

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Room 126 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, December 12, 2012

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:33:10 PM](#) . Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained in the Planning Office for an indefinite period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Michael Gallegos; Vice Chair Emily Drown; Commissioners Bernardo Flores-Sahagun, Michael Fife, Clark Ruttinger, Marie Taylor and Mary Woodhead. Commissioners Lisa Adams, Angela Dean and Matthew Wirthlin were excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Eric Shaw, CED Director; Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director; Nick Norris, Planning Manager; Nole Walkingshaw, Program Manager; Nick Britton, Senior Planner; Casey Stewart, Senior Planner, Michael Maloy, Principal Planner; Ray Milliner, Principal Planner; Daniel Echeverria, Associate Planner and Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary.

FIELD TRIP NOTES:

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Planning Commissioners present were: Chairperson Michael Gallegos; Commissioners Michael Fife, Bernardo Flores-Sahagun, Clark Ruttinger and Mary Woodhead. Staff members in attendance were Nick Norris Daniel Echeverria and Ray Milliner.

The following locations were visited:

- 700 South and 900 South- Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commissioners asked if the proposal prevented duplexes. Staff stated lot size determined what could be built, but most lots would not be large enough for duplexes to be constructed.
- West Temple Gateway- Staff identified the driveway, access and use issues.
- Climbing Wall- Staff gave overview of proposal.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE November 28, 2012 MEETING

MOTION [5:34:15 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife made a motion to approve the November 28, 2012 minutes. Commissioner Drown seconded the motion. Commissioners Taylor, Woodhead and Flores-Sahagun abstained. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:34:52 PM](#)

Chairperson Gallegos stated this was the last meeting of the Planning Commission for the year and wished everyone a happy holiday season. He stated the City Council also held their last meeting for the year on December 11, and asked Mr. Sommerkorn to report on any items that were approved or reviewed by the Council.

Mr. Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director, stated the City Council approved the Design Guidelines for the Historic Districts which included the residential, commercial and sign guidelines. He stated the City Council had approved additional areas in the TSA zoning as well as the Signature Books rezone.

Vice Chairperson Drown stated she had nothing to report at this time.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:36:15 PM](#)

Mr. Wilford, Sommerkorn, Planning Director, stated there were a couple of items previously approved that needed some changes made. He stated there was also a previously approved plan development being modified that Staff wanted to make the Commission aware of. Mr. Sommerkorn asked Mr. Britton and Mr. Joyce to present the subject items.

Mr. Nick Britton, Senior Planner reviewed the wording that needed to be changed in the Parking and Transportation Demand Management ordinance as outlined in the memo given to the Commissioners (located in the case file). He stated the current language would correct the language to be in line with what was intended by the ordinance in the beginning.

The Commissioners stated they understood the proposed changes and the intent of the language.

Mr. Everett Joyce, Senior Planner, reviewed the approved Plan Development for Rowland Hall and explained the three phases of the project. He stated Rowland Hall had requested a temporary use in Phase two and three which would consist of another soccer field and a parking lot both of which are allowed in the ordinance. Mr. Joyce stated the soccer field and the parking lot would be in place until the Applicant was ready to start the second

phase of building the gymnasium. He stated the temporary use would be limited to five years at which time the project would be reviewed and re-evaluated.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated the phase two and three areas were shown as grass in the approved petition therefore, their request was not largely changing the proposal and fit within the minor modification provision of the ordinance.

The Commissioners asked about parking in the area and if it would increase the traffic for the neighborhood.

Staff explained the proposed parking lot would alleviate some of the parking that was currently on the street.

The Commission and Staff discussed the parking arrangements for Rowland Hall and how parking would be accommodated after the gym was constructed.

Mr. Sommerkorn reviewed the request by the City Council for Staff to redesign the Master Planning Process and stated Staff had been working diligently on it. He stated Staff would be sending items to the Commission for their comment via email. Mr. Sommerkorn stated a briefing was scheduled for January 8, and asked the Commission to send their comments to Staff prior to this meeting.

