

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
In Room 326 of the City & County Building  
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah  
Wednesday, September 8, 2010**

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were Chair Babs De Lay, Chair ; Commissioners Emily Drown, Charlie Luke, Susie McHugh, Matthew Wirthlin, Michael Fife and Mary Woodhead. Commissioners Michael Gallegos, Angela Dean, and Kathleen Hill were excused.

A field trip was held prior to the meeting Planning Commissioners present were: Emily Drown, Michael Fife, Angela Dean, and Matthew Wirthlin.

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; Joel Paterson, Planning Manager; Nick Norris, Planning Manager; Doug Dansie, Senior Planner; Casey Stewart, Senior Planner; Ana Valdemoros, Associate Planner; Katia Pace, Associate Planner; and Nick Britton, Principal Planner; Paul Nielson, City Attorney; and Angela Hasenberg, Senior Secretary.

**Field Trip Notes** (Taken by Nick Norris)

Planning Commissioners visited the Salt Lake Clinic.

Planner Doug Dansie gave an overview of the site, no questions were asked.

Planning Commissioners visited the Utah Crew Rowing Dock, located at 830 South Delong Street.

Planner Nick Britton gave an overview of the proposal.

Commissioners asked questions regarding ownership of the canal. Mr. Britton answered that it was owned by Salt Lake County as is the location of the dock.

[5:47:34 PM](#)

**Approval of Minutes from Wednesday, July 14, with corrections.**

**Commissioner Woodhead made a motion to approve the July 14, 2010 minutes with corrections. Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion. Commissioners voted, "Aye". The motion passed unanimously.**

[5:48:15 PM](#)

**Report of the Chair and Vice Chair**

Chair De Lay welcomed Emily Drown as a new commissioner.

[5:51:05 PM](#)

### **Report of the Director**

Mr. Sommerkorn had nothing to report.

[5:51:05 PM](#)

### **Public Hearing**

**PLNPCM2010-00229: Salt Lake Clinic** - A request by INC Health Services, Inc. for a zoning map amendment to change the zoning at approximately 333/349/365 South 900 East and 911/933/937 + 959/963 East 400 South from I (Institutional), RMF-45 (Residential Multi-Family) and CC (Commercial Corridor) to UI (Urban Institutional). The applicant wishes to reconstruct the Salt Lake Clinic in a more urban form.

Chair De Lay recognized Doug Dansie as staff representative.

Mr. Dansie presented a PowerPoint presentation. He stated that basically this would be an introduction to this project which was a rebuild of the Salt Lake Clinic. Mr. Dansie identified locations for parking and the change of entrance to 4<sup>th</sup> South.

Mr. Dansie pointed out that some of the area was zoned institutional, currently. The zoning change would be if the applicant decided to do a more urban development. The question is not whether or not there would be a clinic, but rather would they make it fit onto the existing site or move it to the corner.

Mr. Dansie noted the more controversial issues of the zoning as the driveway off of 3<sup>rd</sup> South, the driveway as illustrated, enters into the back of the existing clinic. To the east was an apartment building, to the west a laundry. 3<sup>rd</sup> South was described as a residential street. The original proposal had an exit from 4<sup>th</sup> South, it was part of the recommendation to rezone to Urban Institutional, but not included the area included in a residential strip. The building in that area remains a non-conforming as a small office building. Staff recommendation was that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that it be rezoned Urban Institutional with the exclusion of the parcel that was zoned RMF-35 and also consider the parcel located on 3<sup>rd</sup> South which was presently zoned Institutional, may consider rezoning to RMF-35 to match the other zoning on 3<sup>rd</sup> South to a depth of 115.5 feet.

### **Questions from the Commissioners:**

Commissioner Woodhead asked as part of the rezoning, can the Planning Commission actually state "no driveway on 3<sup>rd</sup> South"?

Mr. Dansie replied that those would be site plan issues.

Commissioner Woodhead clarified that it was her understanding that the Commission could not add conditions.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that he agreed with Commissioner Woodhead, and that the issue was a design issue and should not go toward rezoning.

Mr. Dansie stated that was the reason the recommendation does not include rezoning that parcel.

Commissioner Wirthlin asked if once this was rezoned, would the Planning Commission have a chance to revisit this item.

Mr. Dansie stated that the item would go forward without Planning Commission review. It was not a planned development and would not need a variance.

