

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

In Room 326 of the City & County Building

451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah

Wednesday, May 27, 2009

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

A field trip was held prior to the meeting. Planning Commissioners present were: Frank Algarin, Tim Chambless, Michael Fife, Kathleen Hill, Susie McHugh, and Mary Woodhead. Staff members present were: Joel Paterson, and Ray Milliner.

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. Chair Woodhead called the meeting to order at 5:52 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; Cheri Coffey, Programs Manager; Joel Paterson, Programs Manager; Lynn Pace, Deputy City Attorney; Paul Neilson, City Attorney; Robin Zeigler, Senior Planner; Nole Walkingshaw, Senior Planner; Ana Valdemoros, Associate Planner; Ray Milliner, Principal Planner, and Tami Hansen, Planning Commission Secretary.

5:53:11 PM Approval of Minutes from Wednesday May 13, 2009.

Commissioner Muir made a motion to approve the minutes subject to noted changes. Commissioner Dean seconded the motion. The minutes were approved. Commissioners Chambless and Hill abstained.

5:55:13 PM Report of the Chair and Vice Chair

Chair Woodhead presented a plaque to former Planning Commissioner Peggy McDonough.

5:57:17 PM Report of the Director

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that the City Council's budget for the Community and Economic Development Department was discussed and one of the items given to the Council was the project priorities list to give them an idea of what the Planning Department was currently working on. He stated that each Commissioner should have also received a copy of this and staff had spent some time gathering this information so that each project was identified then management reviewed the projects and current staff levels and decided on the priority ranking.

Commissioner De Lay suggested identifying each neighborhood plan and when they were adopted for the use of the Commission.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that would be done.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that the North Temple Charette was planned for June 18 at the State Fair Park from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. And on June 24, the Commission would receive an update on the Northwest Quadrant plan.

Commissioner Wirthlin stated that it seemed critical to spend some time out on the Northwest Quadrant because the Commission had never been involved with a master plan that dealt with raw land.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that was a good idea.

[6:08:06 PM](#) **2040 Plan presentation** by Val Halford of Wasatch Front Regional Council.

Sam Clem, Dave Evertson, and Aly Koffsky gave a presentation.

Public Hearings

[6:45:18 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](#)

Chair Woodhead recognized Robin Zeigler as staff representative.

[6:47:30 PM](#) **Public Hearing**

Chair Woodhead opened the public hearing portion of the petition.

The following people spoke or submitted a hearing card in *support* of the proposed petition: **Warren Lloyd** (911 Military Drive) stated he was the Vice Chair of the Historic Landmark Commission (HLC) and also served on the Mayor's Citizen's Advisory Committee that had worked on this plan. He stated that this was a large document and there are some specific topics that would help the HLC and on a larger scale it would help the City by giving a better understanding to how preservation worked with redevelopment and sustainability, as well as economic development. He stated that there were five themes and the second one talked about a broader range of tools that might be developed to help all the Boards and Commissions deal with the ideas of preservation including: conservation districts, transfer of development rights, and insights into what needed to be improved relating to economic hardship and that process. It gave clarification to demolition by neglect, how to achieve housing density in the City, which works with current and future districts. He stated that there were also some suggestions about education relative to sustainability and preservation. **Sandra Hatch** (1141 Michigan Avenue) stated she was an architect and she had represented the spectrum of economic backgrounds, a lot of her clients did not know what to do in the historic districts due to costs. She stated that the tax reductions were helpful, but it should be spread out over the entire City. She cautioned to keep in mind that not everybody that lived in historic districts have the money to bring their homes up to what was considered a high preservation level, they just wanted to get by and make their houses comfortable. She stated that the size of the document was overwhelming and she would suggest something that would be easily implemented and easy to follow.

Commissioner De Lay inquired what Ms. Hatch determined to be the biggest obstacle for her clients when working with the City.

Ms. Hatch stated that windows, material choices, and looking into alternative materials, and when people were approached by sales representatives they were not quite sure how they fit into the historic context.

Commissioner De Lay suggested putting her concerns into written format and submitting them to Ms. Zeigler.

