

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

In Room 326 of the City & County Building

451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah

Wednesday, July 8, 2009

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were Vice Chair Susie McHugh; Commissioners Michael Gallegos, Angela Dean, Prescott Muir, Michael Fife, Tim Chambless, Kathleen Hill, Matthew Wirthlin, and Babs De Lay. Commissioner Frank Algarin and Chair Mary Woodhead were excused.

A field trip was held prior to the meeting. Planning Commissioners present were: Vice Chair Susie McHugh; Commissioners Tim Chambless, Michael fife, Michael Gallegos, and Matthew Wirthlin. Staff members present were: Michael Maloy, Kevin LoPiccolo, Nick Britton, Ana Valdemoros, and Cheri Coffey.

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. Acting Chair McHugh called the meeting to order at 5:45 p.m. Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained in the Planning Office for an indefinite period of time. Planning staff members present at the meeting were: Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director; Pat Comarell, Assistant Planning Director; Cheri Coffey, Programs Manager; Paul Neilson, City Attorney; Nick Norris, Senior Planner; Michael Maloy, Principal Planner, Kevin LoPiccolo, Planning Programs Supervisor; Robin Zeigler, Historic Preservation Planner; Nick Britton, Senior Planner; Ana Valdemoros, Associate Planner; and Tami Hansen, Planning Commission Secretary.

5:46:13 PM Approval of Minutes from Wednesday June 24, 2009.

Commissioner Gallegos made a motion to approve the June 24, 2009 Planning Commission minutes. Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion. All in favor voted, “Aye”. Commissioner Muir abstained. The minutes were approved.

5:47:10 PM Report of the Chair and Vice Chair

Acting Chair McHugh stated she did not have anything to report.

5:47:13 PM Report of the Director

Petitions 410-06-14 Time Extension for Planned Development Approval at 464 South 600 East—a request by David Harries for a one year time extension for the approval of a planned development. The property is located at approximately 464 South 600 East in a CS Community Shopping zoning district. The Planning Commission granted a one year extension on July 9, 2008. The applicant is also proposing to landscape the site. This project is located in Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. View: [Memorandum](#)

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that due to market conditions and the current economy, the applicant was not ready to proceed at this point. He stated that there were a couple of extensions granted for this petition, and the applicant was asking the Planning Commission to grant another one year time extension.

He stated that in return the applicant had proposed to landscape the lot and had worked out an arrangement with the Public Utilities department so they could have a water meter on the site.

Commissioner De Lay stated she did not have a problem with the time extension, but noted that the applicant said they were going to plant maple trees and recommended that native trees were planted instead.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that recommendations from the Urban Forester could be obtained.

Commissioner Chambless stated that currently this lot looked like a blighted area and he would also encourage native Utah plants.

5:49:51 PM **Motion**

Commissioner Wirthlin made a motion to grant the one year time extension with a recommendation to the Planning Director that native plants and trees should be used for the landscaping.

Commissioner De Lay seconded the motion.

Commissioners De Lay, Hill, Fife, Gallegos, Dean, Chambless, Muir, and Wirthlin voted, “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that the City Council was currently doing their annual board and commission briefings to get feedback and talk about any issues there might be. He noted the Planning Commission was scheduled to meet on August 11, 2009. The Chair and Vice Chair were required to be there, but the full Commission was invited as well.

Public Hearings

5:53:21 PM **Petition PLNPCM2009-00203; Diamond Parking Conditional Use**—a request by Chris Furstenau, Furst Construction on behalf of Diamond Parking, to amend and expand conditional use 410-07-31 for an existing commercial parking lot located at approximately 1925 West North Temple Street. The purpose of the request is to allow construction of a new private vehicular driveway to be located at approximately 1969 West North Temple Street. The new driveway will become the primary entrance into the existing commercial parking lot, which is owned and operated by Diamond Parking. The zoning designation for the property is CC Corridor Commercial District and CG General Commercial District. The property is located in City Council District Two, represented by Van Turner. **View:** [Staff Report](#)

Acting Chair McHugh recognized Michael Maloy as staff representative.

