

**SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**Room 126 of the City & County Building**  
**451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah**  
**Wednesday, January 28, 2015**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:37:18 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for an indefinite period of time.

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

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Nick Norris, Planning Manager; Everett Joyce, Senior Planner; Lex Traughber, Senior Planner; John Anderson, Principal Planner; Daniel Echeverria, Principal Planner; Amy Thompson, Associate Planner; Michelle Moeller, Administrative Secretary and Paul Nielson, Senior City Attorney.

**Field Trip**

A field trip was held prior to the work session. Planning Commissioners present were; Michael Fife, James Guilkey and Carolyn Hoskins,. Staff members in attendance were Nick Norris, Amy Thompson, Daniel Echeverria and Lex Traughber.

The following sites were visited:

- **South Temple Cell Tower PLNPCM2014-00643:** Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked questions about the generator.
- **Ronald McDonald House PLNPCM2014-00838:** Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **Rezone and Master Plan Amendment PLNPCM2014 -00769 & 770:** Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **1430 W Andrew Ave PLNPCM2014-00643:** Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked about the location and screening details.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 14, 2015, MEETING [5:37:42 PM](#)**  
**MOTION [5:37:47 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Guilkey moved to approve the January 14, 2015. Commissioner Hoskins seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:38:02 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Lyon stated he had nothing to report.

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:38:11 PM](#)**

Ms. Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director, stated the City and County were working together on a Homeless Services Site Evaluation Commission. Staff will keep the Commission up to date on the activities of the new Commission. She reviewed the items that may be reviewed by the City Council in February, Local Historic Districts and Sugarhouse Streetcar zoning. She stated Commissioners that would like to attend the Utah Heritage Historic Preservation Conference in March needed to notify her before the middle February. Ms. Coffey reviewed the need for people to join both the Planning Commission and the Historic Landmark Commission.

[5:40:27 PM](#)

**[Verizon Wireless Rooftop Antennas at approximately 1430 W Andrew Avenue](#) – A request by Verizon Wireless for a Conditional Use for new unmanned wireless antennas located on the rooftop of Glendale Middle School and electrical equipment related to the roof mounted antennas that exceed the measurements to be considered a permitted use at the property located at the address listed above. The subject property is located in the PL (Public Lands) zoning district and is located in Council District #2, represented by Kyle LaMalfa. (Staff contact: Amy Thompson at (801) 535-7281 or [amy.thompson@slcgov.com](mailto:amy.thompson@slcgov.com)). Case number PLNPCM2014-00643**

Ms. Amy Thompson, Associate 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. Nefi Garcia, Technology Associates, stated the project met the code for the area and they would abide by all federal and local regulations.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The length of time the generators run.
  - The generator was for back up purposes only, ran for a twenty minute interval once a week and could be set for any time period requested.
- If the decibel level was that of the Health Department's acceptance.
  - Yes it met the noise standards.
- The federal approvals required for the application.

**PUBLIC HEARING [5:47:42 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke in opposition to the petition: Mr. George Chapman and Mr. Michael Clara.

The following comments were made:

- The proposal should be turned down because not enough outreach had been done to educate the public.

- Need a RF signal strength reading for the proposal.
- The health risks to the students of the school were an issue, even though the Federal regulations won't let the Commission review the proposal for health issues it should be taken into consideration.
- There are warning signs on the towers indicating the frequencies are much higher than what is allowed.
- An environmental assessment needed to be done to make sure the wildlife in the area would be protected.

Vice Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The meaning of the sign on the tower.
  - A placard that says a signal is being emitted is a federal requirement.
- The environmental assessment required, before and after the tower was installed.
- If the school was aware of the installation of the tower.
  - They have known about the proposal since November, as Verizon would be a tenant and pay them rent for the use.
- If generator test time was approved by the school.
  - Conditions could be put on the operation of the generator to meet the needs or requirements requested.
- The shielding of the generator from the surrounding residents.
- If a condition could be put on the petition stating the applicant should work with the school to decide when to run the generator.
  - Conditions cannot be put on something that was held in a private lease but if the condition was tied to the Conditional Use it would be allowed.

