

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
In Room 326 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, March 10, 2010**

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

There field trip prior to the meeting was cancelled. A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called 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, Cheri Coffey, Programs Manager; Casey Stewart, Principal Planner; Nick Norris, Senior Planner; Janice Lew, Senior Planner; Everett Joyce, Senior Planner; Paul Nielson, City Attorney; and Tami Hansen, Senior Secretary.

Report of the Chair and Vice Chair

Chair De Lay presented a plaque to Prescott Muir, who served on the Planning Commission from 2001—2010, and thanked him for his service.

Report of the Director

Mr. Sommerkorn stated staff made some changes to the notification requirements in the Zoning Ordinance and discovered later there were notification requirements in the actual body of the ordinance in the Planned Development section, along with a few other sections. He noted staff wanted to make sure those requirements were consistent with the overall notification requirement and rather than bring this back before the Commission, Mr. Neilson agreed a technical correction could be made to the Zoning Ordinance for consistency. Mr. Sommerkorn clarified these technical changes would not change the substance or intent of what the Commission recommended to the City Council.

Commissioner Woodhead stated she reviewed the memorandum and felt the changes were exactly what the Commission's understanding and expectations were.

Motion

Commissioner Gallegos made a motion that the technical adjustments to the Zoning Ordinance concurred with the intent of the Planning Commission's previous action.

Commissioner Woodhead seconded the motion.

Commissioners McHugh, Fife, Dean, Gallegos, Chambless, Woodhead, Wirthlin, and Algarin voted, "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Minutes from Wednesday, February 24, 2010

Commissioner McHugh made a motion to approve the February 24, 2010 minutes as written. Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion. Commissioners voted, “Aye”. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Hearing

PLNPCM2010-00072;Odd Fellows Hall Historic Landmark Site Re-designation—a request by the Administration for re-designation of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows Hall located at approximately 26 West Market Street as a Landmark Site on the Salt Lake City Register of Cultural Resources. The petition is for a zoning map amendment to re-list the Landmark Site, formerly located at 39 West Market Street, at its new location. This requires the Planning Commission to forward a recommendation to the City Council. The property is zoned D-1 Central Business District and is located in City Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott.

Chair De Lay recognized Janice Lew as staff representative.

Ms. Lew stated the Odd Fellows building was listed as a landmark site in 1998, and as part of the mitigation measures for the upcoming expansion of the Moss Courthouse, the GSA had relocated the building across the street from the original location at 39 West Market Street, to approximately 26 West Market Street. This petition request was to relist the building at this current location.

She stated the Historic Landmark Commission reviewed this petition at their last meeting and forwarded a positive recommendation to the Planning Commission and the City Council. She stated the Downtown Community Council also reviewed this request and voted in favor of it. Ms. Lew stated based on the analysis found in the staff report staff recommended the Commission forwarded a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner Woodhead thanked Ms. Lew for the great staff report, which included the history of the Odd Fellows Association.

Commissioner Chambless stated he appreciated the history as well, and added the Odd Fellows building was contemporaneous with the City & County Building.

Commissioner Dean stated obviously the historic designation did not follow the building; it followed the site, and she inquired if during this application to re-designate the building, it had been in limbo.

Ms. Lew stated it had in a sense, but as part of the evaluation for mitigation measures, it was indicated this process would happen, as well as relisting the building on the National Register of Historic Places. She stated it was more of a formality because the building was currently for sale, and staff was trying to get that relisting in place, so the requirements in the zoning ordinance for the historic district would apply to that building in the new location.

Commissioner Dean inquired if this process could have been done prior to the move, or even finalized during the moving process.

Ms. Lew stated yes, but the records showed that after the building moved the listing went with it, so as far as being unprotected, there was an agreement with GSA, who specifically stated they did not want the historic designation review process to be in place during the time they owned the property.

Public Hearing

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

Motion

Commissioner Gallegos made a motion regarding Petition PLNPCM2010-00072, based on the analysis and findings in the staff report, the Planning Commission forwarded a positive recommendation to the City Council.

Commissioner McHugh seconded the motion.

Commissioners McHugh, Fife, Dean, Gallegos, Chambless, Woodhead, Wirthlin, and Algarin voted, "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.

Briefings

Proposed Regional Sports Complex. The Planning Commission will receive a briefing and discuss with staff various zoning issues relating to the proposed community recreation center (regional sports complex) to be located at approximately 2223 North Rose Park Lane.

Chair De Lay recognized Everett Joyce as staff representative.