Mr. Nick Norris, Planning Manager stated there would be an open house tomorrow December 13, at the City Library to view a short film regarding the changes to downtown and also provide an opportunity for citizens to tell their downtown story. He explained a video log was being created to help establish what the communities' values were for downtown.

The Commission asked if the film was available for public view other than at the Open House.

Staff stated individuals would need to check with KUED for availability.

BRIEFING [5:47:46 PM](#)

PLN2012-00799 Circulation and Streetscape Amenities Plan – A request by Mayor Ralph Becker, in behalf of Salt Lake City, requesting the City adopt the Circulation and Streetscape Amenities Plan for the Sugar House Business District. (Staff contact: Michael Maloy at 801.535.7118 or michael.maloy@slcgov.com).

Mr. Michael Maloy, Principal Planner reviewed the purpose for the proposal and turned the time over to Ms. Hutchinson for a presentation. He stated the proposal would be brought back to the Commission at a later date for approval.

Ms. Robin Hutchinson, Director of Transportation, introduced Mr. John Nepsted, Consultant and Mr. Ed Butterfield, RDA. She reviewed the circulation and Streetscape plan as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file).

The Commissioners asked questions regarding how the pedestrian first policy was addressed in the proposal.

Ms. Hutchinson reviewed the recommendations that improved the pedestrian environment in a number of locations.

The Commission and Ms. Hutchinson discussed the effects to the business on 2100 South and if bicycle lanes would be added to the Sugarhouse business district.

The Commission asked when the proposal would be brought before them for approval.

Staff stated it would most likely be at the last meeting in January.

The Commission and Ms. Hutchinson discussed if parking would be available along the street car route. Ms. Hutchinson stated parking would not be provided as the intent was to reduce single occupant vehicles.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:17:04 PM](#)

PLNPCM2012-00726 The Front Climbing Club Additional Building Height Conditional Use- A request by The Front Climbing Club, represented by Dustin Buckthal, for a Conditional Use for additional building height in order to accommodate the construction of a tall climbing wall at approximately 1460 S 400 West . The request is for an additional 30 feet, for a total of 90 feet of height. The subject property is located in the CG (General Commercial) zoning district and is located in Council District 5, represented by Jill Remington Love.(Staff Contact: Daniel Echeverria at 801-535-7165 or daniel.echeverria@slcgov.com).

Mr. Daniel Echeverria, Associate Planner reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated it was Staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission asked for clarification on the language in the Staff Report that stated there would be a ninety foot climbing wall. They asked if it was a ninety foot building with a smaller wall.

Staff stated the building would enclose the climbing wall and that the Applicant could better address the height of the climbing wall. He stated the building would not be taller than ninety feet.

Mr. Dustin Buckthal, Applicant, and Mr. Rob Merrick, Architect, reviewed the height of the wall and the building and stated the building would not go over the ninety feet.

The Commission asked if there were any foreseen parking issues.

Mr. Buckthal reviewed the available parking and explained additional parking was available on site as well as street parking in the area.

Mr. Merrick stated the proposal met the parking requirements for the building size.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:22:14 PM](#)

Chairperson Gallegos opened the Public Hearing seeing there was no one present to speak for or against the petition; Chairperson Gallegos closed the Public Hearing.

DISCUSSION [6:22:32 PM](#)

The Commissioners asked about the signage allowed on the site.

Mr. Norris stated the signage regulations for the CG zoning district determine the type and size of signs allowed in the area,

MOTION [6:23:14 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife stated in regards to Conditional Use PLNPCM2012-00726, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report and the testimony given, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the proposed Conditional Use with the five conditions listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Drown seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[6:23:55 PM](#)

PLNPCM2012-00785 Salt Lake City Employee Medical Clinic Conditional Use - A request by Salt Lake City Corporation and PEHP for conditional use approval for a proposed medical clinic to be included in the existing office building located at 230 South 500 East. The clinic would be located on the 5th floor of the building, which is located in the RO (Residential Office) zoning district and is located in Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott (Staff contact: Casey Stewart at (801) 535-6260 or casey.stewart@slcgov.com)