Commissioner Gallegos stated the Commission's purview was to discuss the land use and the petition met those conditions.

**MOTION [5:59:03 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Gallegos stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00643 Verizon Wireless Rooftop Antennas and Electrical Equipment located at 1430 W Andrew Avenue (Glendale Middle School), based on the information in the staff report, public comment provided and discussion, he moved that the Planning Commission approve PLNPCM2014-00643 for rooftop antennae and related electrical equipment at subject to the conditions one through four listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Fife seconded the motion.**

Mr. Paul Nielson, City Attorney, asked the Commission to include the condition that the Application be required to comply with all federal regulations and requirements.

**Commissioner Gallegos stated he would amend his motion to state the Applicant would be required to comply with all federal regulations and conditions.**

Commissioner Fife seconded the amendment. Commissioners, Guilkey, Fife and Gallegos voted "aye". Commissioner Hoskins voted "nay". The motion passed 3-1.

[6:01:49 PM](#)

**[Electrical Equipment Associated with Wall Mounted Antennas at approximately 560 E South Temple](#)** - A request by Verizon Wireless for a Conditional Use regarding electrical equipment associated with wall mounted antennas that exceed the permitted size in a residential zoning district at the property located at the above listed address. The subject property is located in the RO (Residential Office) zoning district and is located in Council District #4, represented by Luke Garrott. (Staff contact: Amy Thompson at (801) 535-7281 or [amy.thompson@slcgov.com](mailto:amy.thompson@slcgov.com)). Case number PLNPCM2014-00826

Ms. Amy Thompson, Associate 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.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- What the barbed wire fence had to do with the antennae application.
  - Staff stated tying the removal of the fence to the application made it easier to enforce.
- The screening of the antennae on the property and if a fence would be reinstalled.
  - Staff stated there was a wall along the north side of the property that screened some of the building's mechanical systems.

Mr. Jared White, Verizon Wireless, stated many of the same issue discussed in the previous application applied to this application and they were willing to work with the condos to determine the best times to run the generator. He reviewed the function of the generator and stated it was not common for the generator to run for an extended period of time.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- The length of time the batteries would run before the generators were turned on.
  - Two or three hours.
- The length of time the generators could run.
  - The generators would be able to run for a week with someone refilling the fuel however, this was not something that commonly happened unless other than in very rural areas.
- Due to the proximity to hospitals, this area was a high priority to the power company in terms of keeping the power on.
- If there was a process to help ensure the generators were not run on bad air days.
  - Not currently.

**PUBLIC HEARING** [6:10:57 PM](#)

Vice Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke in favor of the petition: Mr. John Dunn

The following comments were made:

- Supported the proposal but would like to limit the number of generators and require the providers to use existing generators instead of adding new ones.

Vice Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If it was common for other providers to use the same equipment.
  - If the landowner installed a generator and required the providers to pay for use of a generator it would work.
  - Generally it was usually initiated through the building owner not the different providers.
- The impetus for adding new cell towers when there was all ready cell coverage in the area.
  - It was a capacity issue and most of the towers could not support the capacity needed alone.
- It was difficult to cover the avenues and this location offered the ability to service that area.

**MOTION [6:16:23 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Guilkey stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00826, based on the information in the Staff Report, public comment provided and discussion, he moved that the Planning Commission approve PLNPCM2014-00826 for antenna related electrical equipment at 560 E South Temple subject to conditions on through seven listed in the Staff Report. Commissioner Gallegos seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

[6:17:14 PM](#)

**[Adaptive Reuse of an Historic Landmark Building Conditional Use at approximately 1135 E South Temple](#) - A request by Ronald McDonald House Charities, represented by Carrie Romano, for a Conditional Use for the adaptive reuse of an historic landmark building to operate as an inn/bed & breakfast or office located at the above listed address. The subject property is in a RMF-35(Moderate Density Multi-family Residential) Zone and SR-1A Zone (Special Development Pattern Residential District). The adaptive reuse of an historic landmark building is a Conditional Use in both of these Zones. The subject property is located within Council District 3 represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Lex Traughber at (801) 535-6184 or [lex.traughber@slcgov.com](mailto:lex.traughber@slcgov.com)) Case number PLNPCM2014-00838**

Mr. Lex Traugher, Senior 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.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Were people concerned that the landscaping was not currently kept up or that it won't be kept up in the future.
  - That it had not been currently kept up.
- Are the neighbor concerns about the use, because of experience or concern that it was going to change.
  - That was not indicated in the submitted comments.

