there was a problem with the water retention pond causing cracks in surrounding home foundations.

Mr. McCandless stated that he would forward that letter.

Petition 410-06-40 Bada Bean Coffee, Modifications to Conditional Use Approval of a Drive-Through Window —A request by James Watts at 1302 South 500 East Street for modifications to the conditions of approval to an existing conditional use for a drive through to an existing retail goods establishment that was approved on February 28, 2007. The site is located in the CN (Neighborhood Commercial) Zoning District. At the time of approval, a drive-through for a retail goods establishment may be allowed as a conditional use in CN Zoning District. The property is located in City Council District 5 represented by Jill Remington Love.

The petition was withdrawn by the applicant.

Petition No. 410-07-31 Diamond Parking North Temple Conditional Use —A request by Diamond Parking Service represented by Bill Baer, to develop a new commercial parking lot and mini-warehouse located approximately at 1925 W North Temple Street. The subject property contains approximately 18.8 ± acres. The Salt Lake City Planning Commission has the final authority to approve the conditional use petition. The proposed development is zoned CC Corridor Commercial District and is within City Council District 2 represented by Van Turner.
(This item was heard at 8:02 p.m.)

Chair Wirthlin recognized Michael Maloy as staff representative.

Mr. Maloy presented a PowerPoint presentation. He noted that the applicant was requesting a conditional use permit to develop three largely vacant sites. He noted that the only legit conditional use aspect of this process was the commercial parking lot. Mr. Maloy noted that there were a few divisions in the city that were requesting a subdivision application to combine all three parcels into one; however, the applicant pointed out that none of the proposed buildings would cross property lines and instead a warranty deed would be completed.

Bill Baer, Diamond Airport Parking Director of Marketing; introduced Jim Schmick, Facilities Manager, and noted that this expansion was driven by a rapidly growing market and would fit the pattern of other airport parking facilities in the Salt Lake City area.

Chair Wirthlin opened up the public hearing portion of this petition. There was no public comment. Chair Wirthlin closed the public hearing.

Vice Chair Woodhead stated that she looked at the master plan for this area and there seemed to be some community inclination that this area would be developed commercially or with retail that would serve the local community.

Mr. Baer stated that he also reviewed the master plan and he did not see that statement. He noted that he believed that with the light rail plan along North Temple Street, there were pretty good odds that there would be more commercial and retail development in this area, and suggested that the owner might view this as an interim land use toward this goal.

Commissioner De Lay made on motion that the Planning Commission approve Petition 410-07-31 for a proposed commercial parking lot and ministorage units as a conditional use based on testimony heard tonight, and subject to the following conditions:

1. **Conditional use approval for a commercial parking lot and ministorage units does not guarantee City approval of the number of parking stalls shown in Attachment B—Conceptual Site Plan in the staff report. The final number of parking stalls permitted on the subject property shall be subject to compliance with building and zoning requirements.**
2. **Applicant shall submit a construction phase schedule for staff review and approval.**
3. **Applicant shall prepare and submit a traffic impact study to the Transportation Division for review and approval. Based on the analysis and findings contained within the staff report, the applicant shall be required to comply with any and all traffic mitigation improvements required by the City.**
4. **Any grade change that exceeds two feet shall require a special exception.**
5. **All park strips within the public right-of-way shall be fully landscaped and planted with deciduous shade trees spaced no more than 30 feet apart on the center in compliance with City standards and subject to approval by the Urban Forester.**
6. **Unless otherwise modified by special exception or waiver, the proposed development shall comply with all applicable City regulations and development policies.**
7. **Petition shall be subject to compliance with all department comments contained within Attachment F—Department Comments.**

Commissioner McHugh seconded the motion.

Commissioner McDonough inquired if condition 2 should be deleted, since Mr. Maloy had stated that the applicant was no longer planning on building the project in phases, or should it be kept incase the applicant changes their intention in the future.

Commissioner De Lay stated it should be kept.

Commissioners De Lay, McHugh, Scott, Chambless, McDonough, Muir and Vice Chair Woodhead voted, “Aye,” the motion carried unanimously.

Petition No. 400-07-42 Diamond Airport Parking Conditional Use — A request by Diamond Parking Service represented by Bill Baer, to expand an existing commercial parking lot located at approximately at 50 South Redwood Road on an abutting property. The subject property contains approximately 0.87 of an acre. The Salt Lake City Planning Commission has the final authority to approve the conditional use petition. The proposed development is zoned CC Corridor Commercial District and BP Business Park District and is within City Council District 2 represented by Van Turner.
(*This item was heard at 8:15 p.m.*)

Chair Wirthlin recognized Michael Maloy as staff representative.

Mr. Maloy stated that this was a sliver of land that was a remnant right-of-way from 100 South, from when Interstate 80 was constructed, and the city sold the property to the applicant for the purpose of developing commercial parking.

Mr. Baer stated that he concurred with Mr. Maloy's presentation.

Chair Wirthlin opened the public hearing portion of the petition, there was no public testimony. Chair Wirthlin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Scott noted that public utilities had made no comment, and inquired if the poles on the property would need to be relocated.

Mr. Baer said the poles would not be moved, the parking lot would be build around them according to code.

Commissioner De Lay made a motion that the Planning Commission approve Petition 400-07-42, for the proposed commercial parking lot as a conditional use based on the testimony heard tonight, the enclosed findings, and subject to the following conditions:

1. Conditional use approval is for a commercial parking lot and does not guarantee City approval of the number of new parking stalls shown in Attachment A—Preliminary Site Plan. The final number of new parking stalls permitted on the subject property shall be subject to compliance with building and zoning requirements.
2. Unless otherwise modified by special exception or waiver, the proposed development shall comply with all applicable City regulations and development policies.
3. Petition shall be subject to compliance with all departmental comments contained within Attachment C—Department Comments.
4. Any grade change that exceeds two feet shall require a special exception.

Commissioner Scott seconded the motion.

Commissioners De lay, Scott, McHugh, Chambless, McDonough, Muir, and Vice Chair Woodhead voted, “Aye,” the motion carried unanimously.

Petition No. 490-08-11 Rocky Mountain Power Utility Structure Conditional Use – A request by Rocky Mountain Power represented by Alene Bentley to install a utility cabinet located on private property at the rear of the property located at approximately 40 North 200 West. The proposed utility cabinet is in a D-1 Central Business District Zoning District and is within City Council District 3 represented by Eric Jergensen.
(*This item was heard at 8:19 p.m.*)

Chair Wirthlin recognized Mike Maloy as staff representative.

Mr. Maloy stated that this utility box is interior on the block, behind buildings and does not displace any existing land uses, specifically parking.

Ms. Alene Bentley stated that the reason why this utility box was necessary was because currently the Plaza Hotel was being serviced beneath West Temple Street; however, when that street was demolished 12, 500 volts would be exposed, so Rocky Mountain Power would like to place a new switch gear over an existing vault.

Chair Wirthlin opened up the public hearing portion of the petition, there was no public comment. Chair Wirthlin closed the public hearing.

Commissioner McDonough made a motion that the Planning Commission approve Petition 490-08-11 Rocky Mountain Power private utility structure conditional use, based on testimony and the presentation of the staff report and subject to the following conditions:

1. All necessary building permits shall be reviewed and issued by the Building Department prior to installation of the structure.
2. Installation of the structure shall not interfere with the existing 8” sewer lateral running through the property.

Commissioner Chambless seconded the motion.

Commissioners De Lay, McHugh, Scott, Chambless, McDonough, Muir, and Vice Chair Woodhead voted, “Aye,” the motion carried unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8: 24 p.m.