Mr. Casey Stewart, Senior Planner reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated it was Staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented

PUBLIC HEARING [6:26:38 PM](#)

Chairperson Gallegos opened the Public Hearing seeing there was no one present to speak for or against the petition; Chairperson Gallegos closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [6:26:51 PM](#)

Commissioner Woodhead stated in regards to PLNPCM2012-00785, Conditional Use request by the Salt lake City PEHP Medical Clinic, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report and the testimony given, she moved that the Planning Commission approve the petition subject to the conditions listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Flores-Sahagun seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously

[6:27:43 PM](#)

PLNPCM2012-00360 700 South to 900 South 700 East to 900 East Rezone - A petition initiated by the Salt Lake City Council to rezone Approximately 189 Properties Between 700 South and 900 South and 700 East and 900 East.

- Existing residential properties proposed to be rezoned from Low Density and Moderate Density Multi-Family residential (RMF-30 and RMF-35) to Single and Two Family Residential (R-2)
- Existing Commercial Properties at 679 East 900 South and 705 East 900 South proposed to be rezoned from Low Density Multi-Family Residential (RMF-30) to Neighborhood Commercial (CN).
- Existing Commercial Properties at 801 South 800 East and 774 East 800 South proposed to be rezoned from Low Density Multi-Family Residential (RMF-30) to Small Neighborhood Business (SNB).

The properties are located in Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Ray Milliner at ray.milliner@slcgov.com or 801-535-7645).

Mr. Ray Milliner, Principal Planner reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated it was Staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council for petition PLNCM2012-00360.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:32:37 PM](#)

Chairperson Gallegos opened the Public Hearing

Ms. Mary Bishop, East Liberty Park Community Council, stated careful review to determine what the best zoning for each block was needed. She stated each street and property needed to be reviewed to determine what was the best use for each area.

Mr. Darryl High, Liberty Park Community Council, stated they were worried about the impacts to the residential uses in the area and how they would be protected. He stated it may impact any growth for the 9th and 9th business district and future growth for the City as well.

The Commission asked if the Community Council was proposing zoning for single family or multiple family dwellings.

Mr. High stated the Community Council debated the issue at their last meeting as there was room for improvement in the area and some of the properties could be better used if they were allowed to have multiple family dwellings.

Ms. Bishop stated there were so many different types of properties in the area and the blocks were large so it would be a benefit to look at each property as an individual before deciding what it should be zoned.

Commissioner Woodhead asked how the Community Council felt about the proposal to combine lots in order to create larger multifamily dwelling units.

Ms. Bishop stated the Community Council saw each street as an individual zoning issue that needed to be address very carefully and the zoning be flexible.

The following individuals spoke in support of the proposal: Mr. Larry Bishop

The following comments were made:

- The down zone of the general neighborhood would be good for the area and allow for more multifamily homes.
- Leave the zoning on the current multifamily homes as is.

The following individuals spoke in opposition of the proposal: Mr. Jerry Hatch, Mr. Norm Elliott, Ms. Clara McKenna, Mr. John Luker and Mr. Tosh Hatch

The following comments were made:

- Maintaining the low density residential zoning would keep the integrity of the neighborhood, keep if family orientated.
- Parking would be an issue
- Late night business traffic would fuel late activities at Liberty Park which would not be a good thing.
- Keep the home and land values intact.
- Rezoning to high density would change the character of the neighborhood.
- 705 East and 900 South zoning needs to stay low moderate density zoning.
- Proposal would be detrimental to the area.
- Traffic and late hours from the business would cause negative issues in the neighborhood.
- Rezone would be a detriment to the neighboring properties due to noise, parking and activities in the area.
- Single family residents would be better for the area

Chairperson Gallegos asked Staff to readdress the intent of the rezoning.

Mr. Milliner stated the intent was to take subject parcels and rezone them from a multi family zone and reduce them to single and two family zoning. He explained this would allow for single family or duplexes to be constructed, currently if the lot size allowed a multi family or apartment style structure could be constructed.

