

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Room 126 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, August 13, 2014

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:31:39 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for an indefinite period of time.

Present for the Planning Commission meeting were: Chairperson Emily Drown, Vice Chair Clark Ruttinger, Commissioners Angela Dean, Michael Fife, Michael Gallegos, James Guilkey,Carolynn Hoskins, Matt Lyon, Marie Taylor and Matthew Wirthlin.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director; Nick Norris, Planning Manager; Everett Joyce, Senior Planner; Tracy Tran, Principal Planner; Chris Lee, Principal Planner; Michelle Moeller, Senior Secretary and Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney.

Field Trip

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Planning Commissioners present were: Emily Drown, Carolynn Hoskins, James Guilkey and Clark Ruttinger. Staff members in attendance were Nick Norris, Chris Lee and Tracy Tran.

The following location was visited:

1. **East Liberty Tap House** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
 - The Commission asked where parking would be located.
 - Staff stated the parking would be behind the building and the proposal complied with the parking requirements.
 - The Commission asked if there were comments from the neighbors.
 - Staff stated not from immediate neighbors but from people in the area that were mostly positive.
 - The Commission asked if it was unusual for council members to send letters to the Commission.
 - Staff stated Council members do not usually send letters to the Commission.
2. **Vector Barn** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
 - The Commission asked why the Applicant needed a Conditional Use.
 - Staff stated it was due to the size of the building.
3. **Road Home**- Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JULY 9, 2014, MEETING. [5:32:03 PM](#)
MOTION [5:32:07 PM](#)**

Commissioner Gallegos moved to approve the July 9, 2014. Commissioner Guilkey seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Fife abstained from voting as he was not present at the subject meeting.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JUNE 11, 2014, MEETING. [5:33:43 PM](#)
MOTION [5:33:47 PM](#)**

Commissioner Fife moved to approve the June 11, 2014. Commissioner Gallegos seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. Commissioner Wirthlin, Dean and Ruttinger abstained from voting as they were not present at the subject meeting.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:34:06 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown stated she had nothing to report.
Vice Chairperson Ruttinger stated he had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:34:12 PM](#)

Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director, stated he had nothing to report.

[5:34:24 PM](#)

[East Liberty Tap House Conditional Use at approximately 850 East 900 South](#) - Scott Evans is requesting approval from the City for conditional use approval to open a tavern at the above listed property. The tavern will be located within a restaurant. The subject property is located in the CB (Community Business) zoning district and is located in Council District 5, represented by Erin Mendenhall. (Staff contact: Tracy Tran at (801) 535-7645 or tracy.tran@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNPCM2014-00387

Ms. Tracy Tran, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented.

Mr. Scott Evans, Business Owner, gave an overview of the proposal and use of the structure.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The layout of the restaurant and tavern.
 - The tavern area will be approximately fifteen seats.
- The public outreach for the proposal.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:40:26 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing; seeing no one in the audience wished to speak to the petition, Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [5:41:13 PM](#)

Commissioner Guilkey stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00387, East Liberty Tap House; based on the information in the Staff Report, public testimony, and discussion by the Planning Commission, he moved that the Planning Commission approve PLNPCM2014-00387 East Liberty Tap House Conditional Use as proposed and subject to complying with all applicable regulations. Due to the potential for detrimental impacts created by the proposal identified in this report, the Planning Commission applied the following conditions of approval to the project:

- 1. Update the security and operation plans if any changes to the nature of the business are made during the conditional use process. The plan will need to be reviewed by the Police Department and Building Official before being submitted for recordation with the City Recorder's office. The plan will need to be recorded before a business license was issued.**
- 2. Ensure the rear light that will illuminate the back doors and the ADA ramp was shielded as much as possible from the abutting residentially owned property to prevent the lighting from being a nuisance.**

Commissioner Gallegos seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[5:43:48 PM](#)

[Vactor Barn Conditional Use at approximately 1530 South West Temple](#) - Natalie Moore, representing the Public Utilities Division of Salt Lake City Corporation, is requesting conditional use approval of a proposed municipal services project consisting primarily of the construction of a building to house vactors (large "vacuum" sewer trucks) along with some site work. Currently the land is used for housing multiple city vehicles and is zoned PL (Public Lands). This type of project must be reviewed as a Conditional Use. The subject property is within Council District #5, represented by Erin Mendenhall. (Staff contact: Chris Lee at (801) 535-7706 or christopher.lee@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNPCM2014-00415

Mr. Chris Lee, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented.