[5:57:31 PM](#)

#### **Comments from the Applicant**

Steve Dibble, Director of Facility Planning and Development for Intermountain Health Care spoke. He stated that the comment made that indicated the parking would double was inaccurate, but that half of the parking would be below grade, thereby reducing the amount of surface parking and allow more open space above.

The Clinic is basically a replacement of the existing Clinic with the physicians that are in place. There would be an addition of Urgent Care which would be an advantage to the neighborhood. There would be no need of ambulances unless to transport patients to other hospitals in the area.

Mr. Dibble stated that they had worked with the Community Council and with the Planning Department and they concurred with the recommendations from them that the driveways on 3 and 4<sup>th</sup> South would not be in the best interest of the project. The architects had found a way to keep the circulation on the parking structure of the site internal without the two entrances.

[5:59:16 PM](#)

#### **Comments from the Public:**

Esther Hunter, co-chair of East Central Community Council focused on Community development and land use and Gary Felt, East Central Community Council business district and community co-chair spoke.

Ms. Hunter stated that she was pleased with the opportunity to work with applicants, to do it early, and see what could be done. She noted that IHC came to the Community Council two years prior, and has had several opportunities to negotiate items that were important to both the applicant and to the community. Because of this, the Community Council is in favor of the re-zone, all but the parcel that is zoned RMF-45, and asks that if there were to be changes made, through the project, that they come back to the Community Council. She noted that they also would like to see any issues that had been mitigated because of situations in the past whereas things develop over the years that items are not included in the recommendations.

Mr. Felt stated that IHC had been a good group to work with and they have appreciated that they had listened and did more than what they had expected.

Gary White, stated that his family owns the apartment house at 975 E. 400 S. His concern was regarding the traffic on 4<sup>th</sup> South. He stated he would like the applicant to provide a traffic count.

Commissioner Woodhead asked Mr. Dansie if the traffic issues are reviewed when plans are submitted.

Mr. Dansie stated that staff is not recommending a 4<sup>th</sup> South entrance.

Cindy Cromer spoke, stating that 25 years ago the Salt Lake Clinic was one of only nearly two dozen medical clinics that did not become non-conforming in the rezoning of 1985. She spoke in favor of the re-establishment of housing in the area and getting a better fit. She added that making intersections appear bigger does not enhance urban design. She disagreed with the Plaza at the front of the building.

[6:11:30 PM](#)

#### **Applicant Response**

Mr. Dibble stated that he agreed with the issues regarding 4<sup>th</sup> South. He noted that there had been a detailed traffic study done by Ryan Hales. The conclusion was that this would not impact the neighborhood negatively.

[6:12:04 PM](#)

#### **Close of Public Hearing**

[6:12:18 PM](#)

#### **Motion**

**Motion: Commissioner Woodhead made the motion in regard to PLNPCM2010-00229:IHC Salt Lake Clinic zoning map amendment, moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council to approve the requested zoning map amendment with conditions 1-3 as listed on the staff report. This motion was based on information from the staff report, in the previous briefing and tonight's public hearing.**

**Commissioner Luke seconded the motion.**

**Vote: Commissioners Fife, Drown, McHugh, Luke, Wirthlin and Woodhead all voted "aye". The motion passed unanimously.**

**PLNPCM2010-00476: Building Height in M-1 Industrial Districts** - A request by Dominion Engineering to amend chapter 21A.28.020 (M-1 Light Manufacturing Zoning District) of the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance to include a provision for increased building height above 65 feet when the building is setback further than the minimum setback from property lines. Antennas would be excluded from building height measurement and in no case could a building exceed a height of ninety (90) feet. The proposed zoning amendment would apply to M-1 districts Citywide.

Chairperson De Lay recognized Casey Stewart as staff representative.

Mr. Stewart gave a PowerPoint presentation. Mr. Stewart stated that this would be a text amendment to the current zoning ordinance, specifically to the M-1 light manufacturing zoning districts. The request is to allow extra building height in the M-1 districts.

Mr. Stewart stated that the request came from Dominion Engineering, who was representing a group that was bidding on the construction of an FBI building. The proposed building would exceed the current height limit of 65 feet. The request is to insert an extra provision for additional height when the building is set back further. For every additional foot of height that a developer would want, they would be required to increase the setback an additional foot to a maximum building height of 90 feet.

