

SALT LAKE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
Room 126 of the City & County Building
451 South State Street, Salt Lake City, Utah
Wednesday, August 27, 2014

A roll is being kept of all who attended the Planning Commission Meeting. The meeting was called to order at [5:31:48 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, Marie Taylor and Matthew Wirthlin. Commission Matt Lyon was excused.

Planning Staff members present at the meeting were: Wilford Sommerkorn, Planning Director; Michaela Oktay, Planning Manager; Nick Norris, Planning Manager; Everett Joyce, Senior Planner; Doug Dansie, Senior Planner; Michael Maloy, Principal Planner; Molly Robinson, Urban Designer; 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: Michael Fife, Carolynn Hoskins, James Guilkey, Clark Ruttinger and Marie Taylor. Staff members in attendance were Michaela Oktay, Michael Maloy, Everett Joyce and Doug Dansie.

The following locations were visited:

- **640 S 900 West** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **888 S 400 West**- Staff gave an overview of the proposal.
- **376 E 8th Ave** – Staff gave an overview of the proposal.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FROM THE AUGUST 13, 2014, MEETING. [5:32:01 PM](#)
MOTION [5:32:11 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife moved to approve the August 13, 2014. Commissioner Ruttinger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

REPORT OF THE CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR [5:32:37 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown stated she had nothing to report.

Vice Chairperson Ruttinger stated he had nothing to report.

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR [5:32:44 PM](#)

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

Briefing [5:32:48 PM](#)

Plan Salt Lake - Plan Salt Lake is a citywide vision document that will help guide the future growth of the City. Plan Salt Lake provides a citywide vision, guiding principles intended to help guide the decision making process, initiatives that provide direction for City actions and targets to help measure the effectiveness of the plan. (Staff contact: Nick Norris at (801) 535-6173 or nick.norris@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNPCM2011-00682.

Mr. Nick Norris, Planning Manager, reviewed the plan as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He asked the Commission for comments and questions.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The time frame for the growth statistics, outlined in the Master Plan.
- Adding a column, in the matrix, that reflected the City implementation tools and how those tools applied to different goals and targets.
- Adding the “Purpose” on the Community Development Corporation item.
- The meaning of promoting and fostering high rates of social capital.
 - Aligning the various types of tools that can build capital such as job training and education.
- The Commission commended Staff on a job well done.
- Arts and Culture – making it easier for pop up festivals to occur and move through the permit process.
 - Would be part of the more specific plans for each area.
- The Implementation and the time frame of the plan.

MOTION [5:50:40 PM](#)

Commissioner Gallegos stated given some final edits, he moved that the Planning Commission forward the plan to a public hearing on September 10, 2014. Commission Taylor seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[5:51:26 PM](#)

Unit legalization at approximately 640 South 900 West - A request by Mr. Nathan Balas, representative of the owner of property located at the above listed address, for a Special Exception to legalize an additional dwelling unit at the property. The property was originally built as a single-family dwelling with a detached garage. The petitioner is requesting the legalization of a second dwelling unit in the garage space. The subject property is located in the RMF-35 Moderate Density Multi-

Family Residential District. The Planning Commission has final decision making authority for unit legalizations, as long as legalized units also pass building inspection. The property is located within Council District Two, represented by Kyle LaMalfa. (Staff contact: Doug Dansie at (801) 636-6182 or doug.dansie@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNPCM2013-00667

Mr. Doug Dansie, 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 deny the petition as presented.

[5:56:48 PM](#)

Commissioner Taylor stated she would not participate in the conversation and would abstain from voting on the issue as it was similar to a personal petition she had worked on.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The criteria a Building Inspector would look for to determine if the unit met life safety standards.

Mr. Nathan Balas, Applicant, reviewed the history of the property and the use of the units. He stated the unit in question was a studio apartment with functioning and usable facilities and amenities.