Kirk Huffaker (Utah Heritage Foundation) stated that he respected Ms. Hatch's perspective because she was out working in the community and if she says the document was too big it probably was for most people. He stated he also served on the Citizen's Advisory Committee and the scope was asking for everything from the beginning of the preservation movement in the City to the ambitions of ten plus years out, which was why this document was so large and such a technical document. He stated that the 2040 plan had also reviewed a lot of these same concerns. He stated the technical aspects of how this document was executed were important and this plan was the basis for that.

Chair Woodhead closed the public hearing portion of the petition.

[6:59:18 PM](#) **Discussion**

[7:40:06 PM](#) **Motion**

Commissioner De Lay made a motion regarding PLNPCM2009-00171, based on the findings listed in the staff report and public testimony, that the Planning Commission continues this item to a later date.

Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion.

All in favor voted, “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Woodhead announced a small break at 7:40 p.m.

Chair Woodhead reconvened the meeting at 7:51 p.m.

PLNPCM2009-000191 City of the Seven Gates Conditional Use—a request by Brylan Schultz located at approximately 2904 West 500 South for conditional use approval to have living quarters for an on-site caretaker. The property is in the M-2 (Heavy Manufacturing) zoning district and in Council District Two, represented by Van Turner.

This item was postponed.

Commissioner Algarin recused himself from the meeting.

[7:51:10 PM](#) **Zoning Text Amendment; Petition PLNPCM2009-00422**—The Planning Division is reviewing a petition initiated by the Salt Lake City Planning Commission to amend the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance. The purpose of the petition is to allow “Public/private utility transmission wires, lines, pipes, and poles” in the Lowland Conservancy Overlay District as a Conditional Use. The Lowland Conservancy Overlay District is generally located west of the Salt Lake International Airport and north of I-80. This area is located in City Council District One, represented by Carlton Christensen. [View: Staff Report](#)

Chair Woodhead recognized Nole Walkingshaw as staff representative.

Mr. Walkingshaw stated that two months ago the Commission discussed a trail through the Lowlands Overlay Conservancy District and a pipeline beneath that trail. He stated that there was a lot of public concern regarding intrusion into that area, specifically involving the impact on birds and bird clubs. He noted that the issue was not with the pipeline running through the area, but its association with the trail.

Mr. Walkingshaw stated that the Planning Commission initiated this ordinance to amend the ordinance of the Lowlands Overlay Conservancy District to allow pipeline transmission corridors as a conditional use through this area, which had been done. He stated that staff’s recommendation was for the subterranean infrastructure, primarily due to the concern that hunting and bird watching activities would be impacted in that area.

Commissioner Muir stated that in the conditional use application, Condition 3 titled Restoration of Disturbed Area, under item two of the findings; implied restoration would extend to any kind of maintenance activity as well, such as having to repair the pipeline, and if the staff reports intent was that after those repairs the landscape would need to be restored.

Mr. Walkingshaw stated that was correct.

Chair Woodhead invited the applicant to the table.

Mr. Jim Townsend (Senior Vice President of UNEV Pipeline Co.) stated that any damage caused to the area by their company during maintenance would be restored.

Commissioner Dean stated that there was a reference to a permanent right-of-way of 50 feet. She inquired about what that would entail.

Mr. Townsend stated that it was an area that was 50 feet wide, or 25 feet on either side of the center of the pipeline that allowed UNEV to maintain the pipeline.

Commissioner Dean inquired if this was simply an easement and not a sort of surface treatment.

Mr. Townsend stated that was correct.

Commissioner Dean inquired if it would be reasonable to request a type of bond on this re-vegetation work.

Mr. Nielson stated that this was a conditional use, so if a bond was reasonably related then it would be within the Commission's authority to require one.

Mr. Walkingshaw stated that Salt Lake City was not the permitting agency for the work or the inspections; the Federal Department of Transportation was that authority, so there would need to be more discussion because this was located in an overlapping jurisdiction.

Commissioner Chambless stated that he was concerned that the pipeline was placed in a seismic zone and close to a body of water, and inquired if Mr. Townsend saw a problem with this.

Mr. Townsend stated that it was not uncommon to build a pipeline in this type of environment.