Chairperson Gallegos asked if this was preserving the integrity of the existing neighborhood.

Mr. Milliner stated yes, that was the intent of the proposal.

The Commission and Staff discussed the commercial zoning in the area and what the proposal would allow. It was stated that the proposal would change the zoning to

neighborhood commercial which would allow for business that would support the neighborhood such as a neighborhood grocery or other small retail type uses with a height limit of twenty five feet. Staff gave examples of other areas that are similar to this zoning.

Chairperson Gallegos closed the Public Hearing.

DISCUSSION [6:59:15 PM](#)

The Commission stated they had the following concerns:

- After listening to the Public comments it may seem that miss information was sent out.
- Changing the zoning at 705 East 900 South could have a negative effect on the neighborhood.
- What the effect would be of down zoning the housing in the area.
- There was a conflict regarding the 700 East parcels between the community council and the residents. The Council was saying that the lower density zoning on 700 East did not make sense for future use of these properties.
- Higher density residential and lower density commercial had relatively the same impact.
- Single family housing could be successful if it was close to the park.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed how and why this area was chosen for the rezone and if the City Council needed to host meetings with the public to understand the public's concerns before moving ahead with the proposed rezone. Staff stated public outreach had been done and this was the first time he had heard the request for multiple family zoning. The Commission stated they were not certain that the Community had enough information to have an informed opinion on the proposal.

Commissioner Fife stated the comments were directed to the parcel at 705 East and 900 South however, the general feeling was that the public did not want intensification of uses in the neighborhood and this proposal prevented the intensification of uses in the neighborhood.

The Commission discussed possibly tabling the proposal to better inform the public. Staff reviewed the public outreach done for the proposal and the response to the outreach. The Commission stated there was a good response to the petition and the noticing standards were met.

The Commission discussed possible motions and language that could be added to the motion to clarify what was being requested.

The Commission and Staff discussed the zoning of the parcel at 705 East and 900 South, its history and what the proposal was requesting.

MOTION [7:15:24 PM](#)

Commissioner Woodhead stated in regards to the Zoning Map Amendment PLNPCM2012-00360, She moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation for the zoning map amendment to the City Council with the exception that the property at 705 East 900 South be zoned small neighborhood business as opposed to the zoning proposed in the Staff Report. She stated the motion was based on the testimony, plans presented, and the findings written in this staff report. Commissioner Fife seconded the motion. Commissioners Fife, Ruttinger, Taylor and Woodhead voted “aye”. Commissioners Drown and Flores-Sahagun voted “nay”. The motion passed 4-2.

[7:16:45 PM](#)

PLNPCM2011-00640 Form Based Code for West Temple Gateway - The Salt Lake City Planning Commission will consider a petition submitted by Mayor Ralph Becker to amend the Salt Lake City Zoning Title and Map from D-2 Downtown Support District and RMF-75 High Density Multi-Family Residential District to FB-UN1 and FB-UN2 Form Based Urban Neighborhood District for properties located approximately between 700 South Street and Fayette Avenue (975 South), and between West Temple Street and 300 West Street. The purpose of the zoning amendment is to ensure future development will enhance residential neighborhoods and encourage compatible commercial development in compliance with the City Master Plan. Related provisions of Title 21A Zoning may also be amended as part of this petition. The subject properties are located in Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott, and Council District 5, represented by Jill Remington Love. (Staff contact: Michael Maloy at (801) 535-7118 or michael.maloy@slcgov.com)

Mr. Michael Maloy, Principal Planner reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated it was Staff’s recommendation that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council for petition PLNPM2011-00640.

The Commission asked Staff to review the comments from Mr. Jamison.

Mr. Maloy stated the comments were sent in a letter to the Commission regarding a number of uses that were allowed in the D2 zone that would no longer be allowed in the FBUN2 zone. He stated Mr. Jamison was requesting that those uses be reintroduced as Conditional Uses in the proposed zone.