The Commission, Applicant and Staff discussed the following:

- If the Commission could approve the unit if it was not up to code.
- If evidence of an inspection was available verifying the condition of the property.
- Building permits for the property.
- If the petition could be approved due to the limited evidence of the use of the unit and the enforcement issues.

The Applicant stated he did not have further information to support the use of the unit under the special exception process. He asked the Commission if there was a way to legalize the unit without having to remove the current Tenants. He will work with Staff to explore options available.

The Commission asked the Applicant how the property was metered. The Applicant stated there was only one meter for the property.

The Commission and Staff discussed if a business license was required and the facilities for the unit.

PUBLIC HEARING [6:06:32 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.

The Commission and Staff discussed if the affidavit was sufficient to show the use of the subject unit. Staff stated in absence of other evidence, the affidavit was inadequate and due to enforcement issues on the property the petition should be denied. \

Mr. Paul Nielson, City Attorney stated it was not an official affidavit but a notarized statement.

The Commissioners discussed the enforcement and code issues for the property. They stated the evidence proved it was not a habitable unit and that there was a process to approve and legalize the unit as long as it met the current codes, and encouraged the petitioner to work with Staff to learn about it further

MOTION [6:10:39 PM](#)

Commissioner Guilkey stated regarding petition PLNPCM2013-00667, 640 South 900 West, based on the plans submitted, the Staff Report and testimony provided, he moved that the Planning Commission deny the Special Exception to legalize a second dwelling unit located at 640 South 900 West. Commissioner Dean seconded the motion. Commissioner Ruttinger, Fife, Dean, Gallegos, Guilkey and Wirthlin voted "aye". Commissioner Hoskins voted "nay". Commissioner Taylor abstained from voting. The motion passed 6-1.

[6:12:17 PM](#)

Avenues Proper Social Club Conditional Use at approximately 376 East 8th Avenue - ALR Restaurant Group, LLC is requesting approval from the City to develop a social club that is less than 2,500 sq. ft. in floor area and will be part of the existing restaurant at the above listed address. Currently the land is used for the Hatch Family Chocolates and the Avenues Proper restaurant and the property is zoned Residential Mixed Use RMU-35. This type of project must be reviewed as a Conditional Use. The subject property is within Council District 3, represented by Stan Penfold. (Staff contact: Everett Joyce at (801) 535-7930 or everett.joyce@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNPCM2014-00386

Mr. Everett Joyce, Senior Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- What the petition would allow on the property versus what currently existed.
- The proposed hours of operation, and State regulated hours for a social club.
- The conditions of approval.
 - Conditions are listed to ensure those standards are followed, detrimental effects were substantially mitigated.
- If there was a noise ordinance for the club.
 - Would have to follow the County Health Department regulations for noise.
- The features of the building that would mitigate any potential noise issues.
- The operations plan and if it could be modified in the future.
 - It could be modified but it would have to go through an approval process with police and permits departments.
- The location of other alcohol establishments in the area.
- If impaired drivers could be considered a detrimental effect to the area.
- If the social club was restricted to a certain size on the property.
 - Staff reviewed the proposed square footage for the Social Club and the ordinance that restricted the size.
- With the existing parking was this more of an attraction for visitors to drive to the establishment.

Mr. Andrew Tetdick and Mr. Liam Connelly, Applicants, reviewed the size limitations for the Club, due to the building layout. They reviewed the neighborhood pub ordinance and the request from customers to allow alcohol to be purchased without requiring food to be purchased. The Applicants stated there would not be a change in the basic services already offered at the facility.

The Commission and Applicants discussed if the patio could be used as part of the social club. The Applicant stated it was part of the restaurant and was not allowed to be used as part of the social club

PUBLIC HEARING [6:26:31 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing.

The following people spoke in opposition to the petition: Mr. Phil Carroll, Mr. Blake Rigby, Ms. Chris Carson, Mr. Ken Jones, Ms. Pilar Pobil Smith and Mr. Mark Gardner.