The application was taken to a public open house, where no one attended to provide public comment. Mr. Stewart did, however, receive two letters of comment one from the property owner in support of allowing the extra height, and another letter from the Salt Lake International Common Area Management Association stating they had no objection to the height increase.

Mr. Stewart stated that staff looked at the proposed text amendment in respect to all M-1 zones because that is how it was submitted, although the applicant was interested in one property. . The applicant indicated what the FBI project was, and options were discussed. Staff determined that it would not be feasible to allow the extra height for one property, and did an assessment of different height allowances within each zoning district. Staff found that when additional height was allowed, it was typically done through a Planning Commission review, such as conditional use or conditional building and site design review.

This request did not include any Planning Commission review proposed by the applicant. The applicant was attempting to mitigate any impacts by the additional building setback.

Commissioner Woodhead clarified that the height increase would be permitted as long as the applicant met the condition of the setback.

Mr. Stewart agreed.

Mr. Stewart added that staff looked at some of the planning documents that would affect the area. One in particular was the Urban Design Element, which talks about indiscriminate high rise construction outside of the downtown core is not preferred, the intent was to keep downtown core the main focus of the city for building height.

In the end, staff felt that policy was sufficient enough to not support the proposed amendment for across the board for M-1 zone.

Mr. Stewart stated that staff 's recommendation was that the proposed amendment does not adequately meet enough of the standards, therefore, staff recommends against the proposal.

[6:20:18 PM](#)

#### **Questions from the applicant**

Bruce Baird, counsel for The Molaskey Group and Suzanne Saunders, representative for Molaskey, and Jeff Snelling from Dominion Engineering.

Mr. Baird stated that he was contacted by Molaskey after the staff report came out. Mr. Baird stated that the staff report stated that there was not a particular building associated with the request, Mr. Baird noted that there was. The reason there wasn't a particular building plan submitted with the amendment was that this was part of the bidding process for the FBI building.

Mr. Baird added that his client had built three different FBI buildings from across the country, and knows what was needed for these buildings. Essentially, the building needs to be five stories tall. Unfortunately because of some of the requirements, five stories are a little bigger than what is typical because of the special mechanical and electrical needs for this building.

Mr. Baird noted two issues that they disagree with, 1. That 90 feet would be among the highest buildings in the city. Clearly this would not be the case. 2. This is not unprecedented. There is a currently existing building within the same zone, Edgewater, North and South. Edgewater is a five story building. It is 66 ½ feet tall with a mechanical system that increased the height to 81 ½ feet. The building that is being proposed is 71 feet tall, for the five stories and the mechanically screened area would add an additional 12 feet which would bring the proposed building 1 ½ feet taller than the existing building.

Mr. Baird suggested a compromise that would enable them to receive a favorable recommendation. 1. Pass the project in total, reject the setback and add a sublimit that would state "no more than 75 feet of building, and 10 feet of mechanical. Or, 2. To apply this only to the Salt Lake City International Center District, and 3. Make it a conditional use.

The preference from the applicant would be to allow 85 feet.

Mr. Norris added a clarification that it was stated by Mr. Baird that Downtown requires a minimum building height of 100 feet. That was incorrect. It was only required on block corners.

Mr. Baird apologized and stated that it was unique because it would be on a corner, but would encompass the entire block.

Commissioner McHugh stated that there was a letter from the airport that opposes this and this is beyond the central district. The airport stated that the height would be hazardous.

Mr. Baird stated that what the letter stated was that they have to comply. He stated that they were not there to change the existing airport rules.

Ms. Saunders added that there was a navigation easement on the site of 120 feet.

Commissioner McHugh quoted from the letter that the building would negatively affect airport regulations.

Ms. Saunders clarified that it was because the change suggested impacts all of the M-1 districts, not particularly for the Salt Lake International Common Area Management Association area.

Mr. Baird stated that you cannot have a building higher than the protection zone.

Commissioner Luke asked staff when the Edgewater North and South buildings were constructed and if they were in a different zone.

If they were in the same zone, how were they permitted?

Mr. Norris stated that he did not know the years of construction, but that they were within the M-1 zone.

Mr. Stewart stated that to his recollection they were built in the 80's.

Mr. Baird agreed and stated that he believed that they were built before the 65 foot in the M-1 zone.