Ms. Carrie Romano, Ronald McDonald House, reviewed the history of the building. She stated they have kept the property in good repair both inside and out. Ms. Romano stated they were looking to sell the property and they were asking for the Conditional Use because the prospective buyer would like to use the property as an Inn or Bed and Breakfast. She stated the proposal was keeping with the use of the structure and would not cause issues in the neighborhood. Ms. Romano reviewed the reason they were selling then property

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [6:22:19 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Scott Anderson

The following comments were made:

- The use of the building was never an issue when it was used as a bed and breakfast or the Ronald McDonald House.
- The concern was over the structure being used as an office because it would cause other properties in the area to be converted to offices.
- The office use would not be compatible with the area.
- Would like to see the building lived in and used but not as an office.

Vice Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- The allowable uses if the Conditional Use was granted.
  - There are four types of uses allowed under a Conditional Use and there was adequate parking for all of the uses.
- The Applicant was requesting all four uses be allowed on the property.
- The Master Plan for the area and if it allowed commercial or office space in the zone.
  - The area and property are zoned for residential.
- An adaptive reuse of a historic structure was to help preserve the building.
- The reasoning behind the request for the bed and breakfast and the office use.

- The best use of the building.
- If a president would be set in the neighborhood.
- If the Conditional Use could be restricted for only one use.
  - It would limit the ability of the property owner to sell the property and possibly hinder the preservation of the structure.
- The negative impacts of using the structure as a office and if it would change the character of the neighborhood.
  - The only structures allowed to go through the adaptive reuse process are landmark sites.

Mr. Nick Norris, Planning Manager, stated the Commission needed to look at not only the neighborhood Master Plan but the citywide Preservation Plan and determine which value was more important.

**MOTION [6:35:19 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Guilkey stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00838, based on the plans submitted, the Staff Report and testimony provided, he moved that the Planning Commission approve PLNPCM2014-00838, 1135 E South Temple - Adaptive Reuse of an Historic Landmark Building- Conditional Use subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. Compliance with all City Department/Division comments listed in the Staff Report**

**Commissioner Fife seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**[6:36:10 PM](#)**

**[Rezone and Master Plan Amendment at approximately 2855 S Highland Drive](#) - A request by Wayne Reaves, representing the property owner DTRL & Associates, for the City to amend the zoning map and associated future land use map designation for a portion of property located the above listed address. The property is currently “split-zoned” with the majority of the property (1.06 acres) zoned CB, Community Business, and the remainder (0.35 acres) zoned R-1/7,000, Single Family Residential. The applicant is requesting that the City rezone the R-1/7,000 portion of the property to CB. The property is currently occupied by a vacant commercial building and parking lot. This type of project requires a Zoning Map and Master Plan Amendment. The subject property is within Council District 7, represented by Lisa Adams. (Staff contact: Daniel Echeverria at (801)535-7165 or [Daniel.echeverria@slcgov.com](mailto:Daniel.echeverria@slcgov.com) Case Numbers PLNPCM2014-00769 & PLNPCM2014-00770)**

- a. Zoning Map Amendment- The petitioner is requesting to amend the zoning map designation of the R-1/7,000 portion of the property to CB. The intent of the proposed rezone is to more fully utilize the entire property for future development. Although the applicant has requested that the property be rezoned to the CB zone, consideration may be given to rezoning the property to another zoning district with similar characteristics. (Case number PLNPCM2014-00769.)**