5:58:27 PM Public Hearing

Acting Chair McHugh opened the public hearing portion of the petition. She noted that there was no one present to speak to the petition, and closed the public hearing.

5:58:43 PM Motion

Commissioner De Lay made a motion regarding Petition PLNPCM2009-00203, based on the findings in the staff report. The Planning Commission approves this petition subject to the following conditions:

- 1. All park strips within the public right-of-way shall be fully landscaped and planted with deciduous shade trees spaced no more than thirty (30) feet apart on center in compliance with City standards and subject to approval by the Urban Forester.**
- 2. Unless otherwise modified by special exception or waiver as permitted by the Zoning Title, the proposed development shall comply with all applicable City regulations and development policies.**
- 3. The petition shall be subject to compliance with all departmental comments contained within the staff report under Attachment C—Departmental Comments.**

Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion.

Commissioners De Lay, Hill, Fife, Gallegos, Dean, Chambless, Muir, and Wirthlin voted, “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

5:59:39 PM Petition PLNPCM2009-00434; Jefferson Street Closure—a request by Jefferson Partners LLC that the remaining portion of Jefferson Street north of 800 South, east of 200 West, be declared surplus by the City, closed, and sold to the applicant. The purpose of the request is to incorporate the remaining portion of this street into the Mark Miller auto dealership. The property is located in City Council District Four, represented by Luke Garrott. **View:** [Staff Report](#)

Acting Chair McHugh recognized Kevin LoPiccolo as staff representative.

Mr. LoPiccolo stated that back in 1990 ordinance number 73 essentially abandoned or closed Jefferson Street. Through title work with Mark Miller, First American Title discovered that there was a portion of 330 feet which was not closed as part of that process. He stated that Mr. Miller was resubmitting this application to clean up any title concerns.

6:03:45 PM Public Hearing

Acting Chair McHugh opened the public hearing portion of the petition. She noted that there was no one present to speak to the petition and closed the public hearing.

6:04:03 PM Motion

Commissioner Fife made a motion regarding Petition PLNPCM2009-00434, that the Planning Commission transmit a favorable recommendation to the City Council to close the subject street, and recommend to the Mayor to sell the property to the applicant at a value determined by the Property Management Division, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. All requirements and comments outlined in this staff report and attached as Exhibit C in the staff report shall be met.**
- 2. Prior to City Council consideration the applicant will work with the City Property Management Division to obtain a compensation price for the subject property.**
- 3. Compliance with City Code 2.58 which regulates the disposition of City owned real property.**

Commissioner De Lay seconded the motion.

Commissioners De Lay, Hill, Fife, Gallegos, Dean, Chambless, Muir, and Wirthlin voted, “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

6:05:33 PM Petition PLNPCM2009-00171; Citywide Historic Preservation Plan adoption—a request by the Historic Landmark Commission to consider recommendation of the Citywide Historic Preservation Plan to the City Council. This is a city-wide project. **View:** [Staff Report](#)

Acting Chair McHugh recognized Robin Zeigler and Pat Comarell as staff representatives.

Ms. Zeigler stated that the Commission should have received a memorandum and a two page summary to help highlight some of the important parts of the preservation plan. She stated that there was also a multi-page response from Clarion & Associates explaining how the plan incorporated the City Redevelopment Agency’s (RDA) comments. She stated that stake-holder interviews were also included so the Commission could see the variety of groups and individuals that had previously reviewed and commented on the plan.

Ms. Zeigler stated she would go through a few of the questions and comments that she had received. The first comment was the document was too large. She stated it was large because it was covering a long period of time and it was also viewed as an educational tool. She stated that in addition to making recommendations to the City on what could be done, the document also reflected how other cities had accomplished some of these recommendations, and explained why Salt Lake City might want to go forward with the recommendations.

Ms. Zeigler stated that another concern was if the preservation plan would create another layer of government. She stated that the Historic Landmark Commission and the ordinance already existed, so this plan was not recommending a new board or new layer of government. She stated that another concern was that the plan would require addition funding. She noted that certain parts of the plan would need additional resources; however, this was a big document that covered a long period of time, which could be broken down into parts year-by-year for the City Council and the Mayor’s office to decide on what additional projects to fund. She noted another question was in regards to the plan balancing other City goals. Ms. Zeigler stated that this was woven throughout the entire plan; there were many recommendations for all of the different City

departments to work together. She noted that this plan was not intended to be the end, but rather a tool to help accomplish the multi-goals of the City.