Ms. Natalie Moore and Mr. Jason Brown, Salt Lake City Public Utilities, reviewed the purpose for the Vactor Truck and the need for the structure. They asked the Commission to approve the petition as proposed.

PUBLIC HEARING [5:48:50 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing; seeing no one in the audience wished to speak to the petition, Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

MOTION [5:49:36 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00415 Vactor Barn, based on the plans submitted, the Staff Report and testimony provided, he moved that the Planning Commission approve the Conditional Use, with no conditions of approval because no detrimental or adverse impacts had been identified related to the proposal. Commissioner Ruttinger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[5:51:46 PM](#)

Commissioner Gallegos recused himself on the basis of the appearance of a potential conflict of interest due to professional matters.

[The Road Home Conditional use at approximately 437 West 200 South](#) - Matt Minkevitch is requesting approval from the City to continue an emergency winter homeless shelter, which operates under a previous conditional use approval that expires April 15, 2014. The emergency shelter is located in the St. Vincent de Paul's community dining hall at the above listed address. Currently the land is used as a community dining hall and for the last five years an emergency winter homeless shelter. The property is zoned D-3(Downtown Warehouse/Residential District). This type of project must be reviewed as a conditional use. The subject property is within Council District 4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Everett Joyce at (801) 535-7930 or everett.joyce@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNPCM2013-00991

Mr. Everett Joyce, Senior Planner reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He reviewed the fifteen Detrimental Effect Standards for approval as outlined in the Staff Report (page 32). Mr. Joyce stated Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If the petition was for a five year extension or to be ongoing.
 - Typically Conditional Uses do not have an expiration date therefore, this would be ongoing.

Mr. Blake Bauman, Attorney for Applicant, gave a history of the proposal and process. He reviewed the pending appeal to Third District Court. Mr. Bauman reviewed the possible public comments, the critical nature of the petition and the reason for locating the overflow shelter at the subject location.

Mr. Matt Minkevitch, Director of Road Home, gave a brief outline of the Road Home's services and use of the overflow facility. He reviewed the Midvale shelter which was used for families in the winter months. Mr. Minkevitch reviewed the critical need for these services and asked the Commission to approve the petition.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the overflow shelter was a continual need or if it was increasing the capacity of the beds for the shelter.
 - The need for additional beds increases in the winter months as the weather changes and other areas are no longer available for the homeless (i.e. canyons or outside areas).
- The need to open the shelter in September rather than when the weather was colder.
 - In years past the Midvale center opened in September due to early storms.
 - Average first freeze for Salt Lake City is in mid October.
- If the people using the shelter were repeat users from year to year.
 - Most homeless individuals move out of homelessness but there is a small percentage (approximately 10 percent) of the homeless population that use the beds year round.
 - Services are changing and helping to move people into housing opportunities and out of shelters.
- The number of beds at the shelter.
 - Approximately 750 at max compactly.
- If the Road Home could do more to mitigate the impact on the surrounding businesses.
 - The Road Home has made improvements to mitigate the impacts over the years. The shelter is open throughout the day to invite homeless in off the streets.
- How inebriated individuals were addressed and if they were allowed to stay in the shelter.
 - It depended on the nature of the person.
 - Dangerous individuals are treated and if needed the police get involved.
- If the Road Home treated this as a holistic approach to help these individuals get off the streets.
 - There is a street team that helps individuals and is working with other services to assist the homeless in getting off the streets.

- If the complaints from the surrounding area are higher in the winter or lower due to the use of the overflow area.
 - It seems that less people are on the street during the winter as they are inside. The Police made comments, at the March meeting that the emergency shelter helped with criminal issues during the winter.

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

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Brian Hill, Community Council, stated the Community Council recognized the value of the Road Home and that the Road Home had been making improvements over the last few months. He asked if other options had been looked at, in other communities, to help the homeless without opening the overflow shelter and where do the people go after the shelter closed.