- b. Master Plan Amendment- The associated future land use map in the Sugar House Master Plan currently designates the majority of the property for “Low Intensity/Mixed Use;” however, the area proposed for rezone to CB is designated as “Parks & Open Space.” The petitioner is requesting to amend the future land use map so that the entirety of the property is designated as “Low Intensity/Mixed Use.” Case number PLNPCM2014-00770.**

Mr. Daniel Echeverria, 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 forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If the Planning Commission had previously reviewed a plan for this area.
- The retaining wall on the property.
- The setbacks for the property.
  - Seven feet is the minimum required landscape buffer however, the rear yard setback was ten feet. It would depend on the orientation of the development if the seven foot setback were allowed.
- The allowable height for the building in the area.
- The maximum lot coverage in the CB zone.

Mr. Wayne Reaves, DTRL & Associates, stated he did not have anything else to add to Staff's comments or drawings. He stated they do not have a designated end use in mind, they are in the process of buying the property and the Commission's decision would determine how they were going to move forward with the property.

The Commission, Staff and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the Applicant was required to have interest in the property to make the proposed request.
  - No, however they are required to have some sort of permission from the property owner to act on their behalf.
  - The Applicant stated they had a signed document allowing them to proceed with the process.
- Why the change was needed to build on the property.
  - It would not be valuable to the buyer to not have full use of the property.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING [6:50:05 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Judy Short, Sugarhouse Community Council, gave the history of the property and split zoning. She stated the Council met with the Applicant, notified the public and there were no objections to the proposal just a lot of questions. Ms. Short stated the open space was



not an issue because Imperial Park would be constructed in the spring. She stated the Community Council fully supported the proposal.

The following individuals spoke in favor of the petition: Mr. Brent Popp

The following comments were made:

- The property was a disaster and the neighborhood wanted something done with it.
- Please approve the proposal to allow something better to be built in the neighborhood.

The following individuals spoke in opposition to the petition: Mr. George Chapman.

The following comments were made:

- There were a lot of objections to the proposal because of the potential parking issues.
- The detrimental impacts in the neighborhood could not be mitigated.
- The community did not want the proposal in their backyard.
- Please do not support the proposal.

Vice Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Ms Judy Short discussed the information regarding objections to the proposal at the Community Council meeting. Ms. Short stated there were concerns regarding parking and noise but as the issues were discussed people seemed to agree with the proposal. They discussed if the concerns were over the entire parcel or the small area. Ms. Short stated the concerns were for the entire parcel.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- If the area could stay a parking lot or had to change in order for the property to be developed.
  - They could change the structure and there would be a point at which the parcel would no longer be allowed to be used.
- If the existing structure would be removed.
- The project that would possibly be constructed on this parcel would be reviewed by Planning and issues could be addressed to mitigate the impacts to the neighborhood at that time.

Mr. Norris stated the City Council did initiate a petition to review the CB zone to address some of the issues with setbacks where these zones interface with residential zones. He stated anything constructed on this property would be required to be reviewed by the Commission in terms of sale and use.

Commissioner Fife stated the development of this site would most likely not come as a surprise to the surrounding neighborhood due to the existing nature of the property.

**MOTION [7:01:47 PM](#)**

Commissioner Guilkey stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00769 and PLNPCM2014-00770 Highland Drive Master Plan Zoning Amendment, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report and the testimony and plans presented, he moved that the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed zoning and master plan amendment. Commissioner Fife seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**[7:02:33 PM](#)**

**[R-MU-35 and R-MU-45 Zoning District Changes](#)** - A request by the City Council for modifications to the R-MU-35 and R-MU-45 Residential/Mixed Use zoning districts. The amendment will affect section 21A.24 of the Salt Lake City Zoning Ordinance. Other related sections of Title 21A may also be amended as part of this proposal. The proposal will add additional design standards, modify density requirements, height requirements and other changes. (Staff contact: John Anderson at (801)535-7214 or [john.anderson@slcgov.com](mailto:john.anderson@slcgov.com) ). Case number PLNPCM2014-00127

Mr. John Anderson, 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 forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The square footage of detached structures.
  - It was 2500 square feet.
- The difference between a twin home and a two family dwelling.