[6:31:14 PM](#)

Questions from the Commissioners

Commissioner Fife asked if it was clear that they knew how tall the building would be and also knew what the height limitation on the zone was, then why was it the Planning Commission's responsibility for approval if they knew they were outside of the zoning.

Mr. Baird stated that they did not pick the land, that it was selected by the GSA (Government Services Administration); the FBI building is designated for this site. The applicant stated that there are five bidders competing to develop the building. He reiterated that they are bidders and that they wanted their bid to comply with City ordinances.

Commissioner Fife asked if all five applicants are going to have the same issue.

Mr. Baird stated he did not know.

Commissioner Fife stated that he understood that the applicant stated that the building could only be built one way.

Mr. Baird stated that he did not know.

Commissioner Fife asked if there were other ways that the building could be built that would fall within zoning requirements.

Mr. Baird stated that it could, but that there is no reason, other than the language in the ordinance, that is prohibiting the approval of this building.

Suzanne Sanders spoke, stating that she would like to expound on the reasons for the application. The building in Cincinnati that was designed became the prototype for the FBI. The FBI wants a five story building; they want the fourteen foot floor to floor because they have a three foot space of cable trays and security runs, the interstitial space requires the extra height.

She stated that they knew going in, that they would have to obtain some kind of relief from the City, and that was the reason she met with staff early on in the process. She stated they understood the risks and were willing to take the risk to give the FBI the building they want. Their hope is that the City will back them and give them help to find a way to solve the issues. She explained that this would be a mixed use campus and that one of the buildings proposed is only a single story, but it is an auto shop. The FBI services and repairs all their armored cars and vehicles there. She stated that it is a unique kind of use with high security.

She stated that their company was sixty years old and holds their projects long term, and they will do a twenty year lease with the government.

Ms. Sanders added that she appreciated the support and help of the staff.

Ms. Sanders noted that the proposed building is intended to be LEED certified, and supports the green policy.

Chairperson De Lay stated that she appreciated that it is for the building, but since this would impact an entire zone, that is a large area, a lot needed to be considered.

Commissioner Wirthlin asked Ms. Sanders whether the FBI would lease or own the building.

Ms. Sanders answered that it would be a lease.

Commissioner Wirthlin stated that if they were to own the building, there would be no need to be in front of the FBI building.

Mr. Baird stated that he doesn't feel that it violates the CBD (Central Business District) policy if the building is limited to five stories.

The Engineer, Mr. Snelling responded to the letter from the airport stating that there was an exhibit that highlighted the areas of concern. He noted that the building falls outside of those areas.

Commissioner Woodhead stated that she was willing to find a way to make this doable, but her question was how much can they change the recommendation given the noticing requirements, could they change it to a conditional use with a geographical limitation.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that he believed they could do that.

Commissioner Woodhead asked if the International Center was exempt.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that they could map the boundaries and isolate it.

Chairperson De Lay clarified the request by stated that an area could be defined for the conditional use of that type of building (office) or for that particular building.

Commissioner Luke asked if the change could be made for the building alone.

The Commissioners debated the topic of changing the zoning for the Salt Lake International Center, or making it specific to the particular building.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that he would caution them against making this a specific provision for one property.

Mr. Stewart added that the current standard was 65 feet. He noted that there are height exceptions for towers mechanical equipment of sixteen feet.

Chairperson Delay clarified that the Edgewater buildings were 65 feet plus an addition twelve feet.



Mr. Sommerkorn clarified that the issue before them was whether or not to change the height exception for the entire M-1 zone, and that there are other areas in the city that are allowed height exceptions through a conditional use.

Commissioner McHugh asked if their obligation was to forward a negative or positive recommendation on this specific zone change for the M-1 while they apply for a conditional use.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that they could approve the proposal, make recommendations for another type of proposal, they could make modifications the proposal or deny it.

Mr. Norris added that it was important to maintain the recommendation in terms of feet; rather than stories, and also added that the ordinance allows for height exceptions within the new Transit Station Area zones, he used the North Temple Street of an example. He added that the boundary should be specific to a geographic area, rather than the name of the development.

The Commissioners discussed what conditions would be needed to be added to the motion.

Commissioner McHugh stated that there was not enough information to make an informed decision and asked more information could be provided.

Mr. Baird stated that the GSA would be making their decision twenty days later, and they would not have enough time to respond to the decision. He added that by not approving, they would risk not have a green, sustainable structure on the site.

