

**-SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Room 126 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, March 11, 2015**

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:34:01 PM](#). Audio recordings of the Planning Commission meetings are retained for an indefinite period of time.

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

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Nora Shepard, Planning Director; Cheri Coffey, Assistant Planning Director; Nick Norris, Planning Manager; Daniel Echeverria, Principal Planner; Chris Lee, Principal 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: Clark Ruttinger, Carolyn Hoskins, Marie Taylor and James Guilkey. Staff members in attendance were Nick Norris, Daniel Echeverria and Chris Lee.

The following site were visited

- **Indiana Ave** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked the difference in the area between CN & RMU 35. Staff stated auto repair was not allowed and more residential uses were allowed.
- **400 S and Concord** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked which properties were involved.
- **400 S and 900W** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked which properties were involved.
- **700 S and 900 W** - Staff gave an overview of the proposal. The Commission asked if a strictly residential building would be allowed.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE FEBRUARY 25, 2015, MEETING. [5:34:34 PM](#)
MOTION [5:34:37 PM](#)**

Commissioner Fife moved to approve the February 25, 2015. Commissioner Guilkey seconded the motion. Commissioners Dean and Drown abstained from voting as they were not present at the meeting. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:35:02 PM](#)

Chairperson Ruttinger asked Ms. Nora Shepard to review the request for a leave of absence from Commissioner Matthew Lyon.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:35:13 PM](#)

Ms. Nora Shepard, Planning Director, read the letter from Commissioner Lyon's request for a leave of absence.

The Commission and Staff discussed the bylaws that regulate leaves of absence and how they are generally handled.

MOTION [5:37:17 PM](#)

Commissioner Gallegos stated regarding the request for a leave of absence from Commissioner Matt Lyon, based on the language in the Planning Commission's Policies and Procedures A.11 of the policies he moved to grant Matt Lyon the requested leave of absence. Commissioner Fife seconded the motion.

The Commission and Staff discussed what would happen if a leave of absence was not granted, the importance of having as many Commissioners attend each meeting as possible, how new members are appointed and if a new Vice Chair needed to be elected.

The motion passed unanimously.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed electing a Vice Chair and that it would be listed on the March 25, agenda and the length of the term for the new person.

Ms. Shepard reviewed the work/training session that will be held on March 25, in room 126. She asked the Commissioners to send suggestions for discussion topics to Staff.

The Commission asked to discuss the following:

- The definitions and differences in Conditional Uses, Planned Developments and other zoning requests to better understand how each was applied and reviewed.
- A field trip to review projects that were previously approved by the Commission.
- Overview of zoning definitions and planning in general.
- Issues regarding tabling items.
- Any upcoming items that may need some direction.
- A list of acronyms.

[5:51:03 PM](#)

[900 W. 700 S. Node Rezone](#) - The City is proposing to amend the zoning map designation of four properties located on the northwest corner of the 700 S. and 900 W. intersection. The following properties are affected: 664, 668, and 680 S. 900 W. and 910 W. 700 S. The parcels are identified as part of a "neighborhood node" in the Westside Master Plan. In order to support the development of the properties as part of a "neighborhood node," the City is proposing to rezone them from RMF-35 (Moderate Multi-Family Residential) and CN (Neighborhood Commercial) zoning, to

a CB (Community Business) zoning district. The CB designation will allow for a greater diversity of mixed uses and opportunities for additional housing. This type of project requires a Zoning Map Amendment. Although the properties are proposed to be rezoned to the CB zone, consideration may be given to rezoning the properties to another zoning district with similar characteristics. The subject properties are within Council District 2, represented by Kyle LaMalfa. (Staff contact: Chris Lee at (801)535-7706 or chris.lee@slcgov.com.) Case Number PLNPCM2014-00374

Ms. Shepard discussed the nature, history of the rezoning proposals and the Commissions role in approval and implementation of the proposals. She stated Staff was coordinating with other departments to help make any improvements, for the subject areas, consistent with the Master Plan and public improvements.

Commissioner Gallegos stated during the phase of the West Side Master Plan, city departments such as the Development Department could have been more involved in the process. He asked to have some of the other Departments be involved in the training session and at other times to present how they are integrating the proposed zoning changes.

Ms. Shepard stated Staff was working toward exactly what Commissioner Gallegos suggested.

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 forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The difference in a commercial node and a community node.
- The difference in CN and CB zoning and which was preferred in the area.
- The height limits for each zoning.

The Commission discussed reviewing all of the petitions prior to making a motion. They determined they would hear each petition, hold the public hearing and make a motion after the final rezoning petition.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:08:22 PM](#)

Chairperson Ruttinger opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Erik Lopez, Popular Grove Community Council, stated the Community Council wanted to see the community grow but they also wanted to make sure both business uses and

residential uses were in the community. He stated they wanted to be involved in what the uses would be to ensure there was diversity and unique business brought to the area.

The Commission asked if CN zoning was being phased out.

Staff explained there are size restrictions for CN zoning, gave the history of the zoning and examples of where the CN zones are located.