Mr. Joyce stated the sports complex was permitted as a community and recreation center in the open space zoning; however, the 21 acres of agricultural zoning would need to be rezoned. He stated the new zone would be a mix of public and open space land to accommodate this complex. He stated future plans of this complex included a field house, which was an enclosed arena and could not be a conditional use under the open space zone. He noted staff opted to change the zone to public land where that field house would be built. He stated there was also 125 acres of open space zoned land and after these changes there would be 149 acres of open space zoned land and 17 acres of public land. He stated if all the acres were rezoned open space, staff could do a text amendment to allow arenas in an open space zone. He stated he would like the Planning Commission's input on which direction to take, or both options could be analyzed in the staff report as well.

Commissioner Fife inquired if the second option was to create a new natural open space zone.

Mr. Joyce stated because the project was in the design process, open space could be created along the river, but it was a restrictive zone because it allowed for trails and corridors, but did not allow parking at the trail heads. He stated until there was a better idea of how that would work with the soccer field complex itself, it was premature to zone that boundary open space.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated Emy Storheim managed the open space areas of the City and her open space inventory, along with the regulations which related were for any city owned property zoned open space. Which included all city parks, golf courses, and cemeteries, along with a number of spaces that people would be surprised were included as open space areas, because they were thinking natural open space. He Stated Ms. Storheim stated these different types of uses should be reviewed and redefined.

Chair De Lay inquired what the indoor arena was for, and why there needed to be 16 soccer fields.

Mr. Joyce stated Rick Graham, Public Services Director could answer those questions.

Mr. Graham stated the funding for this project was coming from two sources; first, a voter authorized 15.3 million dollars, which bonds could not be sold until the City match of 7.5 million dollars, which they had done. The City Council had authorized the sale of the bonds and the process still needed to be done. Second, the City needed to develop a restoration plan for the property that bordered the Jordan River, which had been estimated at 23 acres. A draft of that restoration was nearing completion and then the City would authorize the rest of the bonds.

Commissioner Gallegos inquired if the site plan was definite.

Mr. Graham stated the project was still being designed, but this site plan was the model they wanted to build as well as the model which modifications would be stemmed from.

Commissioner Gallegos inquired if the location of the field house would be the final location.

Mr. Graham stated in terms of location and cost, that location seemed to be the best place. He stated the 160 acres came from the State and was zoned open space and agricultural.

Commissioner Chambless inquired if the area of Salt Lake City with the fastest growth in the future was the Northwest Quadrant? He inquired if the intention here was to anticipate growth and meet those needs, while preserving land that had always been zoned open space.

Mr. Joyce stated the term open space was sometimes thought of as land that would never be developed, but major facilities are allowed in the open space zone.

Ms. Coffey stated this area was not close to the development of the Northwest Quadrant of the city, because the airport and the International Center were in between this area.

Commissioner Chambless stated in two to three decades this entire area would be filled in.

Mr. Joyce stated on the other side of the freeway the land would be zoned agricultural and business park development, but not housing.

Commissioner Chambless stated in terms of supply and demand baseball fields around the city were empty, but soccer fields were being used, so there was a need.

Mr. Graham stated the heaviest need was in the area of soccer, but there was also a need for baseball facilities and there were currently plans for up to six or eight baseball/softball diamonds at this site as well.

Commissioner Woodhead inquired if the City Council already agreed on using this space for soccer fields.

Mr. Joyce stated it was bonded and the use was allowed.

Commissioner Woodhead stated it would make sense to work on having better open space definitions, because it did not make sense to amend the definition to allow arenas, it seemed inconsistent. She stated if there was a way to move this forward as a type of open space she would feel more comfortable.

Commissioner Wirthlin stated currently an arena could be built under public lands designation as a conditional use, and then the rest would be zoned open space.

Commissioner Algarin stated the City needed a lot more recreational facilities. He stated he agreed with Commissioner Wirthlin, the zones should be kept as open space and public land.

Commissioner McHugh stated earlier Chair De Lay had inquired why 16 soccer fields were being built; she wondered if it was due to Real Salt Lake's 7.5 million match.

Mr. Graham stated there was no connection between the number of fields and the match from Real Salt Lake. He stated when this project was envisioned in 2003 as a large athletic complex and taken to the voters; multiple soccer and baseball fields were included. He stated there was a great need for soccer fields in Salt Lake City, as well as for football, lacrosse, and a variety of other activities. He stated over the years the community would find other uses for this type of athletic space and currently facilities were being placed in parks that increased traffic and public use, so this was one solution to those increases. He stated this would allow a lot of the activities to be taken out of public parks and reopened for the community at a location that could be accessed by the residents of the valley. He stated there was an amassing of athletic fields, both soccer and baseball, which allowed opportunities for public recreation and would produce an economic engine to help support the cost of maintaining a field like this.