Ms. Zeigler stated that many people were invited to be involved with the plan, there were obviously multiple discussions with the Historic Landmark Commission, and the planning process started with a meeting with the Planning Commission that explained the Citizen's Advisory Committee, and the stake-holder groups including: City Council members, Planning Commission members, architects, past economic review panel members for the economic hardship, realtors, City staff, citizens, and developers. She stated that there was a lot of public outreach through multiple open houses, and additional meetings were offered to the many Community Councils. She noted that one-on-one meetings were held with City Council members, presentations at the Utah Heritage Foundation Board, the Liberty Wells community council, the Downtown Alliance, the Central City Community Council, and flyers and poster were distributed throughout the City. Ms. Zeigler also noted that staff attended street fairs and public service announcements were aired on Channel 17. A letter from the Mayor was sent through his mailing list, flyers were mailed, discussions with RDA were held, information was sent through the City's Listserv, and the Vest pocket Business Coalition and the Utah Heritage Foundation also promoted this.

Ms. Zeigler stated that it was suggested that a sixth theme be added to the preservation plan, which stated that the Planning Commission would work side-by-side with preservation, development, and the business economy of the City. Staff did not want to change what the Historic Landmark Commission had recommended, but it seemed that this theme had been woven throughout the plan by working with different groups and departments City-wide. Ms. Zeigler noted that it was also asked how the plan would fit into any State or County policies already in place. She stated this was not really a regional issue like transportation or housing; it really was a City issue.

Ms. Zeigler stated that another concern was how the master plan would be updated to incorporate the Preservation plan. She noted that master plans would be updated as the City Council and the Mayor's Office were ready for them, and then preservation would be a key for each of those districts. The plan needed additional definitions of terms that were currently found in the ordinance, which Clarion & Associates had added to give more clarity.

Ms. Zeigler stated that the new construction requirements only addressed height and materials, there might be other areas to look at, but Clarion & Associates did not want to focus the plan on those elements, because the City should determine what was appropriate.

Ms. Zeigler stated that there were several comments about the Architectural Review Committee, which was a discussion the Historic Landmark Commission needed to have. If they decided this would be a valuable committee, then a better definition of the Committee's responsibilities and members would be added to the plan. She noted that additional financial incentives were added to the plan; in addition there was a list under Appendix C, which reviewed those various incentives.

Ms. Zeigler agreed that it was critical to inform people of historic designations before property changed hands, and this was a recommendation of the plan which staff had already started to work on. Also, only historic parks would be designated as such, not all City parks.

Ms. Zeigler noted that regulation of historic landscapes would not include bushes and plants; the intent was to cover all exterior alterations to a property (i.e. walkways, gazebos, and fences). She stated that there may be additional landscaping features such as parks, park strips, and medians in historic districts, and cemeteries, which would also be regulated.

Ms. Zeigler noted that historic designation was a separate process, and input from property owners and the neighborhood played a big role, but the plan could not specify areas that would be designated because of the that process. She stated that a suggestion was made that the plan should reference a historic street pattern and Clarion & Associates agreed, but felt that should be part of the master plan process.

Commissioner Muir stated that Clarion suggested putting some sustainability language into the preservation plan, and inquired if they had done that.

Ms. Zeigler stated that the sustainability concept was woven throughout the report. Sustainability had always been a key component of the plan as one of the five themes, but others working with Clarion on sustainability, provided language specifically on solar panels that could be included in the City's design guidelines.

Commissioner Muir inquired about the idea of embodied energy.

Ms. Zeigler stated that the concept of embodied energy in an existing building was the idea that energy went into creating the materials that made that building, transporting those materials to the site, and putting all the materials together to build the building. She stated that once the building was torn down all of that embodied energy was lost, so it was greener and more sustainable economically and environmentally to keep existing buildings wherever possible so that the embodied energy was not lost.