[6:12:22 PM](#)

900 W. 400 S. Node Rezone - The City is proposing to amend the zoning map designation of twenty four properties located at, or near, the intersection of 400 S. and 900 W. The following properties are affected: 360, 362, 364, 366, 376, 412, 417, and 435 S. 900 W., 841, 843, 848, 852, 857, 858, 859, 864, 865, and 877 W. 400 S., 866 W. Pacific Avenue, 869 W. 300 S., 321, 331, 365, and 371 S. 870 W. The parcels are identified as part of a “community node” in the Westside Master Plan. In order to support the development of the properties as part of a “community node,” the City is proposing to rezone them from RMF-35 (Moderate Multi-Family Residential) and CN (Neighborhood Commercial), to the R-MU-35 (Residential/Mixed Use) zoning district. The R-MU-35 designation will allow for a greater diversity of mixed uses and opportunities for additional housing. This type of project requires a Zoning Map Amendment. Although the properties are proposed to be rezoned to R-MU-35, consideration may be given to rezoning the properties to another zoning district with similar characteristics. The subject properties are within Council District 2, represented by Kyle LaMalfa. (Staff contact: Chris Lee at (801)535-7706 or chris.lee@slcgov.com.) Case Number PLNPCM2014-00375

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 forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council for the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Why RMU 35 zoning was being suggested versus CB zoning.
- Commercial uses were not required in the zone but could be incorporated if desired.
- The notification process for property owners of zoning changes.
- Percentage of owner occupancy of the properties.
- Public comments for the proposal.
- The end goal for the proposed zoning changes.
 - To develop the property as outlined in the Master Plan while making the areas viable and sustainable.
- If the property owners were local.
- The public transportation for the area.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:24:14 PM](#)

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

[6:24:45 PM](#)

[Indiana Avenue Neighborhood Node Rezone](#) - The City is proposing to amend the zoning map designation for properties located along the north side of Indiana Avenue between Navajo Street and Pueblo Street. The following properties are affected: 1380, 1410, 1416, 1420, 1424, & 1430 W Indiana Avenue. The properties are identified as part of a “neighborhood node” in the Westside Master Plan. In order to support the development of the properties as part of a “neighborhood node,” the City is proposing to rezone them from CN, Neighborhood Commercial, to R-MU-35, Residential/Mixed Use. The R-MU-35 designation will allow for a greater diversity of mixed uses and opportunities for additional housing. This type of project requires a Zoning Map Amendment. Although the properties are proposed to be rezoned to the R-MU-35 zone, consideration may be given to rezoning the properties to another zoning district with similar characteristics. The subject properties are within Council District 2, represented by Kyle LaMalfa. (Staff contact: Daniel Echeverria at (801)535-7165 or daniel.echeverria@slcgov.com.) Case Number PLNPCM2014-00381

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 for the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The additional height that could be requested under a Conditional use
- The rear setbacks and if seasonal shadows were reviewed.
- Which zoning allowed drive-thrus.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:28:38 PM](#)

Chairperson Ruttinger opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Diana Oaks, neighbor, stated the extra height was an issue as it would block the light to her property. She stated she supported the changes to bring growth back to the area, little neighborhood businesses would be preferred and there was not enough communication that was done prior to the proposal. She stated the proposed thirty five foot height would be a detriment to her property.

Chairperson Ruttinger closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The notification process for the proposal.

- The impact of a thirty five foot building next to the residential property and the setbacks for a project of that height.
- If R-1/500 zoning could be put on the property to restrict a structure higher than twenty five feet from being built on that property.
- Why only the north side of the street was being rezoned to CN.
 - A mix of zoning would guarantee commercial use in the area.
- The height limit of the CN zoning.
- The reasoning for the zoning change and how it would affect housing for the area.
 - By doing this the city was concentrating low income housing in an area where it already existed. In the northern areas the housing was more at market level so the proposal would not help the affordable housing issue for the city.
- When the zoning was initially changed in the area.
- The programs to entice developers to construct affordable housing.
- If zoning density could be created between the zones and how density was addressed in the plan.

[6:46:50 PM](#)

[400 S & Concord Street Neighborhood Node Rezone](#) - The City is proposing to amend the zoning map designation for properties located near the intersection of 400 S and Concord Street. The following properties are affected: 1217, 1221, 1225, 1233, and 1266 W 400 South. The properties are identified as part of a “neighborhood node” in the Westside Master Plan. In order to support the development of the properties as part of the “neighborhood node” the City is proposing to rezone them from R-1/5,000, Single Family Residential, to CN, Neighborhood Commercial and R-MU-35, Residential/Mixed Use. The CN and R-MU-35 designations will allow for a greater diversity of mixed uses and opportunities to expand and reinforce the neighborhood business node. The properties are currently used for single-family homes. This type of project requires a Zoning Map Amendment. Although the properties are proposed to be rezoned to the CN and R-MU-35 zones, consideration may be given to rezoning the properties to other zoning districts with similar characteristics. The subject properties are within Council District 2, represented by Kyle LaMalfa. (Staff contact: Daniel Echeverria at (801)535-7165 or daniel.echeverria@slcgov.com.) Case Number PLNPCM2014-00380

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 for the petition.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- How the proposal prevented neighbors from requesting zoning changes for their properties and constructing large buildings on those properties.