The following comments were made:

- Bar was one step further away from the allowed use.
- Operating hours were an issue and should be limited.
- If the hours could not be limited it should not be approved.
- Social Club was not necessary and would bring unwanted individuals to the area.
- Very little police presence in the area now and the lack of police will create more issues for the area.

- Streets are difficult to maneuver in the area and adding drunk drivers will create more issues.
- Avenues are a nice family orientated residential area.
- The proposal would set precedence for more of these uses in the area.
- Parking and traffic in the area are already an issue and this would create more of an issue.
- Business did not fit with the residential area.
- Noise was already an issue and this would increase the problem.
- Restaurant was ok but a bar did not fit in the area.
- Other areas of the City are more appropriate for this use.
- How it would affect the children in the area and what they are viewing.

The Applicants stated they care about making this work for the community and neighborhood. They stated the change in use was a response to customer requests and they did not have control over personal choices of customers. The Applicant reviewed the operating hours and the parking in the area.

The Commission and Application discussed the following:

- The lease of the facility.
- If parking spaces were allotted to the restaurant during operating hours.
 - Yes there were spaces for restaurant parking.
- If live entertainment was offered in the building.
 - Live entertainment was not provided.
- If Hatch Chocolate supported the change of use.
 - Yes the Property Owner supported the Social Club use.
- The exterior lighting and how it was being shielded.
- How the Owners would handle inebriated individuals in the facility.

The Commission discussed the following:

- The Social Club was not an invitation for a rowdy crowd to come to the area.
- The Social Club would be small in nature and contained within the facility.
- Impacts would be minimal.
- What would happen when the next person rented the building as the use stayed with the building,
 - The conditional use would transfer.
- Hours in the proposal worked for the area but without ability to regulate the hours, allowed by State law, how could the Commission approve the proposal.
 - They couldn't regulate hours.
- The reasonable detrimental effects of the proposal.
- How to mitigate the hours of operation.
- The issues with surrounding uses and the proposed use.
- Approving the petition didn't affect the parking issues in the area.

- If the issue of noise from patrons getting in and out of their cars was a detrimental effect.
 - That issue existed with the restaurant use and was not directly linked to the Social Club use.

Mr. Nielson stated the Commission had to list findings regarding the reasonable detrimental impacts specific to this location. He stated the purpose of the ordinance was to allow these types of facilities in residential areas and the liquor license stayed with the business not the property so the use could change over time.

The Commission and Mr. Nielson discussed why this petition was different from others the Commission had reviewed.

Mr. Sommerkorn stated the Commission had to consider the impacts that existed and if the Social Club use exacerbated those issues. He stated the City Council, by virtue of adopting the current regulations, understood what the potential impacts were and they felt the use was appropriate for the area. Mr. Sommerkorn stated it was hard to look at a Conditional Use, determine that the use had the same impacts as a permitted use and deny the conditional use. He stated the Commission had to compare the proposed use to what existed in the area.

The Commission asked for clarification on the future use of the facility as an alcohol establishment.

Mr. Nielson stated the liquor license stayed with the business not the property so the use could change and at that point the Conditional use would become moot.

The Commissioners stated the parking was a mitigating factor as onsite parking existed and parking in the neighborhood was not required.

MOTION [7:14:38 PM](#)

Commissioner Dean stated regarding petition PLNPCM2014-00386, The Avenues Proper Social Club, based on the findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony, and discussion by the Planning Commission, she moved that the Planning Commission approve the Avenues Proper Social Club as proposed and subject to complying with all applicable regulations. Due to the potential for detrimental impacts created by the proposal identified in the report, the Planning Commission applied the following conditions of approval to the project:

- 1. The security and operations plan be approved by the Salt Lake City 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 is issued.

2. Obtain a valid license issued by the Utah State Division of Licensing, and a valid business license from the City.
3. Any modifications to exterior lighting be shielded from abutting residential property to prevent light from being a nuisance.