**PUBLIC HEARING [7:13:53 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke in opposition to the petition: Mr. Gorge Chapman.

The following comments were made:

- Increasing density with the proposal and there were a lot of single family homes in the zoning.
- It was important to protect single family homes.

Vice Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

Mr. Norris stated the properties referred to by Mr. Chapman are zoned RMF 30 or 35 not RMU, there are no RMU zoned properties in that part of the city.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The density suggested would be a good thing and actually make things better.
- The proposal was a tool Planning could use to address problems in the city.
- Any properties requesting the proposed zoning would be required to be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

**MOTION [7:18:33 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Gallegos stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00127, Text changes to the R-MU-35 and R-MU-45 Zoning Districts, based on the information in the Staff Report and the discussion heard, he moved that the Planning Commission forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00127, text changes to the R-MU-35 and R-MU-45 zoning districts. Commissioner Hoskins seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

[7:19:14 PM](#)

**[Transportation Master Plan Update at approximately 5700 West between California Avenue and the 2100 South frontage road \(north of SR201\)](#) - A request by Salt Lake City Mayor Ralph Becker for an amendment to the Major Street Plan Map at the above listed location. Currently the Major Street Plan Map proposes a collector street. This requested would is remove the proposed 5700 West Collector Street due to UDOT's determination of the alignment of the Mountain View Corridor. This type of project requires a master plan amendment. The subject property is located within Council District 2, represented by Kyle LaMalfa. (Staff contact: Everett Joyce at (801)535-7930 or [everett.joyce@slcgov.com](mailto:everett.joyce@slcgov.com).)Case number PLNPCM2014-00586**

Mr. Everett Joyce, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Why this was brought in front of the Commission now.
  - The requested was initiated by the Transportation Division.
  - There was a petition to rezone the property between 5600 West and Mountain View Corridor, and at that time the collector street was noted. In review of that proposal this is being recommended to be removed.
- If the frontage road was a through street.
  - There was no longer a demand for a collector street.

**PUBLIC HEARING [7:23:13 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Dave Eltis

The following comments were made:

- Please ensure the existing bike path will not be interrupted in this area.

Vice Chairperson Lyon closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed:

- The proposed route for the Mountain View Corridor.
- If the proposal would impact bike transportation along the corridor.

**MOTION [7:26:19 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Fife stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00586 Update of the Transportation Division's Major Street Plan, based on the information and findings in the Staff Report, public input and discussion, he moved to transmit a favorable recommendation to the City Council to adopt the proposed amendment to remove the proposed 5700 West Collector Street located between California Ave and 2100 South from the Major Street Plan. Commissioner Guilkey seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**[7:26:59 PM](#)**

Mr. Norris explained Transportation Staff was recommending the Commission continue the proposal to the next meeting to allow Staff to make changes and amendments to the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan.

The Commission and Staff discussed if the petition should be heard or moved to the next meeting. Staff stated there were members of the audience that wished to speak to the petition and he would advise the Commission to hold the hearing.

The Commission asked the Presenter to highlight the changes to the plan.

**[Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan](#) - Mayor Ralph Becker is proposing a major update to the City's existing Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan is a citywide master plan that will guide the development and implementation of the City's pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure and programs. (Staff contact: Becka Roolf at (801) 535-6630 or [becka.roolf@slcgov.com](mailto:becka.roolf@slcgov.com).)**

Ms. Becka Roolf, Transportation, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Transportation was looking for additional comments or questions and would return in February for the final review and approval.

Commissioner Gallegos stated the comments that would be received from the public were very pertinent to the plan and additional time should be given to those that wish to speak.

**PUBLIC HEARING [7:34:59 PM](#)**

Vice Chairperson Lyon opened the Public Hearing.

The Commission discussed if the Public Comments should be extended from two minutes to five minutes.

The following individuals spoke to the petition: Mr. Scott Little, Mr. Malcolm Campbell, Mr. George Chapman and Mr. David Eltis.