Chairperson Gallegos stated the public hearing for this item was held on October 24, 2012, he asked the Commission for discussion regarding the vehicle access and opening up the public comment regarding vehicle access in the area.

The Commission agreed to open the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING [7:40:49 PM](#)

Chairperson Gallegos opened the public hearing for comments regarding vehicle access. He stated this was not the last time public comments would be heard and explained that the City Council would take public comments when this petition was heard at their meeting.

The following individuals spoke to the proposal: Mr. Paul Christensen, Mr. Will Jamison, Mr. Reid Jacobson

The following comments were made:

- Restrictions on parking and access would restrict the uses of the properties on 300 West.
- Snow removal in the alleys would be difficult.
- People in the alleys would be more dangerous than people walking on a sidewalk with a curb cut.
- There are conflicts in existence currently regarding required setbacks.
- More time needs to be spent in determining what can be done on the properties in the area.
- The narrow widths of the lot limited the ability to access properties from the alley and provide adequate off street parking
- Some parking should be required for all properties.
- Access from only the alley way was not ideal.
- Access from the street should be allowed for optimal parking and use of the property.
- Cub cuts would not be a hindrance to the pedestrian use of the area but would better serve the businesses in the area.
- Option 3 would be the most ideal option for the area

The Commission asked for clarification on option 3.

Staff reviewed Option 3 and its aspects as outlined in the petition.

Chairperson Gallegos closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Maloy explained there would be pedestrian access to the properties on 300 West and on street parking allowing access to the businesses. He stated the reason this was an RDA exercise was to change what was there as it was not presently working. Mr. Maloy stated the goal was to create a walkable neighborhood with pedestrian friendly businesses.

Commissioner Woodhead stated she was not convinced that the proposal was optimal for 300 West as it was a vehicle friendly street. She stated the notion that people could not pull off of 300 West in to a business seemed a little bit of a stretch. Commissioner Woodhead stated this proposal would work on other streets in the neighborhood and on the interior streets but not on 300 West. She reviewed the existing business on the street, the access that was currently in place and stated requiring a new business to have different access did not seem ideal.

Audience members stated they were under the impression that the Public Hearing was still open for the proposal and asked the Commission to let them speak.

Chairperson Gallegos stated there would be a Public Hearing at the City Council meeting where further issues could be addressed.

It was asked when the City Council meeting would be held.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated the time and date of the meeting would be determined by the City Council. He stated the soonest it would be heard would be around February of 2013.

The Commissioners stated they were not ready to forward a recommendation on the proposal as there were small issues such as parking on 300 West and what Conditional Uses would be allowed in the zoning. They asked if the item should be tabled and further discussion held to clarify the concerns.

Mr. Norris stated based on what had been heard and the additional Public Comments it would be Staffs preference to hear the rest of the concerns of the public so that we can work out the issues prior to moving ahead with approval. He stated requiring alley access was a big change for the City that we may not be ready for but other options could be put in place. Mr. Norris stated 300 West as it was today would not remain as such in the future and would eventually be changed to a pedestrian orientated street.

Chairperson Gallegos stated the item was tabled for Staff to provide additional information that was requested by the Commission, it was not a continuation of the Public Hearing. He stated Staff had returned with the information however, there were still some things that needed clarification and discussion. Chairperson Gallegos asked the

Commission what they would like to do at this point, open up the Public Hearing, table the issue or make a motion to forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated the individuals that did not get a chance to speak could send their comments to Michael Maloy to incorporate them into the proposal.

The Commission stated they were comfortable with opening the Public Hearing to address the additional concerns.

MOTION [8:09:34 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife made a motion to reopen the public hearing. Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion. Commissioners Taylor, Fife, Ruttinger, and Drown voted "Aye". Commissioners Woodhead and Flores-Sahagun voted "nay". The motion passed 4-2.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:10:36 PM](#)

Chairperson Gallegos opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke in opposition of the proposal: Mr. Abe Shaw, Mr. Mark Broadbent, Mr. Will Jamison and Mr. Rich Broadbent.