Commissioner Taylor seconded the motion. Commissioner Hoskins, Ruttinger, Fife, Dean, and Taylor voted "aye". Commissioner Guilkey, Gallegos and Wirthlin voted "nay". The motion passed 5-3.

[7:16:26 PM](#)

The Commission took a short break.

The Commission reconvened.

[7:28:43 PM](#)

Volunteers of America Youth Center at approximately 888 South 400 West Street - Hannah Vaughn, MHTN Architects, in behalf of Volunteers of America, is requesting approval to operate an emergency youth homeless shelter within a youth center at the above listed address. Currently the land is vacant and the property is zoned CG General Commercial 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: Michael Maloy at (801)535-7118 or michael.maloy@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNPCM2013-00916

Mr. Michael Maloy, Principal Planner, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). He stated Staff recommended that the Planning Commission approve the petition as presented. Mr. Maloy read the fifteen detrimental effects criteria (outlined in the Staff Report) and how the petition mitigated the detrimental effects.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- The definition of a shelter and how people sleeping at the facility created a detrimental effect.
 - If there was no overnight sleeping component to the petition, the issue would not be in front of the commission..
 - There are no hours of operation limitations within the subject zoning.
- The amount of information and documentation related to the proposal.
- The Master Plan information, how it affected the proposal, when it was adopted and how the subject property was addressed in those Master Plans.
- The Public Safety impacts and comments.

- The time period for the crime report, the number of crimes, and if it applied to the shelter in the current location. (Attachment I, page 933, of the Staff Report).
- If the crime report was relevant to the petition as there was not an overnight shelter at the current location.
- The potential motions for the proposal.
- If additional findings were needed beyond what was listed in the Staff Report.
 - It was reasonable to state the Commission's findings were based on the information in the Staff Report, the public hearing and all materials submitted.
 - The five conditions are what Planning Staff believes would mitigate any or all of the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects.

Commissioner Taylor stated she knew the Applicant personally but they had not discussed the application.

Ms. Kathy Bray, Volunteers of America, reviewed the proposal, the VOA program and the need for an overnight shelter. She reviewed how the shelter component would work and the proposed number of beds.

Mr. Mark Manazer, Volunteers of America, reviewed the programs the VOA offered for homeless youth in Salt Lake City. He discussed how they helped move the youth out of homelessness and into society, that VOA needed the larger space to better help the youth and the new shelter would allow for queuing to be inside the shelter not on the street.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the hours of operation for the shelter, how queuing would be handled during the time the facility was closed and the activities that would be happening at the facility.

The Commission asked if the shelter was not permitted would the day center still be constructed.

The Applicant stated they would still operate the center at this location with or without the shelter component. The Applicant stated the current center did not meet the standards for operation therefore a new center was needed.

The Commission and Applicants discussed the reasoning behind the request for thirty beds. The Applicant stated the number came from the research they conducted and that they did not want to create too large of a shelter as it was a short term option for the youth.

The Commission and Applicants discussed the programs for homeless individuals younger than fifteen.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the statements made by the Appellant that the center would be emptied out multiple times a day and how the youth would be handled at those times. The Applicant stated there were times when the center would be closed but it would not happen on a daily basis and was not a normal occurrence.

The Commission and Applicant discussed how additional individuals, over the thirty, would be housed. The Applicant stated the individual would not be allowed to stay but they would work with that person to make sure they had someone to stay with or if other arrangements could be made. The Applicant stated the street outreach team will be working at night to help address issues such as this and a backup strategy will be in place.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the crime statistics for their current location and if it was a correct reflection of what was happening in the area.

Mr. Blake Bauman, Attorney, stated the real question was what were the detrimental effects created by allowing people to sleep in the shelter at night. He reviewed the Appeals Hearing Officer's request for more evidence as to why the shelter was approved for the location. Mr. Bauman reviewed the statements from the Appellant and the documents from the Applicant that proved the reasonably anticipated detrimental effects would be mitigated.