- Zoning changes could currently be requested by a property owner. The proposed rezone would not change that.
- Could the properties be combined and a big box built in the area.
 - The RMU 35 regulations allow for a large developments if the properties are combined but design standards help break it up a bit.
 - Would have to be supported by the Master Plan.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:52:38 PM](#)

Chairperson Ruttinger opened the Public Hearing.

Ms. Megan Foster, Director of the Lee Boys and Girls Club, supported the zone change as it would bring more people and improvement to the area. She stated a traffic light was a necessity for the intersection where the Boys and Girls club was located.

Mr. Eric Lopez, Community Council, stated the major concerns are that they want to make sure the community remained walkable, looked good and create a feel of an inviting community.

Chairperson Ruttinger closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The level of importance of the proposals and if they should be approved in stages not all at once.
- The planning best practices for changing the zoning.
- How to implement the plans and draw different businesses to the area.
- Establish a priority of development to help the diversity of the uses.
 - The proposal was a start and other tools would move the diversity along.
- Which proposal best fit the Master Plan.
- Areas where different zoning would be more appropriate and if changes to the proposal were allowed.
 - The Commission could make change to the zoning in the motion.

MOTION [7:05:25 PM](#)

Commissioner Dean stated regarding PLNPCM2014-00374, 700 S 900 W Zoning Map Amendment, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing, she moved that the Planning Commission propose to City Council designation of the northwest corner properties per the Staff Report discussion that they be zoned CN zoning in order to encourage commercial mixed use with the density, residential and the others. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION [7:07:20 PM](#)

Commissioner Drown stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00375, Zoning Map Amendment, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing, she moved that the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation to the City Council for the

proposed zoning amendment. Commissioner Fife seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION [7:08:29 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00381, Indiana Avenue Neighborhood Node Rezone, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing; he moved that the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed zoning amendment. Commissioner Hoskins seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Guilkey stated once zoning went from R-1/5000 to something else it was never going back. He stated the city was losing single family homes and that was sad.

MOTION [7:09:55 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00038, 0 400 S & Concord Street Neighborhood Node Rezone, based on the findings and analysis in the Staff Report, testimony, and discussion at the public hearing; he moved that the Planning Commission transmit a positive recommendation to the City Council for the proposed zoning amendment. Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion.

Chairperson Ruttinger stated it seemed contradictory to the Master Plan to maintain housing and was the only proposal that felt out of place.

Commissioner Taylor commended the Staff on implementing the Master Plan as requested by the Commission and the residents of the area.

The Commission and Staff discussed how the rezone area was chosen.

Commissioners Hoskins, Taylor, Fife, Drown, Dean and Gallegos voted “aye”. Commissioner Guilkey voted “nay”. The motion passed 6-1.

[7:13:18 PM](#)

The Commission took a short break

Briefing [7:18:29 PM](#)

Commissioner Guilkey reviewed the information packet he passed out to the Commission and how it related to the Commission’s concerns with parking.

The Commission and Staff discussed the parking requirements in the zoning ordinance, the history of parking in Salt Lake City and why the changes were implemented.

The following questions and comments were discussed:

- The standard size of a parking stall.
- The cost for the parking permit program.

- Thirty five dollars a year per pass.
- How the parking permit program worked and the areas that have the program in place.
- If a proposal was not requesting exceptions would the Commission review the proposal based on parking requirements.
 - Staff stated no, it would not be reviewed by the Planning Commission.
- When the community is involved in the transportation issues for their areas and when/how their questions are answered.
- There is not a frequent low cost transportation option in Salt Lake City.
- What do people do if they don't have a car and there is no mass transportation.
- How the parking standards have affected the way people move about the city and the inconveniences it cause.
- A transportation option should be required to have at least one car per unit.
- The definition of frequent transit.
 - Within ten minute intervals throughout the day.
 - There are currently a large number of buses that run every fifteen minutes.
 - UTA and the City are not on the same page in developing transportation.
- Need to look at what the ultimate intention is and how to keep a balance of access.
- Why the parking was different for single family homes and apartment units.
 - Because of the household size and the number of cars in a single family household than in a multifamily development.
- Everyone has at least one car and tends to travel for work.
- Have to encourage development but have a balance with parking.
- The next steps for reviewing parking and transportation in the City.
- Having shared parking available in areas and if it is available.
- Should have parking at homes and the ordinance should allow for one stall per unit.
- If the Commission should initiate a petition to change the parking requirements in the City.
- Have to look at the whole picture and find out where less than one stall would work and where more parking stalls are necessary.
- A parking study is being done and people need to be involved in the process.

The meeting adjourned at [8:28:06 PM](#)