Commissioner Muir stated that currently loss of embodied energy was not reviewed during the economic hardship analysis, or the conventional wisdom in construction regarding when a building was remodeled, twice as much energy and cost was invested in demolition as there was in rebuilding new. He stated that economies typically leaned toward demolition and new construction, as opposed to adaptive reuse. He inquired if the conventional wisdom within the historic preservation community would eventually manifest in the construction economies.

Ms. Zeigler stated that economic hardship was a separate process to ensure that there was not a taking.

Commissioner Muir inquired if the cost of adaptive reuse, upgrade, or restoration was supported by the market place, because if economic hardship could not be demonstrated, then it was not supported by the market place. He stated that embodied energy was a great notion and a sustainable idea, but he had not seen it manifest in the market place—it was still cheaper to demolish and rebuild from scratch.

Ms. Zeigler stated she disagreed, but it would depend on the building, some it would not make sense to keep and some buildings it would.

Acting Chair McHugh stated that a new building, even if it was LEED certified, could take up to 65 years to recoup what was lost from the destruction of embodied energy, plus what it took to create the new building.

Ms. Zeigler stated that it also created more landfill.

Commissioner De Lay stated that on page 11 of the plan it stated, *currently local historic designation is on property deeds*. She stated that she rarely saw this, so what does that statement actually mean.

Ms. Zeigler stated that historic information was given to the County and they placed it on the deeds.

Commissioner De Lay stated that she was not completely happy with the draft document and she felt that the plan needed another six months to work out some of the fine points. She stated the idea of all that would need to happen before this plan could actually go forward was still a little scary.

Commissioner Fife stated that he hoped that one of the roles of the mentioned Architectural Review Committee and the Historic Landmark Commission, would not include providing proactive advice to property owners on how to meet the requirements of the City's preservation regulations and guidelines, which He felt should be coming from the City staff. He stated that he did appreciate enabling broader use of solar collectors on historic buildings, and he supported historic preservation because the City needed a wide range of building ages to provide economic opportunities for people of various economic start-up businesses.

Ms. Comarell stated that she had met with D.J. Baxter, the Redevelopment Agency Director, about the letter that Clarion & Associates had written in response to their concerns. She stated that he was unable to make it to this meeting, but he wanted the following comments expressed: first, he appreciated Clarion's response. Second, they continue to have concerns with the methods of economic hardship, which was not in the plan yet. And last the RDA staff expressed their concern regarding conservation districts.

6:28:26 PM **Public Hearing**

Acting Chair McHugh opened the public hearing portion of the petition.

The following people spoke or submitted a hearing card in *support* to the proposed petition: **Rawlins Young** (2135 South 1900 East) stated that there was a theoretic law which stated that once something was established it was impossible to change, so this preservation document should be encouraged, but it should be realized that this was not a perfect document and things would need to be done to make it better. He stated that the City needed to do a real property land use survey of the City, which would allow elected officials to get a better grasp of what type of housing there was and how it should be preserved. **Cindy Cromer** (816 East 100 South) stated that anything that the RDA asks for, which is exclusive to their agency that is not available to small scale developers, creates an uneven playing field. She stated that she had purchased four properties in City registered districts since 2002 and for each of them the title search indicated that they were in City registered districts. She stated she was noticed on all four of those, but she had also actively looked for that information to make sure it was there. Ms. Cromer stated that the Planning Commission represented over half of those in the City that could actually initiate zoning petitions; she stated that the Historic Landmark Commission could not make proposals in the form of zoning amendments that would affect historic preservation, so that left it up to the Planning Commission. **Esther Hunter** (1049 Norris Place) stated that preservation was why she became involved in the City because historic preservation was a huge benefit. She stated she strongly supported the preservation plan moving forward and stated that she agreed with Ms. Cromer that as a former member of the Historic Landmark Commission it was frustrating to not be able to initiate petitions. She stated that on Page 97, the University area was listed as compromised instead of stable and the community council objected to that change of language because they did not agree with that.