The Commission and Applicant discuss how the VOA was working to house homeless youth in apartments moving them out of homelessness and the current number of homeless youth in the City. They discussed if individuals used the center repetitively and how the VOA helped to break that cycle of use.

PUBLIC HEARING [8:36:54 PM](#)

Chairperson Drown opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Brian Steffensen, Appellant, reviewed the reason for their appeal and the documents presented in their argument. He stated the shelter would be more attractive to the homeless youth because of their ability to stay overnight making the use larger and more relevant. He stated this would increase the detrimental effects of the proposal and that should be recognized. Mr. Steffensen stated if the increased detrimental effects could not be mitigated then the Commission had to deny the proposal.

The Commission asked Mr. Steffensen how it was known that more people would use the shelter.

Mr. Steffensen stated it was based on the Applicant's proposal and the research submitted by the Applicant. He said the issues with the permitted use, regarding the negative effect of the homeless shelter being built in a residential area, would be dealt with in Third District Court. He stated the conditional use had to comply with the law and the Appeals Hearing Officer found it did not comply with the law. Mr. Steffensen reviewed why the proposal could not be approved, that queuing would happen prior to the opening of the facility and those kids would be waiting in and around the neighboring properties. He stated the kids who spend the night would be put out on the street in the morning after the center opened and reviewed the issues of having the kids sent out onto the street multiple times a day.

The Commission and Appellant discussed the number of times the kids would be in and out of the facility.

Mr. Steffensen stated their supplemental documents addressed the mitigation plan, the crime statistics and the fifteen detrimental effects. He stated if the Commission had not reviewed the submitted information then a decision could not be made.

The Commissioners confirmed they had received and reviewed the information.

The Commission and Appellant discussed what aspects of the mitigation plan was a problem.

Mr. Steffensen stated the VOA admitted they did not know what they were doing in terms of adding an overnight shelter, there are problems with the current location; taking thirty youth off the street would not be taking additional youth off the street and out of the proposed neighborhood as it would be more of an attraction for homeless youth.

The Commission and Appellant discussed why it was an issue for the kids to be in front of the current shelter. Mr. Steffensen stated the negative impact was to the women and families that would be walking past the kids on the sidewalk and feeling unsafe. The Commission and Appellant discussed the risk to people walking in the same area with homeless youth.

The Commission stated the issue being considered was whether or not the thirty youth were allowed to sleep in the facility and if the overnight component was not approved then a larger number of kids would be on the street and in the neighborhood at night. The

Commission asked how keeping thirty kids off the street at night would be a detriment to the neighborhood.

Mr. Steffensen stated that was the issue and it was an imperial fact that the negative effects of concentrated homeless was detrimental to the area. He stated because there are beds at the proposed center there would be an increase in the homeless youth that use the shelter. Mr. Steffensen stated the VOA had not denied that this would happen.

The Commission stated there was no proof that more kids would use the facility. They asked Mr. Steffensen for evidence showing more people would use the facility.

Mr. Steffensen stated the Applicant stated they would start with fifteen people and as the word got around more people would use the facility.

Ms. Jessica Norie, Art Space, stated she supported the Youth Center and it was a compatible use in the area. She stated Art Space owned property next to the Road Home and they are ninety nine percent leased in that apartment complex. Ms. Norie stated crime was not an issue until 2006, but it was not related to the homeless in the area, it was due to providing places to loiter and lack of development.

The Commission and Ms. Norie discussed if the homeless in the area caused issues with scaring tenants. Ms. Norie stated it had not been an issue with renting the facility she stated loitering was an issue because of the gate at Rio Grande. Ms. Norie reviewed the reasoning behind Art Space selling the property to the VOA for the shelter.