Commissioner Woodhead stated that this proposal would have to go before the City Council, and how would two more weeks on their end stop the project?

Mr. Baird stated that it would give them a chance for the City Council to put the item on the agenda for September 14.

The Commissioners discussed the time frame that would be necessary to have an informed vote.

Ms. Sanders stated that it was important to receive a favorable recommendation because another competitor had informed the GSA that this height exception would never be approved, and therefore, if it were approved, it would support their bid with the GSA.

Ms. Woodhead stated that she felt that giving the approval would in a sense, be giving their backing to the applicants bid.

[6:57:08 PM](#)

Executive Session

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that there may be conflicts for the City Council for the dates provided from the applicant.

[6:58:01 PM](#)

**Motion:**

**Commissioner McHugh made the motion that in regard to PLNPCM2010-00476: Building Height in M-1 Industrial District to table the issue until the next meeting so that staff would have time to craft language for this issue.**

**Commissioner Fife seconded the motion.**

**Commissioner Woodhead proposed an amendment to the motion. She stated that she would like to see an addition that they are inclined to submit a positive recommendation to City Council, but that the zoning change to reflect that it would be a conditional use, that it would be limited in geographical scope, and that there appropriate conditions attached?**

**Commissioner McHugh agreed to the compromise.**

**PLNPCM2010-00476: Building Height in M-1 Industrial District to table the issue until the next meeting so that staff would have time to craft language for this issue. The table is premised on the notion that the commission is inclined to send a favorable recommendation to the City Council to this zoning change with, if it is changed, to 1: a conditional use ; 2: to be a limited geographical scope to the general area of The International Center, described in an appropriate way, that it reflects setbacks, and that it has appropriate conditions attached, with no additional public hearing.**

Mr. Sommerkorn added that the wording needed to be changed to be conditional building and site design.

Commissioner Fife clarified that they were noting that they were inclined to vote on something that had not been seen.

Commissioner Woodhead clarified that they are not committed to vote, but that direction to staff is that they would like them to come back a new recommendation with changes.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated that can say they are inclined to vote favorably, but need more details.

**Vote: Commissioners Fife, Drown, McHugh, Luke, and Woodhead all voted “aye”. Commissioner Wirthlin voted no. The motion passed.**

[7:01:26 PM](#)

Public Hearing

[7:02:47 PM](#)

**Motion:**

**Commissioner Wirthlin motion to bring the matter off the table.**

**Commissioner Luke seconded the motion**

Vote: Commissioners Luke, Wirthlin, Woodhead and De Lay voted “aye”, Commissioners Fife, and McHugh voted no, Commissioner Drown abstained. The motion passed.

**PLNSUB2010-00182 Crandall Cove Minor Subdivision** – Ivory Development requests preliminary approval for a subdivision plat to create seven lots; one commercial lot for the existing commercial building at 2855 S Highland Drive and six new residential lots accessed from Crandall Avenue. The subject property is located at approximately 2853-2855 S Highland Drive in a CB and a R-1/7,000 zoning district, in Council District 7, represented by Søren Simonsen

Chairperson De Lay recognized Casey Stewart as staff representative.

Mr. Stewart stated that this was an item brought before the Planning Commission previously. The petition as proposed did not obtain approval at the first hearing and the petition was subsequently tabled to give the applicant opportunity to make revisions and/or provide additional information. Since the initial hearing on August 11, the applicant submitted a color rendering of what the subdivision might look like when complete, the actual subdivision layout had not changed.

The original reasons it came before the Commission were that the right away width was less than the standard, and the lot depth was less than the standard. Those standards could be waived by the Planning Commission. Without any changes to the project since the last meeting, Staff did not feel they could recommend approval yet and therefore no recommendation is given.

Commissioner Woodhead asked if the applicant might have been confused about the prior meeting, and that was the reasoning they provided no new information.

Mr. Stewart noted that he confirmed with the applicant that they would be making no subdivision layout changes.

[7:06:37 PM](#)

Comments from the Applicant

Chris Gamvroulas from Ivory Homes spoke. He stated that when they were there one month prior, they wanted the Planning Commission to waive two standards: Road width and lot depth. The concern that they heard was that there was not enough information. Mr. Gamvroulas brought renderings to provide additional information. He stated that he heard the Commissioners say that they wanted to know what they were getting in exchange for waiving the standards.