Acting Chair McHugh closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Muir stated that he was concerned about the success of the sustainability initiatives and stated that it was important to change the ordinance to allow accessory structures and infill development, but it seemed that it would be politically easier if the changes to the sustainability ordinance went before the preservation plan. He stated that the preservation plan would cause a heightened agenda for historic preservation and

maintaining the status quo in single-family neighborhoods would make it more difficult to bring about those initiatives.

Ms. Comarell stated that Clarion & Associates not only did this preservation plan, but they were also working with the City on the sustainability ordinance, which related to historic preservation in areas like solar panels, as well as other aspects of City ordinances that particularly relate to planning and zoning. She stated that there was funding already in place for this and staff was working with the Mayor on this as well. She suggested that the heightened interest was already there.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that the sustainability efforts were ongoing and accessory units were part of that. He stated it might be wise to start with areas that were not so sensitive in a newly developing area like the Northwest Quadrant, as well as in other areas of the community where it may be something that would be easily accepted. He stated that there was heightened sensibility for sustainability goals and historic preservation, along with a number of other issues, and there would be some balancing that would need to be taken into consideration.

Ms. Coffey stated that one way that preservation and sustainability might be able to come together may be that large houses in historic districts that are zoned single-family could be allowed to have more units in that building, or opening up the types of uses that are allowed in historic sites, because currently it was very limited.

Commissioner Muir stated that Salt Lake City is relatively young and if a 50 year benchmark is used, then go back 50 years and Salt Lake City was predominately a single-family residential City. He stated that by moving forward with this the City was saying we are going to preserve these single-family neighborhoods, and then each subsequent neighborhood will want the same type of recognition. He stated that he was concerned that this would not enable the growth potential that this City has to have in order to help solve the fundamental and more critical everyday sustainability issues, which is people living together with common walls and floors within walking and biking distance of their jobs.

Ms. Zeigler stated that preservation was about preserving the building structures and sites, not about how those buildings were necessarily used. She stated that just because a neighborhood originated as single-family did not mean the City was trying to preserve it as such. She stated that some single-family dwellings could be used as commercial or multi-family.

Commissioner De Lay stated that the sustainability needs to be bumped up in the preservation plan, to plan for the future. She stated the rules about the economic hardship were either too difficult or not reasonable and those needed to be reviewed, but other than that she would be in favor of sending a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner Dean stated that on Page 74 there was a list of ten items which included: climate change and air quality, water quality and conservation, alternative energy production and energy conservation, mobility and transportation, urban forestry, housing and accessibility and diversity, community health and safety, food production and nutrition, recycling and waste reduction, and open space, parks, and trails. She stated that housing accessibility and diversity was not discussed elsewhere in the document and she would like to see more information and insight added to that framework, along with the other nine elements of sustainability.

Ms. Zeigler stated that those were all part of the sustainability plan, not the preservation plan.

Commissioner Dean suggested that a brief statement be included that explained how these sustainable items were linked regarding planning items, so the Planning Commission had some future guidance as to how those connections were made.

Ms. Zeigler stated that those ten points were what the Mayor and City Council had determined as an immediate goal, which was what the Sustainability Plan overall was being directed toward. She stated that preservation was only one component of sustainability, along with transportation and housing.

Commissioner Muir stated that it might be a good idea to get a general plan by using this technique within the document to show how to reconcile a conflict between two issues, or even a broader policy from the City.

Ms. Comarell stated that staff would request that from Clarion & Associates.

Commissioner Gallegos inquired if it would be possible for members of the Commission to work with staff on these issues.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that could be arranged.

Commissioner Muir stated that he would suggest that since the City Council had the final say on this, it should be forwarded to them with concerns and suggestions from the Planning Commission, because they may have a completely different mindset regarding this.

Commissioner De Lay stated that she would be in favor of recommending this tonight to the City Council, with the caveat that the Commission was not satisfied with the sustainability planning within this plan, as well as economic hardship.