8:02:11 PM **Public Hearing**

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

8:03:23 PM **Motion**

Commissioner Wirthlin made a motion regarding Petition PLNPCM2009-00422, the Salt Lake City Zoning Text Amendment Lowland Conservancy Overlay District, based on the staff report and discussion, the Planning Commission recommends to the City Council approval of the zoning text amendment.

Commissioner Gallegos seconded the motion.

Discussion of the motion:

Commissioner Fife stated that in the staff report there were two different wording changes, and inquired if the Commission was only referencing the one regarding the subterranean.

Commissioner Wirthlin stated that was the intent of the motion.

Mr. Walkingshaw stated that attachment A was to add the underground utility infrastructure. He stated that if the Commission would like it to read, *subterranean utility transmission infrastructure* that could be done.

Commissioner Fife stated he was fine with how it currently read.

Chair Woodhead stated that the motion was in reference to attachment A and called for the vote.

Commissioners De Lay, Dean, Chambless, Hill, Muir, Wirthlin, McHugh, and Gallegos voted, “Aye” and Commissioner Fife voted, “No”. The motion passed.

8:06:17 PM UNEV Pipeline Project; Petition PLNPCM2009-00423—The Salt Lake City Planning Division is processing a request for approval of a conditional use by UNEV Pipeline to develop an underground petroleum distribution pipeline. The UNEV Pipeline Project, located at approximately 705 N Wright Brothers Drive and approximately 1070 North 5200 West. The property is zoned M-1 light manufacturing, and portions of the property are within the Lowland Conservancy Overlay District. This application is being processed in conjunction with petition PLNPCM2009-00422. This property is located in City Council District One, represented by Carlton Christensen (Staff contact: Nole Walkingshaw)

8:06:20 PM Motion

Commissioner Wirthlin made a motion regarding Petition PLNPCM2009-00423, based on the findings listed in the staff report, discussion and information received from the applicant and Planning staff, the Planning Commission finds that the general applicable standards are met for this conditional use, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Approval subject to the adoption of Petition PLNPCM2009-00422 Zoning Text Amendment to the Lowlands Conservancy Overlay District, by the City Council. The purpose of the request is to amend the Lowlands Conservancy Overlay District (LC) regulations to allow only underground utility transmission infrastructure to be considered in the LCOD as a conditional use.**
- 2. Construction is subject to the standards of review and inspections as required by the Federal Departments of Transportation, who oversees the following required permits for this section of the line.**
- 3. Restoration of the disturbed area with native vegetation and topography consistent with the vegetation and topography in place prior to the disturbance.**

Commissioner McHugh seconded the motion.

Discussion of the Motion:

Commissioner Dean inquired if the Commission wanted to discuss a potential bond for the work.

Commissioner Wirthlin stated that he did not see a need for that.

Commissioners De Lay, Dean, Chambless, Hill, Muir, Wirthlin, McHugh, and Gallegos voted, “Aye”. Commissioner Fife voted, “No”. The motion passed.

Commissioner Fife stated that the reason he voted in the negative on both petitions was because there seemed to be other ways to get to North Salt Lake City without going through a Lowland Conservancy District.

[8:08:56 PM](#) **Our Lady of Guadalupe at 715 West 300 North**—a request by Catholic Diocese of Salt lake City, represented by John Sparano, for various approvals to accommodate a place of worship, related uses and expansion of the parking lot. The project is located in an R-1/5000 Single Family Residential Zoning District. The property is located in City Council District Two, represented by Van Turner. **View:** [Staff Report](#)

- a. **PLNSUB2008-00698 Preliminary Subdivision**—a request by the applicant for preliminary approval to combine four lots into one single lot.
- b. **PLNSUB2008-00856 Conditional Use Planned Development**—a request by the applicant to accommodate more than one principal structure in one lot including the place of worship and the rectory.
- c. **PLNPCM2008-00697 Conditional Use**—a request by the applicant to accommodate the existing place of worship and expand the parking lot on a lot smaller than 4 acres.

Chair Woodhead recognized Ana Valdemoros as staff representative.

[8:14:30 PM](#) **Public Hearing**

Chair Woodhead opened the public hearing portion of the petition; she noted that there was no one present to speak. Chair Woodhead closed the public hearing.