Commissioner Woodhead stated she was hoping for revisions to the proposal to meet the standards of other concerns that the Commission had raised.

Mr. Gamvroulas stated that some of the concerns that were raised relative to the lot size dimensions were tentatively that the property itself is not proportional to the lots around it. He stated that this property is 220 feet deep. The lots around it were 110 feet deep, were they to line up “cigar lot” and have 50 feet wide, 210 feet deep lots would be very different than the 50 feet wide, 110 feet lots around it. He stated that they are trying to maximize the lot that they have.

He presented sketches to illustrate what the homes would become. He also gave a PowerPoint presentation. The images shown were photos of existing homes built in the Day Break community.

The Commissioners were concerned about the homes that would exist in the community in question.

Commissioner Luke commented that his concern was not in regard to how the homes will look, but instead in the street width. He asked how garbage pick up on Elizabeth Street would work.

Mr. Norris stated that garbage trucks drive in, and then back out.

Mr. Gamvroulas stated that the community was in favor of this, and that many neighbors sent emails in support of it.

Commissioner McHugh stated that the sense they were trying to convey with the motion to table was not necessarily to line four or five houses facing Crandall. It was her hope that the applicant would have brought in new plans.

Commissioner Woodhead stated that the reason she wanted to table the issue was to give the applicant a chance to reconfigure the plan, and not to come back and try to “resale” the same proposal.

The applicant stated that he did not understand that was the purpose, and that when he met with City staff, he did not feel that had been conveyed to him.

Commissioner Luke asked what the City standard on a turn-a-round was.

Mr. Sommerkorn answered twenty feet.

Commissioner Fife stated that his concern was whether the width of the street met the city standard, or not.

Mr. Norris stated that the City standard is what was mentioned, however, the ordinance is structured in a way that allows exceptions to that standard.

Commissioner Fife stated that based on the applicant’s testimony, it would seem that this would be an instance where that would apply. Why does the City think this would not be a case for exceptions?

Mr. Stewart stated that there was no recommendation and that it was to the Planning Commission’s discretion.

Commissioner Woodhead stated that her issues were never in regard to street size on their own, but that there were two parts to the petition, and two things the Planning Commission was asked to waive street width and lot depth. She stated that lot depth was not a problem to her, but that the petition was brought forth as a preliminary plat, and not as a planned unit development and not on anything that gave the Commission control over the size of the houses. Given that they were waiving the depth of the lot, it seemed that from the information provided, the houses were too big for the small size of the way the lots were configured. She felt the applicant was inflexible on how the lots were configured.

Mr. Norris stated that one of the corollary impacts of reducing the lot depth is reducing the buildable area, which does limit what they can build as far as foot print. He stated it was important to note that any property in the R-1 7000 zoning district can max out their buildable area in a subdivision like the one proposed, or any other subdivision.

Commissioner Woodhead stated that how the buildable area relates to the setbacks makes a difference.

Mr. Norris stated that the setback requirements still need to be met.

Mr. Gamvroulas stated that there is a minimum setback for the lot, regardless of the size of the lot.

Mr. Norris clarified that you can tie things into the ordinance, and items have been approved in the past that would have specific items such as setbacks.

Commissioner McHugh asked if Public Utilities Fire and the Garbage have to approve it.

Mr. Norris responded that they do not.

Commissioner McHugh stated that they do not have to agree.

Mr. Stewart stated the request was for a 43 foot right of way, so the request is for a seven foot reduction in the right of way. Transportation reviewed it, and added stipulations such as no parking on the street. They anticipated this width and have ways to make it work.

Commissioner Fife added that the home owners could have four cars in the driveway.

[7:44:07 PM](#)

#### **Motion**

**Commissioner Wirthlin made the motion in regard to PLNSUB2010-00182 Crandall Cove Minor Subdivision based on the staff report and the findings and discussions in past meetings and discussion from tonight, He moved that the Planning Commission grant approval subject to conditions listed as 1 and 2 on the staff report.**

**Commissioner Fife seconded the motion.**

**Vote: Commissioners Fife, Drown, McHugh, Luke, Wirthlin, Woodhead all voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

[7:52:44 PM](#)

#### **Public Hearing**

**PLNPCM2010-00223, Salt Lake City Code Maintenance- Fine Tuning text amendments** - a request by Salt Lake City Mayor Becker to analyze the feasibility of amending the City Zoning Ordinance to provide for clarity and efficiency of use as part of an ongoing process of code maintenance. These text changes are Citywide

Chairperson De Lay recognized Ana Valdemoros as staff representative.

