



# MEMORANDUM

PLANNING DIVISION  
DEPARTMENT *of* COMMUNITY *and* NEIGHBORHOODS

---

To: Salt Lake City Planning Commission  
From: Cheri Coffey, AICP  
Date: April 12, 2017  
Re: Order of Items on Agenda

---

**ACTION REQUIRED:** Planning Division Staff request input and direction on how Commission would like items on the agenda to be ordered

**BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION:** Since 2011, the agendas have been divided into the part of the meeting devoted to reviewing Administrative Applications and Legislative Applications. We started doing this to help the Commission and public remember that administrative items are project where the Commission is reviewing the project to ensure it meets the adopted rules and the types of public input received must be based on evidence. Legislative Items, on the other hand are applications where the rules are being made and any comments received can help shape those rules.

Most of the time administrative items are initiated by the public sector for a conditional use, special exception, etc. Most of the time legislative items are initiated by the City (zoning text changes, master plan amendments, etc.) However, the applicant for either administrative items or legislative items can be by the private or public sector.

In the past we have organized our agendas so the administrative items are scheduled first with legislative items scheduled after the administrative items.

As a staff we try and predict which items will have more public input associated with them. Then we debate as to whether we should schedule the “easy” projects that won’t have much public input first (and get those out of the way quickly so the applicant doesn’t have to sit through a long meeting waiting to get to their item) or whether we should schedule the item we think will have more public input first, so the public will not have to sit through a bunch of items on the agenda waiting to get to the more controversial one.

Since we have not been able to come to a perfect solution on this issue, we would like to pose the question to the Commission and determine which order you think the items on the agenda should be listed.

1. Are the meetings running too long?
2. Are the number of items on the agenda appropriate?
3. Do we need to separate the items between legislative and administrative?

4. Would including the type of item in the body of the project description suffice? For example

**Planned Development and Preliminary Subdivision located at approximately 824, 826, 830 South West Temple.** - A request by CW The Ruby LLC to construct The Ruby: A proposed twelve unit townhome style multifamily development to be located at the above listed address. The planned development would have four buildings, consisting of three attached, side by side, units in each single building. Two buildings will face West Temple; two buildings will be located to the rear of the street facing buildings and be without street frontage. The site is approximately 0.40 acres located in the FB-UN2: Form Based Urban Neighborhood 2 zoning district and is within Council District 4 represented by Derek Kitchen. (Staff Contact: Doug Dansie at (801)535-6182 or doug.dansie@slcgov.com) **Administrative Matter** Case number **PLNSUB2017-00047 and PLNSUB2017-00129**

5. Should items that are most likely to have a lot of public input be placed first on the agenda or should items that are likely to be easy for the Commission to decide on, placed first?

We look forward to discussing this matter with you at the April 12, 2017 meeting.

Thank You