[8:19:10 PM](#) **Motion**

Commissioner De Lay made a motion regarding Petition PLNSUB2008-00698, Minor Subdivision, based on the findings of facts listed in the staff report, the Planning Commission approves the petition subject to the following conditions:

1. **A deed needs to be recorded at the Salt Lake County Recorder's office to consolidate the existing parcels into a new lot.**
2. **A landscape plan shall be provided as part of the building permit review with final approval delegated to the Planning Director.**
3. **A light obscuring fence should be placed on the west side of the new parking lot.**
4. **Compliance with all departmental comments.**

Commissioner Chambless seconded the motion

Commissioners De Lay, Dean, Chambless, Muir, Wirthlin, McHugh, and Gallegos voted, "Aye". Commissioners Fife and Hill voted, "No". The motion passed.

[8:20:08 PM](#) **Motion**

Commissioner De Lay made a motion regarding Petition PLNSUB2008-00869, Planned Development, based on the findings of facts listed in the staff report, the Planning Commission approves the petition subject to the following conditions:

1. **A deed needs to be recorded at the Salt Lake County Recorder's office to consolidate the existing parcels into a new lot.**

2. A landscape plan shall be provided as part of the building permit review with final approval delegated to the Planning Director.
3. A light obscuring fence should be placed on the west side of the new parking lot.
4. Compliance with all departmental comments.

Commissioner Gallegos seconded the motion

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

[8:20:52 PM](#) Motion

Commissioner De Lay made a motion regarding Petition PLNPCM2008-00697, Conditional Use, based on the findings of facts listed in the staff report, the Planning Commission approves the petition subject to the following conditions:

1. A deed needs to be recorded at the Salt Lake County Recorder’s office to consolidate the existing parcels into a new lot.
2. A landscape plan shall be provided as part of the building permit review with final approval delegated to the Planning Director.
3. A light obscuring fence should be placed on the west side of the new parking lot.
4. Compliance with all departmental comments.

Commissioner Muir seconded the motion

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

Issues Only Public Hearing

[8:21:42 PM](#) **Capitol Park Planned Development Phases 1-3 and The Maridien at Capitol Park Amended**—a request by the Capitol Park Planned Development Homeowner’s Association to transfer ownership of roads within the subdivision from private to public ownership. The land is located in the Foothill Residential (FR-3) zone in City Council District three, represented by Eric Jergensen. [View](#): Staff Report

- a. **PLNSUB2009-00445 Conditional Use Planned Development Amendment**—a request by the applicant to amend a planned development approved on August 10, 1995 to allow the transfer of Capitol Park Avenue, Penny Parade Drive, Redbrick Court, Charity Cove, and Caring Cove from private ownership to public.
- b. **PLNSUB2008-00902 Subdivision Amendment**—a request by the applicant to dedicate Capitol Park Avenue, Penny Parade Drive, Redbrick Court, Charity Cove, and Caring Cove to the City.

Chair Woodhead recognized Ray Milliner as staff representative.

Mr. Milliner stated that this application was an amendment to a planned development as well as a subdivision amendment for the Capital Park Planned Development. He stated that this project was originally approved by the Planning Commission in 1995, and part of the approval was to create the streets within the subdivision as public streets. He stated that one thing that was not clear in the staff report was that the applicant was requesting that these streets be dedicated to the City as well as the utilities.

Mr. Milliner stated that the original approval was negotiated with the developer of the property, who was currently not involved with the project anymore after developing and then selling it. He stated that he did so with the finding that this street would be held privately and part of the rationale for the approval was that it would be private because at the time of construction it did not meet the minimum standards for dedication to the City, and the primary issue was the slope of the street in some areas being fourteen to fifteen percent where the City standard is ten percent.

Mr. Milliner stated that this property is currently owned by the Home Owner's Association and they are requesting the dedication. City departments stated that there would need to be some upgrades to the sidewalks, curb, and gutter and an assessment for street lights. Also the Caring Cove landscaping would need to be modified to create a twenty foot right-of-way, and the steep section would need to be mitigated. He noted that there is a need for a process that would deal with the dedication of streets; currently the City does not have a set of criteria that could be applied to the dedication of a street or utilities, making the findings of these types of dedications more arbitrary. Staff is asking the Commission if these criteria should be created prior to the dedication, or if it should be moved forward.