Mr. Clair Baldwin, Chief of Medical Services, reviewed the issues of hypothermia, where the homeless are living during the summer months and reasons why the homeless are not getting treated for their medical issues. He stated the emergency shelter was not anecdotal it was critical. Mr., Baldwin stated money was an issue for the Road Home to provide all the needed services for these people. He said if the shelter was closed the homeless people would not go away as there was nowhere for these people to go and it was the responsibility of the city, as a whole, to take care of these individuals.

Mr. Bruce Shapiro, Attorney for Appellant, reviewed the appeal of the Rio Grande, stated the Rio Grande was sympathetic to the plight of the homeless but the Conditional Use permit could not be based on sympathy, it needed to meet the standards. He stated a prior Conditional Use was not a basis to grant the petition and other uses in the neighborhood should be considered. Mr. Sharpiro stated this would not be a time limited conditional use, reviewed the comments made by Staff regarding the Detrimental Effect Standards and how the petition did not met those standards. Mr. Sharpiro asked the Commission to deny the petition for a Conditional Use.

Mr. Nielson and Mr. Sharpiro discussed how the Gateway Master Plan addressed different uses and the compatibility.

Mr. Pete Henderson, Appellant, reviewed the history of Rio Grande Street and how the homeless shelter came to be in its current location. He reviewed incidents with the homeless and crime in the area. Mr. Henderson asked the Commission to deny the petition. He stated homeless facilities and retail commerce are incompatible and a continued attempt to make them work will cost the business owners not the homeless.

The Commission and Appellant discussed the following:

- How the criminal incidents in the neighborhood related to the emergency homeless shelter.
 - Homelessness was part of the issue because the homeless gather around the area of the shelter.
- If it was better to take eighty inebriated men off the street each night or was it better to let them stay on the street.
 - It was better for the homeless but not the businesses who deal with the homeless throughout the day when they are not in the shelter.
 - The City should find a different location for them.
- If the overflow shelter made the issues worse or better in the winter.
 - No statistics on if it was worse or better during the six months the emergency shelter is open but there are more people in the area.
- If the solution would be to build new shelter in the area that would accommodate the number of homeless.
 - It would be better to spread it out so the concentration was not in one area.
- Additional conditions the Appellant would like put on the petition in order to make it more compatible rather than deny the petition as a whole.
 - Put a time limit on the petition so it would be reviewed again in the future.
 - The issue before the Commission was not if the homeless freeze in the winter but if the shelter was compatible.
- The impact of the homeless on the local businesses and area.
- How this petition would be decided if it were a different use causing the negative impacts to the area.
 - The detrimental impacts would still need to be mitigated.

Ms. Pamela Atkinson stated it was important to take care of the less fortunate and to use sound policy in making these types of decisions. She reviewed the programs that are decreasing the drug activity in the area and that the emergency shelter made a difference for the people it serves. Ms. Atkinson discussed the programs available for the homeless, the need for these services and that it is a continuous effort to help move the homeless off the street and into housing. She reviewed the team of people that help to assist the homeless and eliminate the impacts to the area.

Mr. Zach Bale, Volunteers of America, reviewed the services for the homeless in the area, the alternatives for homeless services (adult detox) and the zoning limitations that prohibit homeless services in other parts of the city.

The Commission and Mr. Bale discussed the time frame it took to get individuals into treatment facilities. Mr. Bale stated the location of the proposed emergency shelter was

ideal to keep the homeless close to the existing services and it was a necessity to move people off the street and keep them safe.

Mr. Richard Thomas stated the homeless situation had continually increased over the years and it was not an issue of seeing people die or being housed in the overflow shelter. Mr. Thomas gave a history of the shelter coming to be located in the area. He stated the City did not give the business owners the option to allow the shelter to be located in the neighborhood but promised to mitigate the impacts, which they have not. Mr. Thomas stated the City had not, could not and would not mitigate the homeless issues in the area and the services should be located in another area of the City.