The Commission and Ms. Norie discussed if screening or fencing would be preferred at the proposed VOA shelter. Ms. Norie stated Art Space would prefer the location be open with clear paths to hinder loitering.

Mr. Erik Steffensen stated property values would decrease and the submitted economic case study was in regards to transitional housing not a shelter therefore, it was not correct. He reviewed the study of a homeless shelter that could not handle the demand of homeless people and overflowed into the surrounding neighborhoods. He stated homeless people and kids are menacing and scary and he would not want the proposed shelter in his neighborhood. Mr. Steffensen stated his tenants threatened to move out if the shelter was constructed in the neighborhood and the amount he could charge for rent would decrease. He stated the Commission ignored the evidence from the neighbors in dealing with the homeless youth at the current location.

Ms. Pamela Atkinson stated these kids would not flock to the shelter as they prefer to stay with friends, squat or be somewhere else. She stated these kids are not out in the open at night they find places to go; the shelter was a piece of the puzzle to get these kids out of homelessness and off the streets. She reviewed the typical character and untrusting nature of the homeless youth. Ms. Atkinson stated the shelter would help the youth to become contributing members of society.

The Commission and Ms. Atkinson discussed if more kids would come because the beds were available. Ms. Atkinson stated more of the kids stay with friends, they don't move to shelters at night only a small portion will use the shelter, it is usually a last resort for youth.

Chairperson Drown closed the Public Hearing.

The Commission and Applicant discussed the following:

- Programs in other cities and the research the VOA had done for the proposal.
 - The VOA reviewed the conversations with Washington State and other organizations that have youth services.
 - Sent existing Shelter Staff to other centers and conferences for training purposes.
- The number of youth using the shelter at different times of the day.
- If the number of youth in the shelter would be lessened with the available outreach programs.
 - VOA stated the outreach programs have helped to maintain the numbers of kids using the facility and most of the kids prefer to associate with the program strictly through the outreach team.
 - VOA knows what is needed, has the experience to help the kids and knows the demand this shelter would have.
 - VOA understands the impacts on the surrounding uses and the conditions on the proposal will mitigate the detrimental effects.
- The queuing for the facility and when the inside queuing area would be open.
 - The building was designed to handle queuing inside the facility.
 - The VOA will track the volume of youth coming and going to adjust times to address queuing.
- The actual number of homeless youth that need a place to sleep.
 - There are approximately eighty four, total, homeless youth in Salt Lake City, with sixteen of those needing shelter.

[9:27:44 PM](#)

The Commission discussed the following:

- What to include in the motion.
- If the Commission had enough time to review the submitted materials.

- Everyone stated they had read the subject materials and did not need additional time to review materials further.
- What should be taken into consideration for their decision.

Mr. Nielson read the standards for approval as stated in State Law regarding Conditional Uses. He reviewed the property valuation, read case law regarding property values and that it was not a detrimental effect that could be considered. Mr. Nielson stated the general issue of homelessness could not be considered a detrimental impact. Mr. Nielson stated the fact that the Appellant would possibly file an appeal or a lawsuit was not something that should be a concern to the Commission. Mr. Nielson read the City Ordinance for Conditional Uses.

The Commissioners discussed their opinion on the proposal and the detrimental effects of the proposal. It was stated that the detrimental effects have been mitigated, the homeless youth lining up on the street to go inside the facility was not a detrimental effect, the shelter would further help people the VOA was all ready serving not bring more people to the area and would keep the kids engaged in programs the next day.