The following comments were made:

- The proposal was written for future development and did not take existing business owners into consideration
- Incorporate existing businesses into the plan and review what would be best
- Proposed zoning was too limited
- Food processing should be added back in as a use
- Proposal was too restricting to uses and possible business in the area
- Current uses not in the proposal need to be added as Conditional Uses
- Businesses just want to continue and possibly expand if needed

Chairperson Gallegos closed the Public Hearing.

DISCUSSION

The Commission and Staff discussed the area that was covered by the proposal.

The Commission gave the following direction to Staff:

- Add food processing back into the proposal as a use.
- Review a combination of both alley and street access.
- Review the parking availability and requirements.

MOTION [8:25:20 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife stated in regards to PLNPCM2011-00640, he moved to table the petition to a future Planning Commission meeting until a time that was determined by Staff. He stated the future meeting would not include a Public Hearing but would be to hear updates on the requested changes. Commissioner Flores-Sahagun seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously

[8:33:49 PM](#)

TMTL2012-00013 Community Based Organizations - A request by Mayor Becker for an amendment to the Salt Lake City Code. The purpose of this revision is to create a framework by which the people of the City may effectively organize into community associations representing a geographic neighborhood or area, or area of interest, and use this as one way to participate in civic affairs and improve the livability and character of the city and its neighborhoods. The amendment will affect sections 2.60 and 2.62 of the Salt Lake City Code. Related provisions of Title 21A- Zoning referencing sections 2.60 and 2.62 may also be amended as part of this petition. (Staff contact: Nole Walkingshaw at (801) 535-7128 or nole.walkingshaw@slcgov.com)

Mr. Nole Walkingshaw, Program Manager reviewed the petition as outlined in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated it was Staff's recommendation that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council for petition PLNCM2012-00013.

Staff and the Commission discussed the term Community Council, its purpose in the ordinance and the importance of having it recognize a variety of organizations. They discussed how the organizations would be notified and who would get notification.

MOTION [8:44:22 PM](#)

Commissioner Drown moved to open the Public Hearing. Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:44:46 PM](#)

Chairperson Gallegos opened the Public Hearing

Ms. Ester Hunter, Central City Community Council, expressed the following:

- Need to expand the definition of Community Councils,
- The early notice on all application is key to public involvement,
- Community Councils represent neighborhoods and communities as an entity,
- All Community Council feedback is not equal; encourage feedback standard be kept such as
 - When was notice given to neighborhood
 - How feedback was taken
 - How many in meeting what were the comments

Ms. Hunter explained the way the Central City Community Council notifies the public of items and how they get people involved in the process.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugar House Community Council, stated it was important to let people know what was happening in the city and the Community Councils are a way to do that. She stated an email notifying the Community Councils of applications could be sent. Ms. Short stated Open City Hall was not the best resource; they would like the Planner to meet with Community Councils at the beginning of the process.

Commissioner Flores-Sahagun stated the Community Council should discuss their issues with the Developer during the review period.

Mr. Walkingshaw explained the pre-application meetings that were held where issues could be addressed however, all the details may not be discussed at these meeting or the projects may never come about. He stated the best time to start the conversation was when the application was deemed complete and ready to be processed.

The Commission and Staff discussed the options for notifying the Community Councils by email and at what time it would happen during the process.

Chairperson Gallegos closed the Public Hearing.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the requirement for Community Councils to reach out to individuals in order to encourage them to be involved in organizations and agreed this would be done by the City not the individual Community Councils. They discussed the notification and participation for items and its difficulty.

MOTION [9:02:47 PM](#)

Commissioner Drown stated in regards to TMTL2012-00013, based on the findings listed in the staff report and testimony, she move that the Planning Commission transmit a favorable recommendation to the City Council. Commissioner Woodhead seconded the motion. Commissioners, Drown, Woodhead, Flores-Sahagun and Fife voted “aye”. Commissioner Taylor voted “nay” The motion passed 4-1.

The meeting adjourned at [9:03:48 PM](#)