Lt. Rich Brede, Metro Support Bureau, stated the Salt Lake Police Department knew that people were sensitive to the issues but in light of any alternative it was essential to get people out of inclement weather and into shelters.

The Commission and Lt. Brede discussed if there were statistics from the past five years depicting how the winter shelter helped the homeless issues. Lt. Brede stated it was researched however; there are currently more officers in the area causing a spike in the number of crimes reported. He reviewed the drug arrests and the continued programs in place to address crime in the area.

Mr. Bob Allen reviewed the importance of helping those less fortunate.

Ms. Ilanna Gurr stated everyone wanted to help the homeless, it was an ongoing problem and granting a Conditional Use only exacerbated the problem. She stated the conditions the homeless are leaving behind in the area are health hazards for the neighborhood. Ms. Gurr would like to see the homeless helped in a better way so in the future this was not an issue. Ms. Gurr reviewed the interaction she has with the homeless around her building and stated something needed to be done to address the issue not mask it.

Mr. Paul Christensen stated the emergency shelter helped to make the area safer during the winter months as it took more of the homeless off of the street. He stated there are challenges that need to be addressed but it did help and he had never felt unsafe in the area due to the emergency shelter or the Road Home.

Mr. John Gurr stated it was unfair to make this an issue of people dying. He stated the problems the homeless people bring to the area such as human waste, trash and camping on private property was the issue. Mr. Gurr stated there needed to be an alternative not a mask for the problem.

Ms. Elizabeth Beuhler, Salt Lake City Homeless Services Coordinator, reviewed the programs the City has put in place. She reviewed the amount of complaints received in the different seasons with winter being the time when the least amount of complaints are received. Ms. Beuhler reviewed the collaborative Services Strategy being implemented in Pioneer Park. She stated the city is looking at the safety and crime to ensure a uniform and collaborative effort exists, extending hours at the Weigand Center and how the outreach teams are trying to get individuals into programs and off the street. Ms. Beuhler reviewed the housing being built to help address the homeless issue.

The Commission and Ms. Beuhler discussed what spurred the new initiative. Ms. Beuhler reviewed why the program was brought implemented and the strategy to address the concerns of the neighborhood.

The Commission and Staff discussed if a time limit was an option and if it would benefit the proposal.

Mr. Nielson reviewed the history of the expired Conditional Use, the standards for Conditional Uses and that Conditional Uses are not subject to a time limit under the ordinance.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The existing Conditional Use.
- If a new Conditional Use was necessary or if the current Conditional Use could be continued.
 - The current Conditional Use expired so a new Conditional Use was necessary.
- If a time limit was allowed as long as the Applicant agreed to it.
 - Staff stated it was not something that the Planning Commission could require of the Applicant.
- If a temporary Conditional Use was a wise choice for the petition.
- If benchmarks could be put in place.
 - Benchmarks were not necessary because if conditions were not met the Conditional Use would be invalidated.
 - The ordinance provided rules and a process for how a Conditional Use could be revoked.
- How the project fit with the Future Land Use maps and if the proposal met those standards.
 - All Master Plans, by ordinance, are advisory documents and do not have regulatory function in terms of private land uses.
- The standards for approval the petition should meet.
- If having the additional facility attracted more homeless to the area or if the homeless were all ready in the city.

- Homeless were all ready in the city.
- The number of complaints regarding homeless individuals during the winter.

Ms. Natasha Deininger stated comments made by the public were related to the homeless problem in general and not to the emergency shelter. She stated the homeless population existed whether or not the shelter was there. Ms. Deininger said the population was extremely vulnerable and had nowhere else to go; they need the shelter and housing them in the winter months was critical.

Mr. Doug Smith reviewed his experiences with working with the homeless services and the trouble with asking the Road Home to shoulder the entire homeless problem. He reviewed the issues with finding areas to build a shelter in other areas, the different shelters that help to house the homeless and the need for the emergency shelter. Mr. Smith discussed the need to have the shelter by public transportation as the homeless do not have access to private transportation.

Chairperson Drown read the following card:

Mr. Warren Epstein. 30 Units Dakota Lofts, stated they were in opposition. Doesn't see how this can be considered an "emergency" since it had been requested for more than a decade. Also pictures represented in the Staff Report are not accurate and don't show the current blight, camping on sidewalks, trash and other hazards not consistent with other areas in the neighborhood.

Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Neilson reviewed the case law stating public clamor was not a basis for a decision in a land use matter. He stated that included both positive and negative comments.

The Commission stated the debate was around homelessness in general and as Council stated the Commission's decision needed to be based on if mitigating factors could be applied to the Conditional Use. It was stated that only the negative impacts regarding the emergency shelter should be discussed not mitigating the homeless problem. The emergency shelter was mitigating itself as it was putting people indoors and off the streets.

Mr. Blake Bauman, Attorney for Applicant, responded to the comments from the Appellant by stating the following:

- The conversion of a kitchen to a homeless shelter use on an overflow basis.

- The ordinance that applied would be what a homeless shelter is. The subject building fit within a zone that provided that a homeless shelter was a conditional use. A homeless shelter was simply a building or portion thereof in which sleeping accommodations are provided on an emergency basis for temporary homelessness.
 - That was what was being proposed at the St. Vincent Center.
- The conditions proposed by Staff were meaningless and not addressing potential detrimental effects.
 - Disagreed as the conditions were meaningful, would impact and mitigate against detrimental effects raised by ordinance (the fifteen standards) and by specific problems with homelessness around the area.
- Time limitation
 - Problematic under Land use law and should be treated the same as other Conditional Uses.
- Many of the comments are about improving services, increasing access to services and continuing to improve the area of the city.
 - The Road Home is actively engaged in different community groups and is continuously looking for solutions to improve the situation.
- Petition was not truly for an overflow shelter.
 - The main shelter is at capacity when the St. Vincent shelter is put to use.
- Whether the problems in the area are during the time when the overflow homeless shelter was open.
 - Evidence need to be provided that the overflow shelter made the issues worse.
 - Would show that this specific use does not further increase those detrimental effects.
 - Information shows that complaints are fewer during the time the overflow shelter is open.

The Commission asked the Applicant how large does the homeless numbers get before there is a cap.

Mr. Minkevitch reviewed the history of the numbers of homeless in Salt Lake City. He reviewed the options for housing the homeless, the growth of the City and how to absorb the homeless that may come with that growth.

The Commission discussed if a cap could be put on the number of beds allowed in the overflow shelter, what the space could accommodate and if there were detrimental effects that could be mitigated with a cap. It was stated that the number of beds allowed would be self regulating based on the space. The Commission discussed the detrimental effects due to the number of people staying in the shelter overnight, the issue of people queuing on the street and if the facility attracted homeless from other areas of the state.

The Commission asked Staff to respond to the Appellant's claim that Staff picked the compatibility standards in determining if this was a compatible use.

Mr. Joyce stated a significant amount of the standards for approval are related to new construction and development and the compatibility of the physical environment of that development. He stated the standards do not get into the types of uses, the master plan supports different uses, are a general policy guideline and the implementation of those master plans was what the ordinances was for. Mr. Joyce stated just because he did not evaluate the master plan policies supporting restaurants and retail uses did not mean the petition failed to meet the detrimental standard impact it just meant that Staff was addressing it for the specific Conditional Use in front of the Commission. The homeless shelter use did not affect other business as a fact, under the standards, because it is a different type of use.

[8:45:40 PM](#)

The Commission took a short break.

[8:56:46 PM](#)

The Commission reconvened.

Mr. Norris reviewed the following public comments:

- Drugs in the area.
 - Was a City issue and not the Road Home's.
- People urinating and defecating on private and public property.
 - This proposal provides a facility for those individuals, during the winter evenings, a place to take care of those needs.
 - Does not prevent it from happening all together.
- Loitering.
 - Public safety issue.
- Living and camping on sidewalk.
 - By providing the overflow shelter this would lessen the number of people sleeping on the street.
- Increase in Emergency Responses.
 - City issue not necessarily created by the particular use.
- County services.
 - Not relevant to the subject petition although homelessness is a regional issue that Salt Lake City should not bear the brunt of.
- What happens to the people after the shelter closes.
 - City is working with other centers to help move people off the streets during the day.
- Staff Report not addressing other uses in the area.