7:07:03 PM **Motion**

Commissioner De Lay made a motion regarding Petition PLNPCM2009-00171, based on the findings of facts presented in the staff report and testimony heard at the meeting, the Planning Commission forwards a positive recommendation to the City Council for approval with the recommendation that the sustainability plan and goals within the Preservation Plan be revised, updated, and expanded to prevent potential conflicts between the City's preservation plan and the City's sustainability plan and goals, and that the economic hardship section be clarified.

Commissioner Muir seconded the motion.

Commissioners De Lay, Hill, Fife, Gallegos, Dean, Chambless, Muir, and Wirthlin voted, "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

Petition PLNPCM2009-00161; City of the Seven Gates— a request by Brylan Schultz, on behalf of City of the Seven Gate, for conditional use approval for an art studio, a community center, and a caretaker's quarters at approximately 2904 West 500 South. The subject property is in the M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) Zoning District and in Council District Two, represented by Van Turner.

This item was postponed.

Acting Chair McHugh announced a small break at 7:09 p.m.

Acting Chair McHugh reconvened the meeting at 7:14 p.m.

Briefing

7:15:25 PM Petitions PLNPCM2009-00170 and PLNPCM2009-00483; Euclid Small Area Plan—Staff is seeking feedback from the Planning Commission regarding options for future land use and zoning amendments for a portion of the Euclid Small Area Plan.

Acting Chair McHugh recognized Nick Britton as staff representative.

Mr. Britton stated that this briefing was a request for guidance from the Commission. He stated that this plan began about four years ago and because of staffing issues and other priorities this plan had been delayed until now. He stated that a lot of new information had come forth, and when this plan was taken back to the public a lot of what was desired by the community four years ago was no longer true, specifically some of the future land use recommendations. He stated that staff was recommending fitting the zoning to what was currently there as well as what was anticipated in the future, with the expansion of the downtown toward the west and the light rail line down North Temple.

Mr. Britton stated that staff was proposing a single-family zoning along Euclid, because a majority of the properties along Euclid were single-family homes and a fair amount of them were owner occupied. He stated that there were properties on the block that reflected the old industrial use that was still found throughout the neighborhood, and people in the neighborhood were concerned about the single-family zoning for a variety of reasons; however, there was strong support for some type of mixed-use zoning.

Commissioner De Lay inquired if staff could explain why they were moving in this direction. She stated that the idea was to preserve the single-family residences and thus down zone to make that happen; however, the neighborhood liked the mixed-use zoning and was not necessarily on board with that plan, so what would staff recommend the Commission do.

Mr. Britton stated that if a mixed-use zone was put in place and the zoning was changed, the single-family homes would be grandfathered in as legal-conforming uses.

Commissioner Fife inquired if there was a Trax station proposed in this area.

Mr. Britton stated that there would be one on 800 West and then one along the Jordan River near the State Fairpark.

Commissioner Fife stated that based on previous discussion on how hard it was to up-zone an area to get more density, he would support a high-density zone over down zoning, since it would also be two or three blocks from a Trax station and bounded by two highways and an industrial site—it seemed the best scenario would be a mixed-use or multi-family environment.

Commissioner Hill stated that she liked this proposal because it contained really great pedestrian links. She stated that commercial support should be provided in every neighborhood to sustain families and individuals.

Commissioner Gallegos stated that there was the potential of losing some affordable housing stock within the City, and how that should be dealt with was another question. He stated that within a mixed-use zone, single-family residences could still be part of that.

Commissioner Chambless stated that most of these homes were constructed in 1927 before there was zoning, so this was a historic area of the City and given that this neighborhood is in transition, he suggested looking at what will make this a dynamic neighborhood fifty (50) years from now.

Mr. Britton stated that to make this neighborhood dynamic it would require not only a mixed-use zone, but having mixed-uses actually throughout the neighborhood. He stated that relooking at what was allowed in a residential mixed-use zone would be enlightening for the neighborhood; maybe some would be surprised that a gas station would be allowed under that zoning.

Commissioner Dean suggested a neighborhood commercial zone along 900 West.

Commissioner Hill stated that was a good point because 100 South and 900 West looked well planned and would become a neighborhood hub and an economic engine that would drive that community.

Mr. Britton stated that the people in Euclid were thinking about the future, there were going to be development pressures and very little incentives to rebuild in this area and the homes that currently were there might encounter future issues with maintenance and home occupations.