MOTION [9:43:35 PM](#)

Commissioner Fife stated regarding petition PLNPCM2013-00916, Volunteers of America Youth Homeless Shelter Conditional Use at 888 South 400 West, the Planning Commission has reviewed and considered all comments, arguments, materials and opinions properly presented in this matter. Unless specifically noted within this motion or included within the findings of the Staff Report the Planning Commission finds that no other concerns presented rise to the level of a reasonably anticipated detrimental effect. Based on the findings listed in the Staff Report, testimony received, and plans presented, he moved that the Planning Commission recognize that the project general meets the applicable Conditional Use standards and complies with the applicable zoning ordinance provisions, is compatible with surrounding uses, is consistent with City policies and plans and complies with the detrimental effects determination criteria of chapter 21a.54 which has been reviewed in detail and individually, conditional uses provide certain conditions and were applied therefore, the Planning Commission approves the Conational use to allow a youth homeless shelter located at approximately 888 South 400 West subject to the five following conditions:

- 1. Homeless shelter shall be limited to 30 beds for clients who are less than 23 years of age;**
- 2. Applicant shall install, manage, and maintain continuous video surveillance of building exterior;**
- 3. Queuing of clients shall be accommodated within the principal building;**
- 4. Homeless shelter shall be continuously managed onsite by trained professional staff; and**

5. Homeless shelter shall be contained within a building that is constructed, managed, and maintained in compliance with City Code and with Department Comments provided within Attachment a.

Commissioner Ruttinger seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

[9:47:42 PM](#)

Downtown and Gateway Master Plan Amendments - Mayor Ralph Becker is proposing an extensive update to the Downtown Master Plan for property located within or near the boundaries of North Temple, 200 East, 1000 South, and Interstate 15. The proposed Downtown Master Plan will replace the existing Downtown Master Plan, Gateway District land Use and Development Master Plan and the Gateway Specific Master Plan. The Planning Commission is required to make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will make a decision to adopt, adopt with changes or not adopt the proposed master plan. A copy of the proposed Downtown Master Plan can be found on the project website project website. A printed copy can be provided by contacting the staff indicated below. The subject property is within Council Districts 3, 4, and 5, represented by Stan Penfold, Luke Garrett, and Erin Mendenhall. (Staff contact: Molly Robinson at (801) 535-7261 or molly.robinson@slcgov.com.) Case number PLNPCM2013-00768

Ms. Molly Robinson, Urban Designer, reviewed the petition as presented in the Staff Report (located in the case file). She stated Staff was recommending that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council regarding the Master Plan as presented.

The Commission and Staff discussed the following:

- Leave the Downtown trolley in the plan as a vision.
- The zoning changes within the plan.
- The walkability portion of the plan.
- Common format between the Plan Salt Lake Plan and the Downtown Master Plan.
- The timing for approval and moving the two plans forward together.
 - The plans would be together by the time they reached the City Council for review and a decision.
- The consistency between Plan Salt Lake and the Downtown Master Plan.
- The need to acknowledge the view of the mountains in the plan
 - Mountains were reference in the view corridor framework.

PUBLIC HEARING [10:11:51 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 [10:12:15 PM](#)

Commissioner Gallegos stated regarding The Downtown Master Plan, he moved that the Planning Commission forward a favorable recommendation to the City Council to adopt the Downtown Master Plan based on the information presented in the Staff Report, the public involvement process associated with creating the plan, the testimony and discussion provided during the Planning Commission briefings and public hearings. Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Other Business [10:14:23 PM](#)

MOTION [10:14:32 PM](#)

Commissioner Wirthlin nominated Commissioner Matt Lyon for the position of Chair. Commissioners Gallegos seconded the nomination.

The Commission discussed the need to allow new Commissioners time to learn the processes before becoming the Chair.

Commissioner Wirthlin withdrew his motion.

MOTION [10:16:36 PM](#)

Commissioner Gallegos nominated Commissioner Clark Ruttinger for the position of Chair. Commissioners Drown seconded the nomination. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Clark Ruttinger was elected as Chairperson.

MOTION [10:16:59 PM](#)

Commissioner Dean nominated Commissioner Matthew Lyon for Vice Chair. Commissioner Wirthlin seconded the nomination. The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner was elected as Vice Chair.

The meeting adjourned at [10:17:16 PM](#)