Chair De Lay inquired if the Planning Commission could change the design at the public hearing, as far as the number of fields.

Commissioner Woodhead stated this was a zoning change so the Commission did not have the authority to do that.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated the soccer fields were a use by right, which did not come before the Commission for review. He stated the arena portion of the project would be reviewed through the conditional use process.

Commissioner Woodhead inquired what the community recreation element of this petition was.

Mr. Graham stated that was how the arena was defined.

Commissioner Woodhead stated there was a dearth of recreation on the Westside of the city, so if this was a recreation place for the residences of the Westside neighborhoods that would be great.

Mr. Graham stated it would be an indoor facility and would have a different type of character than a regular recreation center. It would operate year-round and provide spaces for more athletic and field types of uses, more of an open facility with artificial surfaces and locker rooms, but it would not have gymnasiums, climbing walls, or a swimming pool.

Commissioner Dean inquired if there were any existing or future planned transit stops close to the facility.

Mr. Joyce stated there was no transit service; however, there was freeway access off of I-215.

Commissioner Dean stated people might not want to have to drive across town to access this facility, so the heavy soccer use going on in the parks might be lost. She inquired if the City would be better served dispersing this amount of money to purchase and build more neighbor based fields to serve communities and help break the scale of this project up. She inquired if this was about tournaments or helping the communities.

Mr. Graham stated the option of building 16 individual fields had not been looked at due to economic and public recreation reasons. He stated there were economics that needed to be considered due to maintaining a facility of this magnitude, which was still easier than managing 16 different sites. He stated the idea was to leave public recreation in the neighborhoods, but would ease the demand at sites like Sunnyside park, where only soccer is able to be played there instead of using the space for multiple activities.

Chair De Lay stated this was a policy decision from the City as well.

Commissioner Dean stated every proposal the Commission saw involving agricultural land was about developing that type of land, and it would be nice to know how much was remaining in the community, and also if the City wanted to maintain any of it, maybe a type of master plan tied to the open space survey on how agricultural land fit into the future land use maps. She inquired if the City should start protecting these small slivers of land.

Mr. Joyce stated he would review that and bring that information to the Commission.

Commissioner Fife noted since he made a comment online about this proposal, so when at the public hearing on this item he would be recues himself.

Civic Campus / Public Safety Building and Emergency Operation Center—The Planning Commission will receive a briefing and discuss with staff various aspects of the proposed Civic Campus area including the proposed Public Safety Building and Emergency Operation Center to be located at approximately between 400 South and 500 South and 50 East and 350 East (former Barnes Bank building and adjacent lots to the south).

Chair De Lay recognized Casey Stewart as staff representative.

Mr. Stewart stated voters approved a bond for the public safety building in November 2009, prior to that the administration was reviewing ten possible sites for this building close to the City & County building. He stated Mayor Becker narrowed it down to the Barnes Bank Building block, located at approximately 300 East 400 South.

Mr. Stewart stated the master plan needed to be updated because it did not currently allow institutional uses. Mayor Becker had initiated a request to amend the Central Community Master plan to adopt the civic campus plan, which would designate a corridor for civic uses, most of which were existing and include: the courthouse, City & County building, SLC library, and the soon to be Leonardo Science Center. He stated the half block on the east side of 300 East would be designated for public safety, mixed-use, and some transit-oriented development along 400 South.

Mr. Stewart stated the concept of a civic campus plan originated in 1943 and was called, *The City Plan*. He stated that plan is not currently in effect, but it does show this idea was contemplated for some time. He noted some text amendments would also need to be made to the document to address the civic corridor from 450 South extending to approximately 400 East, which would allow for these types of congregated uses. He stated for ease of access, light rail down 400 South, as well as bus routes would factor into this site.

Mr. Stewart stated the design of this site was being headed up by a design team, which the Commission would review in the future, so the issue before them would be to update the master plan with the civic campus map and specifically designate it for civic uses.

Chair De Lay inquired if this proposal had been presented at public meetings, and did they vote on where they would like this facility to be located.

Mr. Stewart stated the actual site selection process allowed for the public to review the possible sites and comment on them. He stated he could include in the staff report what the top two or three sites were that the public preferred.