The following comments were made:

- Plan needed to go further and address the bigger issues like moving curbs, burying power lines and realigning sidewalks to create bike lanes.
- Needed to take cycling seriously, make it safer and easier to move through the city.
- Focus on the big stuff not the small stuff.
- Salt Lake City Bicycle Advisory Committee fully supported the plan and appreciated the hard work that had gone into the plan.
- Plan did not incorporate all the issues with biking in Salt Lake.
- Far too much was missing in the plan from where we as a city should be.
- Should be working to be a gold bike city and not settle for less.
- Connect the plan to the surrounding areas.
- The comment period needed to be extended as it was over the holidays and people did not have enough time to comment.
- Plan needed more detail, street standards NACTO and faster implementation.
- Continue development of the safe bike plan.
- Needed to incorporate more pedestrian aspects.
- Cycle tracks do not work the way they are being implemented.
- ADA compliance on 300 South cycle track was a must.
- Need a good north and south bike lane on Richmond Street.
- Wider sidewalks are part of complete streets which are not mentioned in the plan.

The Commission and Mr. Campbell discussed how his comments could be incorporated into the proposed plan. The Commission urged Mr. Campbell to work with Ms. Roelf on the plan.

The Commission and Mr. Eltis discussed if the alignment issues with other communities had been addressed. Mr. Eltis stated the relationships between the cities were not strong enough and communication did not happen often enough. They discussed the things that would move Salt Lake to diamond or platinum bike status.

Mr. Norris read the following emails:

Martin Cuma - Sorry for being late on this, hopefully not too late, while the Master Plan is great overall, I share the concerns that Dave has raised in his latest document and feel the extra time taken to consider his suggestions would result in a much more robust plan.

Polly Hart- Hello, I think the plan has some worthy goals, but one gaping hole stands out to me. There is only one tiny mention of recreational cycling on page 104, and I am going to guess that at least half of cyclist "trips" are recreational. Some are on roads, some are on

trails, but this activity seems to be al but completely left out of the plan. At this point in my life, I find roads to be too dangerous, and I will only get on my bike to ride recreationally away from cars. I appreciate the mention of educating both drivers and cyclists about laws and courtesy (goal #3 objectives), but the bottom line is that until enforcement happens in big fat way, I will not ride my bike on roads anymore. I am one of those who has been hit and left for dead on the side of the road (witness said the driver absolutely knew he hit me), and the police were very upfront that they would not make any attempt to find the culprit. If both drivers and cyclists know there will be no consequences for illegal behavior, they have no impetus to change their behavior. I would really like to see stronger language to this end. Thank you for your time,

Vice Chairperson Lyon stated the public comment period would remain open.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- If the plan had been updated from the previous version.
  - The new draft was still being updated and would be ready for the February 11, meeting.
- How Transportation felt about the comments that the plan was “only half way there”.
  - Ms. Roolf stated from what they had heard from the community at large, the proposal was a major step forward. She stated the proposal may not be a twenty year plan as things are moving very quickly within this realm and the plan was a pretty good blue print to push the city on its way.
- The measure of approval from the community that should be required before the plan moved forward.
  - The plan was one part of the overall transportation plan for the city.
- Why the City was working on the smaller issues rather than the bigger issues.
  - You had to start somewhere to get to where you want to go long term.
- If the resources were available all of the issues would be addressed, the plan addresses what the City would like to see and what was possible right now.
- How to incorporate recreational cycling into the plan.
- Working with the schools was a great idea.
- If two weeks was long enough for Staff to update the document.
  - The new draft was almost complete and should be ready for the first meeting in February.
- The stake holders for the plan and the groups that helped review the document.
- Were certain areas being focused on to address places where biking would be a great mode of transportation but were too dangerous to ride in, such as the East Village.
  - All areas are being reviewed under the proposal however; there are areas that need further review.

**MOTION [8:13:50 PM](#)**

**Commissioner Gallegos stated regarding the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, he moved to table the petition to allow Staff to make the suggested changes and come back to the Commission in February for further review and approval. Commissioner Fife seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.**

**The meeting adjourned at [8:14:16 PM](#)**