Ms. Valdemoros stated that these are routine code maintenance and some had been done in previous years. They are intended to clarify the intent of the ordinance; however, they do not substantially alter it.

Ms. Valdemoros stated that she had not received any comments in regard to the item.

[:53:55 PM](#)

#### Public Comments

Cindy Cromer spoke regarding two issues, one the zoning administrator, she stated that she would like to see that the lines of authority become very clear.

She also stated that the triangular, pennant type banners need clarification on use.

[:57:34 PM](#)

#### Comments from the Commissioners

Chairperson De Lay asked about the use of balloons for promotion.

Commissioner Woodhead asked if there could be a provision that discusses the use of balloons for less than a day.

Mr. Pace clarified that the Zoning Administrator should 21a . 16, which deals with the section on appeals. That section authorizes appeals to the Board of Adjustment, it states, that any decision of the Zoning Administrator or the Administrative Hearing officer. What that really mean was that if staff makes a decision that someone else does not like, it is unclear where the appeal would go. If the Planning Director makes the decision, they don't like, it goes to the Board of Adjustment.

In the past, the practice has been to take all of the appeals to the Board of Adjustment, what would be needed to insert here would be something akin to a decision made by the Zoning Administrator or designee. So if the staff or the attorney's office has the latitude to make the accompanying changes necessary, in title 21a.16, that would cover us.

Chairperson De Lay asked if the item would need to be re-noticed.

Close of public hearing

[:03:05 PM](#)

Motion:

**Commissioner Fife made the motion regarding PLNPCM2010-00223, Salt Lake City Code Maintenance- Fine Tuning text amendments, he moved that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to City Council based on the information that we heard tonight and in the staff report and public hearing, in addition, add changes to section 21a-16 to make it clear that decision made by the Planning Director or their designee would approved through the Board of Adjustment, including conditions 1-10 on the staff report.**

**Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion.**

**Vote: Commissioners Fife, Drown, McHugh, Luke, Wirthlin, Woodhead all voted "aye".  
The motion passed unanimously.**

[8:04:09 PM](#)

**Public Hearing**

**PLNPCM2010-00354 - Major Street Plan Amendment**- A petition initiated by Salt Lake City Mayor Ralph Becker to update the Major Street Plan of the Salt Lake City Transportation Master Plan. The major changes that will occur as part of this proposed update to the Major Street Plan include the following:

1. Ownership of North Temple.
  2. Ownership of 1300 East.
  3. Removal of proposed 5500 West between 300 South and 700 South.
  4. Removal of proposed Mountain View Corridor alignment on 7200 West and change to proposed arterial street.
  5. Removal of the proposed connection of Wright Brothers Drive and 800 North.
  6. Change a section of Gladiola Street from proposed to existing.
  7. Change status of a section of 1730 South from proposed to existing.
  8. Change status from proposed to existing of 700 South, 5600 West to 6400 West; 5700 West, 300 South to 700 South; 6400 West, 300 South to 700 South.
  9. Change status from collector to local of 5500 West, 300 South to approximately 200 South.
  10. Change status from proposed to existing of Legacy Highway.
  11. Removal of 800 West connection to Warm Springs Road
  12. Include connection of 900 West to Warm Springs Road.
- Changes would be City Wide.

Chairperson De Lay recognized Katia Pace as staff representative.

Ms. Pace stated that this was an update to the Major Street Plan. It is a plan amendment because it is amending the Salt Lake Transportation Master Plan.

The Salt Lake Transportation Master Plan was adopted in 1996, since then, the major street plan was updated once in 2006. These updates are a reflection of developments that had occurred, and there were many that have had approval processes take place.

Major changes had been listed on the staff report and had been advertised with public open houses.

Ms. Pace noted that FedEx who has a property on Wright Brothers Drive. They feel that the removal would affect their future operations. Ms. Pace added that this had already had approval and the property has been purchased.