Chair De Lay inquired what the intent for the mixed uses was.

Mr. Stewart stated residential uses, retail services, and small retail uses such as coffee shops and bakeries.

Chair De Lay inquired if staff had spoken to any lenders regarding the residential aspect regarding the mixed uses to see if they would allow loans to be given to buyers for this type of development.

Mr. Stewart stated he had not as part of this process; however, the design team was considering that aspect of it.

Chair De Lay stated there still was not a definition in the City for this type of use; so buyers would not be able to get loans on live/work spaces. She stated there was a revitalization of 400 South in the last several years and inquired if the intent for 400 South was to be more walkable. She inquired if the civic campus site would be walkable.

Mr. Stewart stated 400 South was zoned TC-75, which focused on a transit-oriented development zone. He stated the design team was working on the walkability of the project.

Commissioner McHugh quoted the first paragraph, *the area bounded roughly by 50 East and 350 East*. She noted Mr. Stewart had stated this corridor would extend to 400 East and inquired which was correct.

Mr. Stewart stated 350 East was correct.

Commissioner Fife inquired if the public safety building would be on the southern two thirds of this block.

Mr. Stewart stated yes, there were certain dimensional requirements regarding this block.

Commissioner Dean stated the purpose of this step was to basically set the stage for future zoning change applications.

Mr. Stewart stated if the uses proposed for this site match the current zoning, it would work that way.

Commissioner Gallegos inquired if the City was planning on being a developer in this particular development.

Mr. Stewart stated the City would not take on the developer role; their role was to designate the space.

Commissioner Chambless inquired if this area was City owned land.

Mr. Stewart stated the City owned most of this land, and some parcels were under contract with the City.

Commissioner Chambless inquired if there would be a partnership both Federal and State on this project.

Mr. Stewart stated there had been some discussion of that, but he was not aware at this point what the outcomes of those discussions were.

Commissioner Chambless inquired if this structure would be below, as well as above grade.

Mr. Stewart stated there were some initial thoughts to do some underground parking, but soil samples had not been done yet.

Commissioner Woodhead stated the document referenced an interior pedestrian corridor at 450 South. She inquired if there was much going on outside the civic campus to make that happen to the blocks east of the civic campus.

Mr. Stewart stated the pedestrian corridor aspects of this project were inspired by public comment, and there was a real push to make that happen.

North Temple Boulevard Viaduct Station Area Plan—The Planning Commission will receive a briefing and discuss with staff the public draft of the North Temple Viaduct Station Area Plan. The public draft of the plan can be viewed on the project website at **[.northtempleboulevard.com](http://northtempleboulevard.com)**.

Chair De Lay recognized Nick Norris as staff representative.

Mr. Norris stated the vision of the viaduct station was based on the existing characteristics of the area, a major regional destination. He stated this station would have a vertical transfer from Frontrunner, at grade, to the North Temple Light Rail line, which would be built on top of the new North Temple viaduct. He stated all involved wanted to make sure those connections were as safe and useable as possible, and enough transportation options were available through the area to make it functional, which would include getting to and from the transit stations, but also allow access for bus services to those stations, along with easy access for automobiles, and service and maintenance vehicles. He stated there was a lot of major city infrastructure in the area, as well as underground, which would need to be maintained in the future and should be protected.

Mr. Norris stated the key policies were design, connectivity, enhancing the mix of uses, place making, and destinations. He stated existing destinations should be protected so they could continue to thrive, along with new destinations to add vibrancy to the area.

He stated from the Frontrunner stop, elevators, escalators, and stairs would be provided for access to the top of the viaduct and the airport light rail station. The framework was designed to make sure patrons could easily navigate these stations. He stated this was an urban center station and unique to the City, this area would be highly connected to the region, becoming a dense mix of high intense uses.

Mr. Norris stated generally City policy restricted the height of buildings north of North Temple Boulevard; and the Capitol Hill master plan listed more intense zoning along 400 West. He stated through the process the community stated they were comfortable with this type of development, which was a departure from current policy, but was an appropriate departure. He stated the emphasis would be on building design instead of the land use.

He stated the transition areas, which would act as a buffer to the intense development and core areas, were generally lower density neighborhoods. For instance a transition zone was placed around the Guadalupe neighborhood area, which would allow moderate height buildings around 65 feet. There would be controls in place to reduce the impact of building height when located next to lower structures.