Chair Woodhead inquired if from a due process procedural standpoint the need for that process would not affect this petition.

Mr. Milliner stated that the Home Owner's Association is vested, so any set of criteria adopted at a future date would not apply to this application.

Commissioner De Lay inquired about the timeframe of this petition and what the priority of this is.

Mr. Milliner stated that the Mayor's Office, the City Council, and the Planning Department had a subcommittee of staff that has been meeting to periodically discuss this.

Commissioner Chambless inquired what the cost to the City would be regarding this petition.

Mr. Milliner stated that the cost would be future maintenance and snow plowing.

Vice Chair McHugh stated that the City had already been collecting property taxes from property owners in the area, which would cover these types of services.

Commissioner Gallegos inquired who would be responsible for the costs of the new upgrades.

Mr. Milliner stated that the Home Owner's Association would cover those costs.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that in the future it should be that developers will not be allowed to not build to City standards, that even with privately dedicated streets they will need to meet those in the event that the City takes them over at some point.

Chair Woodhead invited the applicants Mr. David Hershey and Mr. Justin Bear to the table.

Mr. Hershey stated they represented the Capital Park Home Owner's Association (HOA). He stated that as was mentioned this project was built over ten years ago, the HOA had been maintaining the roads and utilities since that time and when the City approved this there was a requirement to build utilities to City standards through an agreement, and after meeting with several departments throughout the City it was determined that this project was feasible.

He stated that there were new condominiums built there that had increased the burden on the private streets, and the utility lines were now a combination of public and private, which created a unified grid of utility lines and made the need of private lines unnecessary.

Mr. Hershey stated the HOA had spoken to the Greater Avenues Community Council and they had taken a neutral position and the homeowners in the area signed petitions in favor of this. He stated he would like the Planning Commission to review this and give guidance since there was no process.

Commissioner Fife inquired if as part of the HOA's budget there was a plan to develop the grade issue or if at this point it was just being ignored.

Mr. Hershey stated currently they had not seen budget numbers on this nor a specific recommendation from the City Engineering department on what they would require, it was anticipated that those conditions would be articulated when this petition was heard at a public hearing.

Mr. Bear stated that he had met with Ted Itchon with the Fire Department and his primary concern for adjusting the grade was so that fire engines and other vehicles could traverse that grade. He mentioned that one possibility would be to allow the fire department either license or an easement over an area of land to allow fire trucks to turn, which would resolve the problem.

[8:51:37 PM](#) **Public Hearing**

Chair Woodhead opened the public hearing portion of the petition.

The following people spoke or submitted cards in *support* of the petition: **Ruthann Hamilton** (Capital Park HOA Board member) stated that some would assume that the homeowners of the HOA lived on that private road, but that was not the case, the development included homes on 11th and 12th Avenue and one on "D" and "F" Street. She stated that those living on the public streets were also paying for the maintenance and upkeep of the private roads.

Commissioner Gallegos inquired if her house was built by the same developer.

Ms. Hamilton stated that was correct. And at one time this development was centered around the veteran's hospital and then land around the Primary Children's hospital was developed into lots. She noted that later the veteran's hospital was removed from the development and privately owned.

John Yoon (President of the Board of Trustees of the Capital Park HOA) stated that the neighbors were not asking for exemption from responsibilities, they were asking for guidance from the City on what the best way to proceed would be.

Commissioner Chambless inquired if the neighborhood would be willing to post a bond, to cover future issues that may recur by nature.

Mr. Yoon noted that the bond idea was discussed and the HOA would be obligated to take this back to the neighbors, and currently the neighborhood was in a state of collaboration and cooperation and a desire to escape spiraling legal fees.

Mr. Nielson inquired about the scope of the vote of the neighborhood to move forward with this, and what parameters were defined as to what they were requesting of the City.

Mr. Yoon noted that a vote was taken only regarding the dedication proposal. He stated about 75 percent of the neighborhood voted to pursue this.

Chair Woodhead stated that this was an Issues Only Hearing so there would be time, if it was decided to proceed with a bond, for the HOA to take it back to the board and neighborhood for discussion.