[8:08:16 PM](#)

**Public Hearing**

No one chose to speak

[8:08:16 PM](#)

**Close of Public Hearing**

[8:08:24 PM](#)

### **Motion**

**Commissioner Luke made the motion that in regard to PLNPCM2010-00354 - Major Street Plan Amendment he moved that based on the information provided by the staff report and the information heard this evening, that the Planning Commissions issues a favorable recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed updates to the Major Street Master Plan.**

**Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion.**

**Vote: Commissioners Fife, Drown, McHugh, Luke, Wirthlin, Woodhead all voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

[8:09:12 PM](#)

### **Public Hearing**

**PLNPCM2010-00449: Utah Crew Rowing Dock Conditional Use** - A request by Sonia Witte, on behalf of Utah Crew, for conditional use approval of a rowing dock on the Surplus Canal at approximately 830 South Delong Street. The property is in the M-1 (Light Manufacturing) zoning district and in the LC (Lowland Conservancy) overlay district and is in Council District 2, represented by Van Turner.

Chairperson De Lay recognized planner Nick Britton as staff representative.

Mr. Britton stated that the property was owned by Salt Lake County, the canal is also under the County's jurisdiction. The conditional use is not for the actual activity of rowing on the canal, but simply for the dock itself, because this property is in the low end conservancy overlay district, and impacts any structure going over the canal.

Mr. Britton gave a PowerPoint presentation that outlined the area of the canal and what will go there.

The proposal is a temporary dock that floats on the top of the canal but connects to the bottom of the canal bed with screws that can be pulled out at any time. The County requires that they be pulled out for the winter. It would be in use from April to November.

[8:12:56 PM](#)

### **Questions from the Commissioners**

Commissioner Luke asked if the dock would be open to the public.

Mr. Britton stated that it would be open to the public, because it would not be fenced off.



Commissioner Drown asked who would take ownership during the winter, and where will it be stored.

Mr. Britton stated that it would be stored in the same place the boats are stored during the summer months.

[8:13:17 PM](#)

**Comments from the Applicant**

Sonia Witt, Head Coach for Utah Crew, she stated that they have a fairly simply proposal. She explained that rowing is an awesome sport that it was a team sport where no one hits each other; it is a team sport where all members are tied to the same piece of equipment. It's a sport where they get a sense of security while working in a tense situation. She believes that it is a character building sport. Utah Crew is an organization that makes rowing available to any student ages 13-18 and offers scholarship options for low income kids. Their intent is to be good citizens in the community.

She stated that historically, Utah Crew has been out on the Great Salt Lake. There were significant issues connected to it. The Lake has severe micro climate, what is called the Tooele Twister which has ripped \$100,000.00 worth of equipment off of racks over the course of the ten years people had been rowing there because of the 90 mile an hour winds. Those winds don't occur at the Surplus Canal.

Ms. Witt stated that the County has Salt Lake County flood control approval; the next step was to come to the City and make it a reality. Currently, the kids waded into the water, but that was not the ideal situation. A dock would reduce slip hazards and injuries and increase safety.

[8:18:18 PM](#)

**Comments from the public**

Chairperson De Lay explained the process to the public.

Ms. Witt stated that they have asked their captains to speak.

Robert Less, an architect, spoke in favor of the canal dock.

Delian Asparouhov, The Captain of the Boys team, and a Senior at West High School spoke, he stated that he was a soccer play who broke his leg and found rowing. He stated that it has been a great activity and provides motivation. He stated that he enjoys being on the Surplus Canal as opposed to the Great Salt Lake. He feels the dock would be very useful and make it easier and safer.

Maggie Bradford, The Captain of the Girls team and a senior at Skyline High School, spoke in favor of the dock. She stated that rowing has changed her life and has given her a lot of opportunities.

Also in favor of the dock were: Alexandra Nelson, Ned Shelton, Ben Silcox, Hannah Blomgren, Michael Kennery-Youn, Michael J. Horrocks, Will Horton, Jaquelyn Orton, and Thomas Lyndsay.

[8:25:24 PM](#)

Close of Public Hearing

[8:25:27 PM](#)

**Motion: Commissioner Drown made the motion that in regard to PLNPCM2010-00449: Utah Crew Rowing Dock Conditional Use she moved that based upon recommendations and findings of staff, and testimony we heard, including conditions 1-4, she moved that the Planning Commission approve the recommendation.**

**Commissioner Fife seconded the motion.**

**Vote: Commissioners Fife, Drown, McHugh, Luke, Wirthlin, Woodhead all voted “aye”. The motion passed unanimously.**

[8:26:39 PM](#)

**Meeting Adjourned.**