Mr. Norris stated the urban design contained a couple of key policies and specific actions either the City or private developers could take, which could be built into regulations as properties developed in the future. He stated one key policy was to extend 500 West to the north, under the viaduct, and south on the Westside of the tracks where currently they split 500 West in two, the west side was not fully developed, and there was no street on the eastside under the viaduct. He stated 300 North would connect to the planned City Creek corridor in the 800 West station area, extending some version of Rio Grande Street under the viaduct, which may be pedestrian only, but needed to be identified in the plan to improve the east/west pedestrian connections.

Mr. Norris stated the focus of the policy was design centered on zoning, connectivity, a mix of uses, place making, and destinations. An open house was scheduled for March 18, and the updated plan would be distributed to the advisory committee. He stated the Planning Commission would hold a public hearing on April 14, after which this plan would be transmitted to the City Council.

Chair De Lay stated Commission Dean had suggested a presentation on public safety regarding this area. She inquired if Mr. Norris would bring that information back for the public hearing.

Mr. Norris stated yes.

Commissioner Chambless inquired about lighting in this high crime area.

Mr. Norris stated lighting was a key element along the entire North Temple Boulevard project. He noted the City Council was considering a lighting district for the boulevard at this time and the City was also reviewing the art in transit project with elements of light included in the art, especially under the viaducts. He stated the 500 West mid-block lighting would also be extended through the station area as well.

Commissioner Chambless inquired if there would be billboards along the North Temple Boulevard corridor.

Mr. Norris stated billboards would be banned and it would be included in the plan as a policy that the City be proactive in removing existing billboards.

Chair De Lay inquired about the definition of a lighting district.

Mr. Norris stated recently the Sugar House business district and State Street had adopted lighting districts, where the City put new lights in areas where they were needed, assessed the cost, and then charged property owners for that cost.

Commissioner Woodhead stated she felt this project was great; she walked over the viaduct today and it would be nice to see it look nicer and be a little less scary. She stated she was happy to see stairs, as well as escalators proposed in the plan.

Chair De Lay stated the impact of noise was not mentioned anywhere in this plan. She lived across from The Gateway, and approximately 100 yards from her home there was an escalator, which for about four weeks was screeching and echoing through The Gateway. She stated maintenance had done work on it about every five days, but the noise continued to get worse. She stated the impact of noise from the Trax train was easily more than 140 decibels when it turned on 400 West and 200 South. Residences have had meetings with UTA to try to get rid of it because it affects the quality of life for residences in that area. She stated the residences around this North Temple viaduct have no idea the amount of noise they will experience, and UTA can make no guarantee it will go away.

Mr. Norris stated he would bring that up in the next discussion.

Transit Station Area Zoning District—The Planning Commission will hold a briefing and discuss with staff the proposed Transit Station Area Zoning District. The purpose of the briefing will be to introduce the zoning approach to the Planning Commission and obtain feedback on the overall direction of the proposed ordinance as well as the content. The Transit Station Area Zoning District is proposed within the station areas identified in the North Temple Boulevard Station Area Plans.

Chair De Lay recognized Nick Norris as staff representative.

Mr. Norris stated as staff went through this planning process for North Temple Boulevard it became apparent zoning approaches needed to be rethought, particularly along transit lines. He stated a form based zoning approach would be used, which was fairly new to Salt Lake City. He stated the City wanted to address how the public participated in the process, by focusing on a station area plan that covered a small geographical area; so staff may be fairly specific with what they are doing. He stated this type of approach probably would not work on a City wide basis, but in small areas it allowed regulations to be developed that were closely tied to each area.

He stated staff wanted to allow flexibility, but had clearly defined outcomes that developers and the community could be aware of so they knew what the expectations were, and everyone could agree on those. He stated desirable development should be easy to realize, while development that may not be as desirable had a way to become that. Staff also wanted to shorten the approval process for those types of projects, by incentivizing agreed upon planning policies and concepts, and implementing an agreed upon vision for areas adjacent to transit stations.

Mr. Norris stated the City needed clear, concise, and non-subjective design guidelines, written more as standards. Graphic representation should also be available to demonstrate the design guidelines, because often prose can be confusing, so pictures can help developers understand the vision of an area. He stated assigning values to the design guidelines does require a value judgment by the City, and quite a bit of feedback was offered through the process of the North Temple project as far as what the community felt were desirable characteristics of buildings. One of the other major concerns was how this was reviewed and administered. When multiple reviewers went through a project they interpreted things differently, so it would be a leap of faith for the City to put some trust in the Planning Division to implement this type of zoning. He stated again part of that implementation was clear and concise guidelines and the planning staff felt they could take this on, and build a sense of trust with the public as well as with developers.