- Staff Report addresses other uses on pages 2-4 and attachment F (pages 31-33).
- Title not authorizing converting a kitchen to a shelter.
 - Not a zoning issue, it is a building code and building occupancy issue.
- Restricting hours did not make it compatible.
 - Shelter offers a place for people to sleep and the other issues are all ready happening during the day. Not because of the proposed shelter.
- Master Plan.
 - Read the information from the Gateway Master Plan (page 5) regarding the purpose and intent of the master plan.
 - Master Plans do not address every specific change, land use or mix of uses that may occur in one shared space. It is up to the zoning ordinance and building code to address that.
 - Master Plan providing for housing downtown.
 - Social services are not directly related to residential housing.
 - Encouraging adaptive reuse applies to historic buildings which the subject building is not therefore it does not apply.
- Social Services intergrading into the fabric and what it means.
 - The master plan provides specific directions on how to accomplish this, such as function, management safety and security, loitering, expanded police presence, and other such things that are currently being done.
- Commission may want to address people lining up on the street as that was an impact that needed to be addressed.
- Off street parking requirements are met
- Use being buffered or screened
 - Was there an impact that would necessitate screening.
 - The Building serves as a buffer and provides screening.
- The proposed use does not create health hazards; they are required to comply with all applicable health and safety codes.
- Impacts offsite are not necessarily directly related to the proposed use.

The Commission asked if Staff was saying that the presence of the facility, which will bring a particular population into the neighborhood who engages in these activities outside the facility was not a detrimental impact.

Mr. Norris stated that impact had to be tied to the particular use at this location. He stated if people that may visit the facility are doing things at another location that isn't necessarily the fault or the impact created by this particular use at this location. Mr. Norris said it is the responsibility of those individuals that are performing the acts and creating the problems. He stated the issue for the Commission was whether or not there was a detrimental impact or nuisance that required mitigation, because of the fact that the people that may be served in the area happen to be sleeping in the subject building during the winter months.

The Commission commended the Road Home for the work they do with the community and the homeless in the city. They stated the businesses in the area are critical to helping revive the area and make it thrive.

MOTION [9:10:31 PM](#)

Commissioner Lyon stated regarding petition PLNPCM2013-00991, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report and the testimony heard, he moved that the Planning Commission recognized that overall the project generally met the applicable conditional use standards, complies with applicable zoning ordinance provisions, was compatible with surrounding uses, was consistent with city policy and plans and complied with detrimental affects determinations criteria of chapter 21A.54 Conditional Uses provided that certain conditions are applied. Therefore, the Planning Commission approves the conditional use to allow an emergency homeless shelter during the winter months from October 1 to April 15 to be located in the dining area of the St. Vincent de Paul Center, located at approximately 437 West 200 South subject to the following conditions of approval

- 1. The Applicant was required to re-submit to the City a security and maintenance plan. The security and maintenance plan may be approved by the Zoning Administrator with input from the Police Department;**
- 2. The clients of the St. Vincent de Paul Center must be continuously visually monitored by on-site staff or by closed-circuit video camera;**
- 3. Lining up for entrance into the St. Vincent's shall not begin prior to 6:30 p.m. nightly;**
- 4. The dining area of St. Vincent's may be used as an overflow facility for the homeless only, from October 1 to April 15 as requested;**

Based on the testimony provided by the Applicant, Appellant and Public, the Commission did not find that anyone could show there was an appreciable increase of detrimental effects or impacts of the problems described during the winter months when the emergency shelter was open. The testimony provided by Elizabeth Buehler, Salt Lake City Homeless Services Coordinator, that the complaints from the community and area actually decreased during the winter months and that there was not a connection between detrimental affects the shelter necessarily.

Commissioner Dean seconded the motion.

The Commission discussed why they were voting either for or against the petition and what would happen if the petition were taken to court.

Commissioners Lyon, Dean, Wirthlin, Ruttinger, Fife, Guilkey and Hoskins voted "aye". Commissioners Taylor voted "nay". The motion passed 7 -1.

The meeting adjourned at [9:21:00 PM](#).