John Paul Kennedy (805 Grandridge Drive) stated he and his wife were in strong favor of this request. **Jonathan Ruga** (Resident of Capital Park) stated that there were a lot of pros in turning over the streets to the City, but there were some homeowner's that wanted to understand what the conditions were for this transfer and what the cost would be before an overall consensus.

Chair Woodhead stated that tonight the Planning Commission was listening to the applicant and to the neighborhoods input and deciding whether or not this would be a petition the Commission would be interested in hearing, and some indications of what conditions would be necessary, some of which would come from City departments, and would allow the opportunity to obtain a reasonable sense of what the cost might be.

Chair Woodhead closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Muir inquired if there were other properties in common other than the street for the HOA, and if the street was dedicated to the City was there any reason for the HOA to continue.

Mr. Hershey stated that yes, the HOA also maintained a park which was currently owned by the City, but was part of the development and located up "D" Street. There were also some common areas that were maintained by the HOA.

Commissioner Gallegos inquired if the park was opened to the public or private.

Mr. Hershey stated it was public.

Commissioner Hill stated that one of the arguments that counsel was using was that there were special circumstances and the homeowners in the area were really bearing a burden that was the result of the developers choices to move this development through in a way that maximized his returns by putting more lots by not making them compliant with City standards, which was unfortunate. She stated the Commission was trying to help as well, but there were only two accesses to this development, so the argument that the condominium would increase traffic when the entrance to that was off a City street was a weak argument. She suggested not taking out the green strip that existed in the cul-de-sac, maybe there is a way to reduce that or provide easements on the neighbor's property without getting rid of that beautification strip.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that Planning staff was not sure as to whether or not City officials wanted to consider taking on private streets, since currently that process did not exist. He stated that if there was no interest in doing this than it would not be pursued any further, and if there was interest staff would structure some kind of process to allow for this to happen that would probably need to involve Public Utilities and City Engineers, and then if the applicant was willing to do this they would then go through that process.

Chair Woodhead inquired if any of the Commissioners wanted to express an opinion on this.

Vice Chair McHugh stated that she would be interested in pursuing this and to come up with conditions for this specific application.

Mr. Milliner stated that if the Commission wanted to pursue this then he would work with the various City Departments to gather information that the HOA would need to make their decision and then bring it back before the Commission. He stated that there should also be some criteria drafted that the applicant and Commission could review.

Mr. Nielson stated that there was a planned development amendment application and at some point a vote would need to be made on that and the applicants due process rights needed to be respected.

Commissioner Wirthlin stated that it would be one thing if the applicant was coming to the Commission simply wanting to wash their hands of the past. He stated he would be in favor of the applicant's proposal and that it would be a fairness issue

to at least pursue this and come up with some conditions and mitigate some of the conditions in an attempt to assist the City in bringing areas up to City code, but to be flexible enough to say if the grade is only affecting the fire trucks then let's find a place where they could turn around and not arbitrarily hold up an artificial standard, but be open to creative solutions to accomplish this. He stated that the Commission should also not be quick to require a bond, staff and City departments should figure out what is needed there.

Commissioner Dean stated that there should be a City policy that did not permit streets to be built outside of City standards, so that when this happened in the future problems may be alleviated. She stated she would have a hard time allowing the street dedication if it was not brought up to City standards, perhaps it could be mitigated, but that would be something that would need to be reviewed by the Commission before it was allowed.

Commissioner Chambless stated that the best way to avoid a problem was to not create it. He stated that four months after the zoning rewrite, that took years to create, this problem was allowed in. The City allowed a development to go forth that was substandard, there probably is a creative solution out there and he would suggest a bond or whatever is appropriate that will be fair for all parties involved.

Commissioner Fife stated that there are standards for City streets and staff should work with the applicant to see what it will take to bring the streets up to those standards, and if they are willing to bear the cost of doing that he would be favorably inclined to proceed with this.

Chair Woodhead stated that there seemed to be a willingness for this to move forward with various thoughts on the conditions. She inquired if any Commissioners were opposed to this in theory, and noted that it seemed the full Commission agreed to move forward with this.

The meeting adjourned at 9:19 p.m.

This document, along with the digital recording, constitute the official minutes of the Salt Lake City Planning Commission held on May 27, 2009.

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

Tami Hansen