Mr. Norris stated the appeal process should also be clear and open, and would be built into the ordinance. The format of the ordinance was similar to the City's other zoning districts which would include a purpose statement to help regulate growth along major transit routes, use transit as an amenity and catalyst for development, and with help promote mixed-use development, and create a more sustainable city.

He stated stationary typology was discussed, the important factor being those typologies would be built into the zoning ordinance and would be used to classify the stations along North Temple and the regulations would be built around that.

Mr. Norris stated the review process would be similar to current standards and would apply to projects in this area. He stated pre-submittal conferences, which were currently held, would need to be reviewed in this forum, to allow staff and the applicant the opportunity to share expectations and policies. Mr. Norris stated a design score would be assigned to each project, which would be a series of thresholds, and a minimum score would be required for all projects. He stated for example if the minimum score was 10

and a project was being scored at 8, the developer would need to go back and modify their project to get their design score up to 10 before the city would even consider it for the next level.

He stated the first threshold would be a Planning Commission review through the conditional building and site design review process, and would still require a public hearing. The next threshold would start at a design score of 15, where the applicant could go through an Administrative Hearing process, which was faster and a public hearing was still held. He stated the top threshold would be projects that satisfied the highest level of the design guidelines and deemed to be the most compatible with the communities vision for that station area, there would be no public process other than the current building permit process, and the Planning Division would still assign a design score at the beginning of the process. He stated any decisions made by the Planning Division still had an appeal process they could go through.

Mr. Norris stated this design concept was based on the guidelines, the ordinance explained how these scores were formulated and used and the role the project review played. The Planning Division was the agency within the City that would assign the score, and the Planning Commission was the appeal authority for those decisions. Again, this approach was being used to focus on design versus land use, with built in flexibility that would also allow public participation upfront in the process.

Mr. Norris stated there would be different lists for different areas within a station, as well as different types. For example the special purpose district and the mixed-use employment would allow some kind of manufacturing use to occur in transition areas, whereas the urban center would not. Dimensional requirements would be the current standards, except building height would equal setback requirements if a building was located next to a residence. There would be no density requirements either minimum or maximum in the ordinance requirements. This was a market based approach to allow the market to create a diverse mix of housing types, densities, and building types critical to creating pedestrian oriented and people friendly places.

Mr. Norris stated the ordinance was being designed to be easily amended to accommodate additional stations where perhaps density limitations were appropriate. He stated it was not so much density that was the issue it was the design of the density the public expressed their concerns about. He stated multiple buildings on one parcel would end up coming through a planned development process, and staff had explored ways to incorporate that into this ordinance as well. Minimum parking standards would not be included, only maximum parking standards and would be reduced by fifty percent, to allow the market to dictate that need.

Mr. Norris stated a number of development incentives were included in the plan, which would increase the design score and either through existing City policy or this process were identified as major benefits to the City as well as developers, and would include a vertical mix of uses, inclusionary housing (which would apply to certain income levels), housing size, senior housing, accessible dwelling units that were ADA compliant, LEED certified buildings, and historic preservations. He stated this process followed the LEED building certifications very closely.

Chair De Lay stated that was the only mention of LEED in the presentation.

Mr. Norris stated maybe, but the ordinance and design guidelines were LEED influenced and pulled directly from the U.S. Green Building Council.

Commissioner Woodhead inquired what the definition of inclusionary housing was.

Mr. Norris stated that was a term for affordable housing, but that term could be changed.

Mr. Norris stated conflict resolutions would kick in where there was a conflict of regulations where the ordinance may apply. The TSA chapter would take precedence over all other regulations except for the overlay districts.

He stated initially staff had set the bar of the rating system way too high, which was realized after testing these concepts. He stated staff would rethink the scoring system and reassess some of the values put in. A number of different building types were looked at, which was a great learning experience. He stated the idea for the scoring was to eliminate as much subjectivity as possible and there were a few open houses coming up to discuss this, along with ongoing meetings with property owners.

Chair De Lay inquired what was driving this process.

Mr. Norris stated the North Temple Boulevard planning process. As staff has gone through this and with the advice of different consultants worked transit oriented developments, because of the complex nature, the City needed to rethink how to approach zoning in those areas.

Commissioner Gallegos stated this seemed like a great opportunity to relook at everything.

The meeting adjourned at 7:29 p.m.

This document, along with the digital recording, constitute the official minutes of the Salt Lake City Planning Commission held on March 10, 2010.

Tami Hansen