Commissioner Fife stated that this area was never single-family zoned, and yet the housing was now a huge concern.

Commissioner De Lay inquired if this area should be made a historic area to protect the housing.

Ms. Coffey stated that was one of the issues that back in 2004 were raised. She stated that if the zoning was for more intensive uses, that would not help with preservation. She stated that within the context of the Preservation Plan the Euclid area was looked at and it was concluded that it would not be very eligible for historic designation.

Commissioner Muir stated that he would support Commissioner Fife's recommendation that this become all mixed-use, which would give flexibility going forward. He stated that this area seemed to be starved for investment; and this might give incentive for investment because there were very limited areas of mixed-use in the City.

[7:42:51 PM](#) **PLNPCM2009-00173; Zoning District Purpose Statements**—a briefing regarding amendments to the Purpose Statements for the Residential, Commercial, Manufacturing, Downtown, Gateway and Special Purpose Zoning Districts. The purpose of the zoning text amendments is to ensure that the purpose statements are consistent with and reflect the overall purpose of Title 21A, ensure that the individual zones fulfill the intent statement of Part III of Title 21A, remove contradictory statements and assist in the administration of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed changes are city-wide.

Acting Chair McHugh recognized Nick Norris as staff representative.

Mr. Norris stated that this was a follow-up briefing to the work session in June regarding conditional use issues the City Council had came up with. He stated that staff was looking to remove any contradictory statements as well as the zoning districts should also be implementing the policies of all the applicable master plans. He stated that the purpose statements were consistent with the overall intent statement of the zoning ordinance, so these proposed changes should improve and become a stronger tool for staff when it comes to zoning interpretations.

Mr. Norris stated that the zoning ordinance statements were divided into classification types: residential, commercial, manufacturing, downtown, gateway, and special purpose. He stated that within each one of these there were several specific zoning districts and each had a statement explaining what they were intended to do.

Mr. Norris stated that staff had worked with the City assembled taskforce to help with all of the zoning amendments and they also reviewed why the zone exists, what it was trying to do, where it was appropriate, who it impacted, And how to make the purposes reality. He stated that they also compared this to purpose statements from Portland, Oregon.

Commissioner De Lay stated that after reading through this, jargon such as *sustainability* and *live/work* were not found within the document. She wondered if staff had found such words inappropriate.

Mr. Norris stated that one of the reasons for that was staff was trying to make the language very specific regarding what each district was trying to do. He stated that a lot of those concepts were built into the purpose statements without using those specific words and actually there was a conscious effort to stay away from some of those terms because a lot of them were ambiguous and meant very different things to different people. He stated that staff wanted to focus on what that district was intending to do.

Commissioner Dean stated that she felt these were great values, but how was staff translating them into the actual ordinance.

Mr. Norris stated that was what the standards were for, and at this point in time those standards had not specifically been looked at, but staff had identified some that may not correlate to the purpose statements that may need to be looked at; for example in the TC-75 zoning district there were some standards within that which need to be modified in order to actually fulfill that purpose.

Commissioner Hill stated that she liked the use of the word, and the concept of pedestrians throughout the entire document.

Commissioner Dean inquired if there were current design standards for commercial corridors.

Mr. Norris stated that there were certain standards built into the various districts that would be design standards.

Commissioner Fife inquired if there was a definition of how many units per acre would make a sustainable community.

Mr. Norris stated that it would vary on what type of community was being created and what was sustainable for that community, for example in an urban core the answer would be as many units as possible. There were some studies that recommended 50 units per acre and up depending on what type of development it was.

Commissioner Muir inquired if preserving urban fabric was relevant in the D-1 zone, or if it should be changed to preserving contributing structures.

Mr. Norris stated the RDA had mentioned something about that and staff would look into it.

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

This document, along with the digital recording, constitute the official minutes of the Salt Lake City Planning Commission held on July 8, 2009.

Go to FTR Gold at <ftp://ftrftp.slcgov.com/FTRPlayerPlusV21.exe> to download the digital recording.

Tami Hansen